

safeguards or limitations. The Treasury recommends early consideration by the Congress of the various proposals designed to modify the bar to deductibility of expenditures in connection with the legislative process.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. SCRIBNER, Jr.,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

APPENDIX

(Regulations under sec. 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to lobbying expenditures)

"(c)(1) Expenditures for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes (including the support of or opposition to any candidate for public office), or for carrying on propaganda (including advertising) related to any of the foregoing purposes are not deductible from gross income. For example, the cost of advertising to promote or defeat legislation or to influence the public with respect to the desirability or undesirability of proposed legislation is not deductible as a business expense, even though the legislation may directly affect the taxpayer's business. On the other hand, expenditures for institutional or goodwill advertising which keeps the taxpayer's name before the public are generally deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses provided the expenditures are related to the patronage the taxpayer might reasonably expect in the future. For example, a deduction will ordinarily be allowed for the cost of advertising which keeps the taxpayer's name before the public in connection with encouraging contributions to such organizations as the Red Cross, the purchase of U.S. savings bonds, or participation in similar causes. In like fashion, expenditures for advertising which present views on economic, financial, social, or other subjects of a general nature but which do not involve any of the activities specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph are deductible if they otherwise meet the requirements of the regulations under section 162.

"(2) Dues and other payments to an organization, such as a labor union or a trade association, which otherwise meet the requirements of the regulations under section 162, are deductible in full unless a substantial part of the organization's activities consists of one or more of those specified in the first sentence of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph. If a substantial part of the activities of the organization consists of one or more of those so specified, deduction will be allowed only for such portion of such dues and other payments as the taxpayer can clearly establish is attributable to activities other than those so specified. The

determination as to whether such specified activities constitute a substantial part of an organization's activities shall be based on all the facts and circumstances. In no event shall special assessments or similar payments (including an increase in dues) made to any organization for any such specified purposes be deductible.

"(3) Expenditures for the promotion or the defeat of legislation include, but shall not be limited to, expenditures for the purpose of attempting to—

"(1) Influence members of a legislative body directly or indirectly, by urging or encouraging the public to contact such members for the purpose of proposing, supporting, or opposing legislation, or

"(11) Influence the public to approve or reject a measure in a referendum, initiative, vote on a constitutional amendment, or similar procedure."

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1960.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of February 1, 1960, with respect to H.R. 7123, a bill "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income."

The Department of Commerce recommends enactment of this legislation or enactment of legislation which would accomplish the same general objectives.

For many years the Treasury Department has disallowed deductions from gross income of expenditures made for the purpose of influencing legislation. This rule was first upheld by the Supreme Court in *Textile Mills v. Commissioner* (314 U.S. 326 (1941)). Early last year the Supreme Court again considered the question in *Cammarano v. United States* (358 U.S. 489 (1959)), and again upheld the Treasury Department position. In *Cammarano* the Court relied on the continuous existence of the rule over a 40-year period, its consistent construction and application by the courts to attempts to persuade the electorate, and repeated re-enactment by Congress of the statutory section which the regulation interpreted.

The provision of the Internal Revenue Code involved (sec. 162) states that there shall be allowed as a deduction all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business. As illustrations of deductible items the section lists compensation for personal services, traveling expenses and rental payments. The Treasury Department has amplified deductible and nondeductible items in detailed regulations.

On September 19, 1959, the Treasury Department published a notice of proposed rule-making dealing with so-called lobbying expenditures. These proposed rules were considered during public hearings held in November and became effective in the latter part of 1959 (24 F.R. 10901, Dec. 29, 1959). The newly issued regulation (sec. 1.162-15(c)(1)) provides that expenditures for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes, or for carrying on propaganda related to any of the foregoing are not deductible from gross income. The regulation further provides that dues or other payments to an organization, such as a labor union or a trade association, are deductible unless a substantial part of the organization's activities consist of one or more of those for which deductions from gross income are not allowed. In passing, it might be noted that the term "a substantial part" creates serious problems of interpretation.

Considerable concern has been expressed, both at the November hearings and since promulgation of the new regulation, by businessmen, labor organizations and trade associations over its possible impairment of necessary, useful and legitimate expressions of opinion. It appears to be completely unrealistic, for example, to disallow under the statutory "ordinary and necessary" test expenditures by a business enterprise whose very existence may be threatened by the passage of a proposed bill.

Legislative bodies need openly expressed opinions in order to properly carry out their functions. Frequently these expressions are made by the business community at the request of legislatures.

It is our view that lawful expenditures by business enterprises to support or oppose legislation at all levels of government, when involving the interests of their particular businesses, should be deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses. The impact of government has become so pervasive that businessmen and the organizations which represent their interests often find it necessary to convey to legislative bodies and to the public their views regarding existing or proposed legislation. Freedom of expression is an essential element of a free economy.

It appears that a realistic solution to the problem will be found only in appropriate legislative changes. We feel that the sound policy would be to permit full deduction for all lawful expenditures that are related to the business of the taxpayer. H.R. 7123 is designed to accomplish this objective and we favor its enactment or the enactment of similar remedial legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

F. A. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1960

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 8, 1960)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Eternal God, quest of the ages, whom by searching we cannot find, we are sure of Thee not because Thou didst speak through the lips of prophets in

days of old. We are sure of Thee because for those who have hearts to feel and ears to hear Thy voice resounds today.

We have heard Thee speak wherever truth is uttered. We have seen Thee in life's loveliness. We have touched Thy garment in the sacrament of human love. We have sensed Thy presence in all brave and generous deeds.

As we come to this session, our hearts are made heavy by the sudden news that the voice of a dedicated public servant will not again be heard in this Chamber. Here that voice was raised in passionate defense of the causes his conscience told him were right and just. We remember with gratitude that he was a gallant crusader in the campaign to track down

the great scourge which had reached for his own life and which yearly snuffs out the mortal lives of a multitude of our people.

We would bear witness that RICHARD NEUBERGER with singleness of heart sought to know the truth and to ally himself with it. We rejoice that he knew human love which is akin to Thine, that he reveled with the poet's eye in all things lovely in nature's wonderland and in literature, and that selfless valor in great causes wherever found, for him brought Thy presence near.

As we think of the Nation's loss symbolized this day by the fluttering flags at half-mast, we pray especially for Thy consoling grace upon the companion who

shared so completely his life in all its aspects. In the darkness, when the sun has gone down while it was yet day, we ask that at last, whether soon or late by our earth calendars, Thou wilt bring us all to the homeland of Thine eternal love. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MAURER, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5040) to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5040) to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that under the rule we would vote on closing debate 1 hour after we convene tomorrow. In view of the distressing news we have heard about our beloved colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, I am going to ask unanimous consent that after we conclude our deliberations today we assemble at 9:30 tomorrow morning, and that we proceed to vote on closing debate at 2 o'clock tomorrow. That would give us time tomorrow to discuss the questions if Senators desire to do so, and would not necessitate our staying in session today. We normally recess after tributes are paid.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was apprised earlier this morning of the possibility of such an announcement as has just been made.

I have not had an opportunity to consult my colleagues who joined with me in the cloture motion. Since we of course desire no controversies on the floor today, I should deeply appreciate the courtesy if the majority leader would withhold his request for a few minutes until I can consult with my colleagues who are interested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought I contacted all with whom it seemed necessary to consult, but apparently I have not, Mr. President. We can have the vote at 10 o'clock tomorrow or at a later time. I shall be glad to have the Senator pursue the subject with anyone else he desires to consult. But I do not want any other business transacted today.

It seems to me that would be satisfactory to the minority leader.

I have discussed the situation with the Senator from Oregon and with others. I believe it will be satisfactory if we fix the time for the debate from 9:30 until 2 o'clock, and then have the vote. If Senators found it necessary, they could leave for the funeral after the vote.

Mr. President, I temporarily withhold my request and yield to the Senator from Oregon.

DEATH OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with sad and heavy heart that I announce to the Senate this morning that last night my colleague, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, passed to the Great Beyond. On the basis of such information as we have up to this hour, the immediate cause of his death appeared to be a massive cerebral hemorrhage.

In the words of the great poet, John Freeman, "Last night a sword-light in the sky flashed a swift terror on the dark."

Mr. President, DICK NEUBERGER wrote a great chapter in Oregon's political history. He loved young people, particularly students. His political record will for generations to come inspire young people who study it. Oregon and the Nation have lost a courageous leader, one whose voice and pen will be sorely missed in this time of national and international crisis.

Mrs. Morse and I extend to his wife, who has been his lovely partner throughout his great political career, to his wonderful mother and father, to his sister Jane, and the other fine members of his immediate family, our deepest sympathy.

I would have the RECORD show, Mr. President, some of the salient biographic facts about this fallen leader.

He was born in Multnomah County, Oreg., December 26, 1912; was educated in the public schools of Portland and at the University of Oregon; served in the U.S. Army from July 15, 1942, until August 12, 1945. He was an aide to Gen. James A. O'Connor during the construction of the Alaska Military Highway.

His experiences in his military service in Alaska made him one of the staunchest and most able advocates and defenders of Alaska statehood in this body when that legislative issue was before us.

He was a member of the Oregon House of Representatives in 1941 and 1942; a member of the Oregon State Senate from 1949 to 1954. He was married December 20, 1945, to H. Maurine Brown, who was born at Cloverdale, Tillamook County, Oreg., and who taught in the public schools of Portland, Newberg, and Milton-Freewater.

I think, Mr. President, it is fitting and apropos to say that all of us in the Senate, as we watched that lovely couple work as a close team in serving this Nation, not only in our State legislature, but here in the Senate of the United States, were inspired by the reflection of what a beautiful marriage really means.

Mr. President, DICK NEUBERGER was one of the able authors of our generation. He wrote "Our Promised Land," "The Lewis and Clark Expedition," "Royal Canadian Mounted Police," "Adventures in Politics—We Go to the Legislature," and other books. His magazine and periodical writings, his special feature stories for various newspapers, including the New York Times, always

were inspiring and educational, and made him one of the best read of our modern writers, both in the newspaper field and in the field of modern books.

He was a member of the Oregon State Grange, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Eagles Lodge, the American Veterans Committee, Temple Beth Israel, City Club of Portland, the Izaak Walton League, the Tualatin Country Club, and other organizations.

He contributed to the Saturday Evening Post, the Reader's Digest, Harper's, Collier's, the American Reporter, the Progressive magazine, and many other periodicals.

DICK NEUBERGER traveled extensively over the entire Lewis and Clark Trail and other historic routes in the Pacific Northwest, and his writings on Pacific Northwest history have been a source of great information and inspiration to the students of our schools and colleges in the Pacific Northwest, as well as elsewhere in the Nation.

He was elected to the U.S. Senate on November 2, 1954, for the term ending January 3, 1961.

Mr. President, among the great things for which DICK NEUBERGER stood, I suppose there is none that he would more appreciate having mentioned this morning than his great record in the field of natural resources. DICK NEUBERGER was a conservationist through and through.

DICK NEUBERGER was dedicated to the cause of enlightened conservation. He truly believed that our generation has a solemn responsibility to see to it that we leave to future generations of American boys and girls a heritage of natural resources untrammelled by waste and selfish interest in our time.

I think that probably the most fitting summary which I can give of this Senator's record and the things for which he stood is to cite his own statement on March 1, 1960, when he filed for reelection to the U.S. Senate. I shall ask permission to have the complete statement printed at the close of my remarks, but I wish to quote from it at this time. In offering himself for reelection to the U.S. Senate, DICK NEUBERGER listed these as some of his major legislative achievements in Congress:

Sponsorship of the bill authorizing \$90 million to save the vast pine forest and wildlife marshes of the Klamath Basin and Indian Reservation from overnight destruction.

Sponsorship of the bill establishing Oregon's first historic shrine under the National Park Service, at Fort Clatsop, near Astoria.

Sponsorship of the first Federal legislation setting standards for the protection of roadside beauty and scenery along the 42,000-mile Interstate Highway System.

The inclusion, for the first time in a waterways bill, of an authorization for the \$19 million Yaquina Bay project on the central Oregon seacoast.

First Senator to sponsor an increase in the Federal gasoline tax so the U.S. highway network could be kept on a pay-as-you-go basis without resort to deficit financing.

Sponsorship of fair across-the-board increases in all classes of postal revenues in order to reduce the staggering fiscal deficit in the Post Office Department and to pay adequate wages to postal workers.

Sponsorship of voluntary health insurance and medical program for public employees, which could become the model for protecting the health of every American citizen.

Leadership in increasing Federal funds for medical research generally and cancer research in particular, including sponsorship of a \$1.3 million grant for a great medical research center at the University of Oregon Medical School.

Senator NEUBERGER also listed these two legislative projects of his which he regarded as "hopefully close to success":

The creation of an Oregon seacoast national park in Lane, Douglas, and Coos Counties, thus giving our State its first new national park since Crater Lake Park was established in 1902.

Legislation setting up a Columbia River regional development corporation so that revenues from existing projects can be used to finance urgently needed new undertakings in the field of water power, navigation, irrigation, and flood control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion I have not covered of the statement Senator NEUBERGER made in Oregon, on March 1, 1960, when he filed for reelection to the Senate, setting forth the legislative record he wished to have the voters consider as they weighed his candidacy for reelection, be printed at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is not only these legislative proposals which DICK NEUBERGER listed as the legislative record which he would have the voters of Oregon consider, and which he would leave behind him as a legislative monument, but he assisted the Senate in the passage of many other pieces of legislation. I think his achievements can be well summarized by saying that DICK NEUBERGER had a tendency to ask himself the question, when he had the task of voting in the Senate, "On which side of this issue do I believe human welfare to be found?" DICK NEUBERGER believed that, after all, our great wealth is to be found in our people. He sought, across State lines, to serve the people by promoting at all times the legislation which he believed would best promote their general welfare.

His most recent writing is to be found in a newsletter which he published on March 7, a newsletter in which he discussed two subject matters which I think it appropriate for me to mention as I pay tribute and make this sad announcement of his death this morning. In this letter, he discussed the proposed legislation which is pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that part of Senator NEUBERGER'S

newsletter which sets forth his views concerning the proposed civil rights legislation.

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

DISCRIMINATION AS A CONDITION, NOT A THEORY

Accounts of the marathon debate on civil rights are heavily burdened with descriptions of the procedural tactics of opponents and proponents of this legislation. Sometimes the substantive issues slip out of sight. Facts contained in the recent report of the Commission on Civil Rights emphasize what the struggle in the Senate is all about:

Only 25 percent of the approximately 5 million Negroes of voting age living in the South are registered to vote. About 60 percent of voting-age southern whites are registered.

Compliance with the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on segregation in schools has been initiated by 11 Southern States. But 6 States have flatly refused to comply, and only one-fourth of all biracial school districts in the 17 States have started to desegregate.

Nearly 70 percent of nonwhite families live in dwellings which are dilapidated or contain inadequate plumbing. While one-third of all nonfarm dwellings occupied by nonwhites have more than one person per room, only one in eight of all such white-occupied dwellings are this crowded.

This is what discrimination means.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this newsletter, written as recently as March 7, Senator NEUBERGER quoted from the report of the Civil Rights Commission. He pleaded with his pen once more for legislation which would give to the Negroes of this country the right to vote. He pleaded with his pen once more, as he would, I am certain, if he were with us today, plead with his voice, that the Senate pass a meaningful civil rights bill, a civil rights bill which not only would give to the colored people of the Nation a guarantee of their right to vote, but also would give to them those other guarantees which are necessary if the 14th and 15th amendments are to have meaning to the colored people of America, and if they are to enjoy first-class citizenship. In his brilliant style, cogently he made that argument in his last newsletter. I am proud to incorporate that part of his newsletter as a part of my tribute to his memory.

In the same newsletter, he penned again his plea for the conservation of youth. He spoke about the need for legislation which he said he was pressing in the Senate which would provide for a youth training corps in the Foreign Service as well as at home. He proposed that our youth be sent abroad to assist with our foreign policy, in a program of technical assistance, a program of natural resource development, a program which would enable the youth assigned to it to be of assistance to our Foreign Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that part of Senator NEUBERGER'S newsletter of March 7, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS: AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

Why not utilize the enthusiasm and talents of American youth to help sell de-

mocracy abroad? Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, has introduced legislation to help accomplish this purpose. He proposes a nongovernmental study of the advisability and practicability of establishing a Point 4 Youth Corps through which young men and women might serve around the world in U.S. technical cooperation programs. I have introduced identical legislation in the Senate.

Such a program could well be a powerful force for increased world understanding. It would add manpower to carry out economic programs in underdeveloped nations, personally acquaint citizens in other lands of American ideals and aspirations, and provide American young people with an opportunity to serve their country in a stimulating fashion. One of the questions to be considered in the suggested study is whether service in the corps should be considered as satisfying military service obligations. In the current cold war, we need persons with the ability to set up a rural school in the jungle as well as those with knowledge of how to operate a machinegun. How could we better explain the United States and its desire for world peace than through sending to aid needy nations our most valuable commodity—our youth?

Mr. MORSE. Then, in a recent article in the Reader's Digest, DICK NEUBERGER wrote on the subject: "The Best Advice I Ever Had." I think it would be of interest to the Senate for me to read just a brief quotation from that article, in which he wrote:

Later, at his home in Calgary, I asked the famous man hunter of the mounted how he accounted for such affection, rarely given to a man with the stern task of upholding the law. La Nauze looked at me out of pale blue eyes that had squinted across bleak miles of frozen tundra. "Dick," he replied, "I suppose those people in the north country still think well of me because I followed a rule that I would recommend in all human relationships. No matter how decisive things seemed to be on my side, I always kept in mind one thought: The other fellow may be right."

Then Dick wrote:

Perhaps because of the impressive dignity of the man, his advice has lingered in my memory and guided me. It has given me second thoughts in situations where once I felt all too sure of myself.

Mr. President, it is due to this fallen leader to say that he put into practice, as a mode of conduct, this bit of advice which he attributed to this Canadian mountie, who told him on that day: "Always keep in mind one thought: the other fellow may be right."

All of us in the Senate know, Mr. President, the courage with which DICK NEUBERGER faced death when he knew that he was afflicted with cancer.

It has been a great encouragement, I am sure, to the rest of us, to read Senator NEUBERGER'S account of his meeting up with the knowledge that he might be afflicted with a cancer which would give him but a few years or, possibly, a few months, to live.

For Coronet he wrote recently a stirring article entitled "Let's Build a 'Crash Program' To Beat Cancer."

He had made clear, in speech after speech here in the Senate, that he intended to dedicate a good part of his public service to an effort to try to awaken the American people to the need

of giving support to those medical research programs and those hospitalization programs and those medical programs necessary to reduce, at least, if not conquer, the great scourge of cancer. In this Coronet article he set forth his views in regard to this challenge to face, and this obligation to meet, the cancer threat. I ask unanimous consent that this recent article of DICK NEUBERGER be incorporated at this point as part of my remarks.

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

[From Coronet, January 1960]

LET'S BUILD A "CRASH PROGRAM" TO BEAT CANCER

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon)

(When cancer suddenly struck this Senator, he realized gratefully that research, for which he'd voted funds, was saving his life and might save the lives of 45 million other Americans.)

What if we knew, without the slightest doubt, that a foreign foe intended to attack us with nuclear missiles or germ warfare? What if we also knew, with equal certainty, that some 30 million of us would perish in agony from this assault, while 15 million more would suffer great pain or be permanently maimed?

A menace of these ghastly proportions does imperil 45 million Americans today, although not in the form of hydrogen warheads or lethal gas. It often gives even less warning than these. The name of the menace is cancer. From the cruel ravages of this disease, two out of every three American families in every avenue and echelon of society are destined to suffer painfully.

The American Government would spare no effort or expense to repel any military attack that threatened 45 million of us. Our Federal Treasury would be emptied, if necessary, to pay for armaments and weapons. Our vast private wealth and resources would be thrown into the fray.

Yet, despite the terrible threat of cancer, we spend far less on research into its causes and possible cures than we do, for instance, to build half a dozen B-58 bombers. Our annual expenditure for doughnuts more than triples what we spend in search of an answer to the curse of cancer. Nor does our total outlay for lifesaving cancer research compare with what we spend on cigarettes or liquor or radio and television repairs or even chewing gum.

What is the reason for such glaring inequities?

I think I can answer that from my personal experience. It's because we all believe, down deep, that it will never be ourselves who will get cancer. It's always the other fellow. I know. I once had such feelings myself. I don't now and for a good reason: I am a cancer victim.

I always had intellectual convictions that cancer was a dangerous enemy, and I've spent a good part of my senatorial career successfully fighting for more funds for Government cancer research. But now my feelings about cancer come from my own bitter, personal experience; and it wasn't all bitter, at that. I'm one of the lucky ones. My cancer was caught early—an accident, you might say—I'd gone to my doctor about something else entirely, and he found the growth I'd never noticed. There was no pain, no warning. My doctor's skill was responsible, of course, but it was just luck that I visited him. And it was luck that my cancer, which began in my testicle and had spread to a minor degree to the edges of my lungs, was one of the kind that responds to the new ways of treatment available.

One of my vivid nightmares is to recall the mixture of incredulity and fear which swept over me when our family doctor told me I had cancer. I just could not accept his terrifying words. This just could not be me.

And then, later, as I came out from under the anesthetic, following surgery, the doctors told me that they confidently expected me to recover. While I stared at them in doubt, they explained that my tumor had been diagnosed as a type sensitive to radiation. Further, the doctors added, cobalt and high-voltage X-ray therapy, developed in recent years, could destroy the tiny but potentially lethal metastases which, even then, lurked on the outer edge of each of my lungs.

I can tell you that the cancer victim is frequently the loneliest person in the world. He feels that nothing can help him. Friends, family, doctors, associates all seem without power to check the malignant growth that perils his life. He wishes, desperately and profoundly, for some miraculous cure which will bring a reprieve.

In the weeks and months of radiation therapy which followed, I lay beneath the X-ray cone for a few minutes every weekday and blessed the long line of men and women whose findings in medical research, over the decades, were helping to save my life. Several well-known doctors wrote me letters saying that funds, for which I had voted in the U.S. Senate, had paid for perfecting the very radiation equipment being used in my own treatment. And when such letters came, I could only think in terror of what the outcome might have been for me if such equipment had not been developed.

I recall one dramatic conversation I had with the radiologist treating me, which demonstrates my personal reliance on the results of medical research.

"The spread to the lung of the type of tumor which you have can be destroyed permanently if an adequate number of roentgens (a measure of X-rays) can be conveyed to the lesions," the doctor had said. Then he added:

"With cobalt or high-voltage X-ray, we know we can deliver to your lungs—safely and tolerably—enough roentgens."

"What if you didn't have these things?" I inquired.

"With the early X-ray equipment we often failed," the doctor said, "because the skin and tissues of the patient were damaged too severely before the necessary dosage could be administered internally."

I wondered what my fate would have been if I had suffered from the same malignancy a few years earlier.

At the recent Senate hearings on appropriations for the National Cancer Institute, our Government-supported research center, Dr. I. S. Ravdin of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine told a gripping story which filled us all with hope. In the early 1920's, a noted doctor visited the William Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Medicine in Philadelphia and lunched with Dr. Alfred Stengel.

"How is your son Tom?" Dr. Stengel asked his friend.

"I wish young Tom were dead," his friend said, his voice heavy with sorrow. "He has diabetes. He is 13 and yet he isn't any bigger than a normal boy of 6. He can't possibly live and grow up."

Dr. Stengel replied, "Tom, you ought not to talk this way. Next month, next year or the year after, someone has got to come up with a solution for diabetes."

Within 24 hours of that prophetic conversation between the two physicians, the discovery of insulin that could be injected into human beings was announced. It brought life and hope to sufferers from diabetes all over the world. Young Tom was the second patient ever treated with insulin in the United States. Today he is married, has five

children of his own and is himself a distinguished doctor. Yet what would have been his destiny if medical researchers had not been delving for years for an answer to diabetes?

My wife Maurine and I visited the Children's Cancer Research Foundation in Boston, where Dr. Sidney Farber and his associates have some 376 children under treatment for cancer, many of them victims of the dreaded cancer of the blood and bone marrow, leukemia. We saw the agonized stare of parents who cannot believe their beloved child suffers from the incurable disease. Yet, these poor little leukemia victims, who used to survive an average of only 3 or 5 months, now live almost 2 years. One boy was kept alive and vigorous for 8 years through chemical agents.

A major breakthrough has not been achieved in leukemia, but researchers are on the frontier of important advances. Dr. Farber believes that the annual screening of some 40,000 chemicals for the treatment of cancer offers the brightest prospect for a startling, new discovery. A universal blood or urine test for cancer is another goal.

But progress depends entirely upon findings in laboratories. Money is needed to train researchers, to build facilities and furnish grants for their operation. Last year, the American Cancer Society spent over \$13 million for cancer research. Much of the remainder of the society's \$30 million of voluntary donations went for service to cancer patients, supported the nationwide program of education to acquaint Americans with the danger signals of cancer, and to persuade them to have annual physical checkups.

Out of the \$75 million budget of the National Cancer Institute, about \$68 million went into some phase of research. About \$4 million was spent in cancer research through the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund, the Sloan-Kettering Institute, and various pharmaceutical firms. Impressive gains have been made but the blank wall of cancer still stands. How can we breach that wall?

Most scientists in the vital field of cancer research believe there is a direct relationship between the number of men and women engaged in their work and the time when a cure finally will be found. Listen to Dr. Howard A. Rusk, distinguished medical editor of the New York Times:

"When will the scientific breakthrough come to solve the riddle of cancer? No one knows. What we do know, however, is that the more scientists who are at work on the problem in laboratories all over the world, the greater are the odds for solution and the quicker that solution will come."

And Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall of the University of Chicago, who retired about a year ago as president of the American Cancer Society, says: "Some people ask in good conscience, 'Isn't there a limit to the funds that could be spent fruitfully on cancer research?' Of course there is a limit, but we have not nearly reached it."

So why not a genuine crash program of cancer research? Why not place half a billion dollars—the cost of 25 B-58 bombers—at the disposal of the National Cancer Institute for grants in a realm where countless lives might be saved? Dr. Leonard Scheele, ex-Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, once told me that half a billion dollars could be used constructively for cancer research. He suggested that the sum be carried over from year to year until fully expended, thus permitting continuity in vital projects which now have only annual duration. "In addition," said Dr. Scheele, "a considerable portion of the amount should be dedicated to the training of new scientists in the health field—just as a major share of our military budget is for the training of fliers, navigators, and other fighting men."

Half a billion dollars may seem like a lot of money per se, but not when we relate it to the lives of 45 million American victims of cancer. It comes down to only slightly more than \$10 per life—per irreplaceable human life.

When I speak of a "crash" program for cancer research, I have in mind the determined Federal action that took place in 1940 after Dr. Albert Einstein had sent his historic letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with its warnings of Nazi experiments in nuclear fission. The all-out crash program to crack the atom followed immediately, with over \$2 billion spent through the top-secret Manhattan project. Scientists claimed that 50 years of research were compressed into 4 or 5 years as a result of this unstinted effort.

Why, then, are we capable of such a crash program when the menace is a foreign foe, but not when it is deadly cells running wild through our own bodies?

Yet even the increase in funds for the National Cancer Institute, from nearly \$22 million (in 1955) to \$110 million (for this year), has not been accomplished without the most persistent sort of congressional activity. The national administration has refused to recommend budget increases for cancer research despite the fact that illustrious supporters such as Senator Robert A. Taft, Senator Arthur H. Vandenburg, and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles all have succumbed to cancer within the last 7 years.

Furthermore, cancer recognizes neither border nor breed nor birth. It can strike down the millionaire on Park Avenue and the tribesman in his Congo hut. Our Government spends more than \$3.4 billion a year in foreign aid to strengthen our alliances with other free nations. Yet imagine the worldwide thrill if some scientific breakthrough were to liberate mankind from the terrifying menace of cancer. This is why Senator LISTER HILL has promoted an Institute of International Health, to help place the necessary funds at the disposal of scientists anywhere on earth who can contribute to the control of cancer and other diseases. The sole test would be medical findings rather than national allegiances.

We look back now with pity on the recent era when pneumonia was almost always fatal, when children were struck down from diphtheria and scarlet fever, when infected throats in childhood often meant lethal Bright's disease in later years. What will be the emotions of the next epoch of mankind as it looks back upon our frequent helplessness in the face of cancer? Will it mourn that so many men, women, and children in our era perished needlessly because they lived a little too soon—before the "crash" effort which at last brought cancer to bay?

What ought to be done? I favor a five-point program:

1. The sum of \$500 million for the National Cancer Institute, to be distributed in grants for cancer research to any medical school, clinic, hospital, pharmaceutical house or private physician where a promising lead had been developed.

2. Increased support through private giving to such voluntary groups as the American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund.

3. Forgiveness of 50 percent of loans under the National Scholarship Act to any medical student or other scientist who will spend at least 5 years in medical research. This should be accompanied by grants to medical schools for the construction of research facilities.

4. The international pooling of medical discoveries through an Institute of International Health, as well as the calling of an International Medical Year in 1960 to parallel

the recent International Geophysical Year. Surely the study of a killing disease is as important as the study of rocks, ice and sea water.

5. Take our Red Cross hospital ships out of mothballs and send them overseas, staffed with American doctors and nurses and sanitary technicians, to help undeveloped nations under our foreign aid program to fight cancer and other diseases. In many less fortunate nations, infant mortality is shockingly high and blindness affects a large segment of the adult population, to some degree. These people would rather keep their babies or have reasonable vision than have their streets paved.

I may be unduly conscious of the urgency of such programs because the results of medical research have saved my life. When we were discussing in the Senate late last June the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, I told my colleagues that I owed my very presence in the marble Chamber to findings sponsored by the National Cancer Institute. The Democratic majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who suffered a massive coronary attack in 1955, declared that he could say the identical thing about discoveries made possible through the research grants program of the National Heart Institute. Because cancer and heart disease recognize no aisle between the political parties, our Republican colleague on the other side of the Chamber, Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, said to Senator JOHNSON and to me: "If the appropriations for medical research have had any force in bringing about both of those results or either of them, they have surely proved their effectiveness. I shall certainly support this increased amount for medical research."

Will increased expenditures result in finding a cure for cancer? The American Cancer Society points out that earlier diagnosis and advances in treatment have increased the cancer cure rate from one out of every four cancer victims to one in three. To the cancer patient, like myself, such things are more than mere numbers. They are survival—the chance to breathe anew, to walk in the woods, to revel in the affection of family and friends, to see the glories of the sunrise and to drink in the wonders of the starlit night.

I'm happier to be alive than I've ever been. Having cancer has changed all my attitudes, all my values. When you're facing the terrible threat of this foul disease, you suddenly discover what's important. The petty discomforts and irritations that used to bother you disappear; and so do ordinary ambitions and attitudes. I don't think I'll ever cease being grateful to my wife for just being my wife; I know I'll never again consider a piece of legislation primarily on its politically partisan aspects.

As a cancer patient, I want to help others who have suffered or who may suffer this disease. I want to encourage them and their families as I was encouraged and supported by cancer progress. I want more: I want to see us lick this disease the way we've licked the infectious diseases. I sincerely believe the world would be more electrified by a breakthrough in cancer than it was by a rocket landing on the moon. As a U.S. Senator, I'm more convinced than ever that we should economize in any other sphere of Government than funds for the research program of the National Cancer Institute—because economy at the expense of human life is the worst extravagance of all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that most of us have read the article he wrote in October 1951 for Think magazine, in regard to the great contest he had with cancer. I am going to read the last paragraph of the article, because

I think it very appropriate as we honor his memory today. He wrote:

A SHADOW'S LENGTH

"For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow." So it is written in Job 8: 9. But we cling to this wraith, shadowy though it may be. It ties us to those we love and to the pleasures of human existence, fleeting and transitory as they are. A tortoise which saw Capt. James Cook, explorer of the South Seas, come ashore from H.H.S. *Resolution* in the 1700's, is under guard in the Tonga Islands. When I look at Mount Hood's eternal snows from our home in Portland, I know I am seeing exactly the same profile of lava rock that came within the telescopes of the first westbound Americans. And so will Mount Hood remain when our descendants have landing platforms in outer space. Man's days may be brief and transient and low-numbered, but he finds them sweet, nevertheless. "Life, if thou knowest how to use it, is long enough," wrote the wise Seneca, and who is there to gainsay him?

As we read this article of Senator DICK NEUBERGER, we are reading the comment of a man who was not afraid to die.

Mr. President, as he faced death, which I am satisfied he knew was not far away, because of the cancer affliction which overtook him, he demonstrated, time and time again, that he was not afraid to die.

In fact—and I speak my own personal view when I say this—I have the feeling, Mr. President, that DICK NEUBERGER knew that the possibilities were great that he would die in the not too distant future. I believe that, when he went back to Portland a few weeks ago, he knew the probabilities were great that he would never return to this body. But I am sure that during those weeks there arose in him again the hope that he might come back—which explains his filing for reelection on March 1.

Yet I am satisfied that this man knew he was facing death, and up to the very last, Mr. President, his pen and his voice wrote and spoke out with words of optimism and encouragement for the living, because he knew there was still much to be done.

Before I close, I wish to say, Mr. President, that DICK NEUBERGER was a partner with his associates in his office in Washington, D.C. He was a partner with his administrative assistant, his legislative assistant, and his research assistant, who are sitting beside me this morning on the floor of the Senate, as we honor the memory of DICK NEUBERGER.

Mr. President, to his office staff, of which he was so proud, I wish to say what I have said to Mr. Lloyd Tupling, his administrative assistant: I and my office staff stand at their service.

In closing this tribute, I know of no words more fitting than those of Edwin Markham when he wrote of Lincoln:

HE HELD HIS PLACE

Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame and faltered not at
praise.

And when he fell in whirlwind, he went
down

As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

We will all be lonesome because this fallen leader is no more in mortal flesh, but his record will live on as his monument.

EXHIBIT 1

FROM SENATOR NEUBERGER'S ANNOUNCEMENT FOR REELECTION

NEUBERGER described his own record as one "which stressed both liberalism and fiscal responsibility." He said he had always emphasized the broad humanitarian needs of the American people, but that he had insisted that programs of social welfare be paid for in our own time by current revenues rather than being financed in the form of deficits. "This may not be popular," he added, "but I know it is right."

If he is reelected to another term in the Senate, NEUBERGER said he would continue to concentrate on specific legislative goals rather than indulge in personal political abuse.

NEUBERGER is recuperating at home from a long series of virus infections brought on by overwork and excessive fatigue. He said he intends to continue his convalescence until his vitality and resistance to such infections has been restored, and realized now he had gone at too hard a pace during recent years. "I have reviewed the record of American voters with respect to many leading public officials, such as President Eisenhower, Senator Lyndon Johnson, Senator John Kennedy, Gov. William Egan of Alaska, and others who have had to take extensive rests," said NEUBERGER, "and I believe the people of Oregon will be no less tolerant and understanding in my own case."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

S. RES. 286

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, late a Senator from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That a committee of Senators be appointed by the president of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that action on the resolution be temporarily withheld.

Mr. President, my feelings about the sad news of the passing of DICK NEUBERGER are very personal. He was a warm friend and a very genuine person.

DICK NEUBERGER was a man of many qualities which endeared him to all of us in this body. He had a great heart. He had great courage. He was totally dedicated to his convictions. We always knew where DICK NEUBERGER stood. Hypocrisy was completely foreign to his makeup. DICK NEUBERGER stated his views frankly, and he stuck to them. At the same time, Mr. President, he had a deep understanding of those who differed honorably with him.

The Senate meets today in a mood of sorrow. All of us who have assembled here know that words are inadequate to bring comfort to DICK NEUBERGER's loved ones.

Mr. President, our Nation has lost a public servant of the highest caliber. Most of us have lost one of the best friends we ever had. I want his wife and family to know that our hearts and our prayers are with them; and we hope that, somehow, time will bring healing solace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the dissolution of the earthly temple that harbors the spirit is always a sad adventure. It is doubly sad when it occurs to a friend. In this case it is exceptionally sad, for it happens not only to a friend, but to a colleague.

The whole mystery of life, I guess, is resolved in death. But on occasions like this, it has always occurred to me that in all the pages of history I can think of only one whose dissolution, rather than whose beginning, has regularly been observed, and that is the patron saint who is commemorated in this month of March—St. Patrick. Perhaps the reason for observing the date of his passing is that the date of his beginning has been obscured in history. But, Mr. President, on occasions like this, I do not think of the end, but, rather, of the beginning, of the wonderful thing it is that life could issue, and that in due course the talent could unfold and could make its constructive contribution to the benefit of our country and to the well-being of mankind.

On many occasions I have said that I know of no greater endowments than the Almighty has given to humankind than, in fact, two great blessings: One, the capacity to remember; the other, the ability to forget.

We can forget all the foibles, all the weaknesses; we can forget all the little exceptions we might have taken in the course of life. But on the hard granite, and on something even more enduring, the human heart, we can enshrine all the nice things we can remember from the glorious past.

Ours would be an impoverished life if we could not summon up from all the wells of remembrance the recollection of a kind touch on a fevered brow and a gentle smile and a thoughtful word that helped lift us and brighten life for us when the day darkened. As the years pass, those things grow in importance, out of God's gift to mankind of the capacity to remember.

So, Mr. President, when we look back and remember, we remember DICK NEUBERGER's wonderful character.

When I first read of his campaign on the west coast, and when there came to my attention some of the things he allegedly stood for, I am not at all sure that there did not build up in my mind a kind of reserve; and before I got to know him at all, I regarded him with perhaps a sort of baleful eye. But all such feeling was suddenly dissolved by the great solvent of his human personality; and, Mr. President, today I confess publicly that I developed a deep affection for DICK NEUBERGER when I got to know him.

DICK NEUBERGER took glory, indeed, in the fact that he was a liberal. But one of the great things about him was that he was an independent liberal. He had

great convictions, and he cherished those convictions and rode with them through thick and thin.

So the Senate has really lost a great Senator. The State of Oregon has lost a great public servant. All of us have lost a friend and a colleague for whom we had not only admiration but affection.

Thus it is, Mr. President, that on this day we remember, not so much his passing, but the fact that he was here. That is the great and the important thing in the entire scheme of life.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate, so all Members may have notice, that we shall set aside a time and a day certain on which they may pay their tributes to Senator NEUBERGER.

I also wish to inform the Senate that, in view of the fact that there will be nothing other than tributes in the Senate today, we plan to ask consent of the Senate tomorrow, after the vote is taken on the cloture motion, to have a morning hour. I shall request that consent tomorrow.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I feel a deep sense of personal loss in the death of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, and I extend heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Neuberger and the Senator's family.

Senator NEUBERGER was interested in resources, and in the heritage we leave to future generations, not only in terms of physical resources, but also in terms of institutions which would assure abundance, peace and fruitful human life.

It has been a great privilege to work with him in relation to resources matters, in which he constantly represented the masses of citizens struggling to preserve for them, and for posterity, some of our great public assets unmarred for perpetual public enjoyment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last Friday I read in the Portland newspapers an announcement to the effect that the doctors of our beloved colleague, DICK NEUBERGER, had given him a clean bill of health, insofar as his ability to run for reelection to the U.S. Senate was concerned. I penned DICK NEUBERGER a note in which I expressed my delight and my gladness that that was so.

Therefore, Mr. President, today, naturally, it was a great shock to me to learn that a relapse had caused his death.

I have known DICK NEUBERGER all my adult life. I had many conferences with him during the time when he was considering running for election to the U.S. Senate. I sat with him on many occasions and urged him to get into the race, because of his deep, devoted feelings regarding the field of conservation and the development of our natural resources, which are so important to our area. He was dedicated to that cause. He had written much about it. He had spoken often about it, and he devoted to that cause much of his career in writing.

DICK NEUBERGER did run for election to the U.S. Senate; and I think that, more than anything else, the people of the State of Oregon felt that in him they had a man devoted to that program.

I wish to put more in the RECORD regarding DICK NEUBERGER, because I feel

that the people should know a great deal more about his life's work and his life's dedication.

Today, I do wish to take the opportunity, of course, to express my feelings to his fine wife, to his family, and to those around him, because I, too, have lost an old friend.

But, second, I wish to point out to the Senate, again, that the times seem now, as they have in the past, to emphasize what DICK NEUBERGER in the last few months of his life had called to our attention and to the attention of the Nation.

About 20 years ago, a distinguished Member of this body, a Senator from the State of Washington, Homer T. Bone, introduced a bill which was the first of its kind in the history of Congress; it was dedicated to making some start in an attack upon the dread killer of mankind—cancer.

I had the privilege, while in the House of Representatives, of joining Senator Bone of Washington in sponsoring that bill. The bill, which was sponsored by the entire Senate, was passed, and out of it came the establishment of what is now known as the National Cancer Institute, in an effort to see what we could do to be helpful with other organizations and medical science and scientists to attack this dread killer. We met some success but since that time I have watched some of our very distinguished colleagues in our own body and other Americans fall one by one to this disease. I was here when the Senator from Connecticut, Brien McMahon, who served with many of us in this body, went the way of DICK NEUBERGER. And then the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, who was then the minority leader, Kenneth Wherry, went the same way. Then the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft, the great American, was also felled by this killer, and now it has hit home again with RICHARD NEUBERGER.

I am sure that what he said, and what was said by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who expresses his feeling that he might contribute to the future of mankind in an effort to do something about this second killer of all Americans, cancer, has contributed. Not only did Senator NEUBERGER contribute all his life to the great cause of the development of our natural resources, he contributed something else, in an effort to help create a public alertness, help create in the minds of those who are working so hard on this dread killer a renewed energy, in the hope that some day we may find a solution.

Mr. President, as I said, I have lost an old friend. The Senate has lost a distinguished and able Member. The State of Oregon has lost one of its finest citizens, and the Nation is sad in the death of DICK NEUBERGER.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, DICK NEUBERGER was our good neighbor. He loved his Nation, his Northwest, his State, and his hometown.

With his artistic pen, he led an unrelenting fight over the years to conserve and better utilize, for all, the great

resources of our Northwest and our Nation. He was a conservationist not only of our natural resources, but of human values.

He was an effective advocate, pursuing with great skill and vigor the causes which were fortunate enough to have his support. In the end, however, his decisions were tempered by a judicial determination to be fair and just to all.

He was, indeed, a dedicated statesman, an honorable man, a noble soul. I have lost an irreplaceable friend and neighbor of more than 20 years. The Senate has lost a truly great U.S. Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is with heavy hearts that Mrs. Mansfield and I join in the tributes paid to our late colleague from Oregon, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. My thoughts go first to those who were closest to him, to his wife and family, and I extend to them the poor comfort which words of sympathy are at such a moment. The loss which they have suffered is deep and personal.

Others will feel this loss. The Senate will grieve. The people of the State of Oregon and elsewhere mourn.

RICHARD NEUBERGER brought a special contribution to the public life of the Nation. He gave us a great personal integrity, tempered with human warmth and understanding and a gentle touch of humor. He gave us, in his life, an example of courage in the face of pain and adversity. He gave us in his work an example of service to the welfare of the people of the Nation, a service which was as dedicated as it was modest and unassuming. He did more than any other man of his time to awaken the Congress and the Nation to the priceless treasure of the rivers and forests—the wilderness around us. He worked to preserve this treasure for all Americans against the ravages of the selfish and the neglect of the unthinking.

For these things and more, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER will be remembered. He will be remembered for these efforts especially by those of us from the Northwestern States from whence he came, from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Alaska. We would regard it as a fitting tribute if a Federal wilderness area in that region were named after this great Senator who did so much to save these areas.

Had he lived longer, RICHARD NEUBERGER would have done more, much more, for Oregon, the Northwest, and the Nation. Yet even in death his presence will be felt. For he was as a quiet star among us, burning for a brief moment, a star whose light remains after it is gone.

Mr. President, when I came to my desk this morning there was a note there to the effect that Senator NEUBERGER had requested me to put in the RECORD an editorial from the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg., dated March 2, 1960, entitled, "Peggy in the Senate." Let me read the words I had intended to employ this morning before I had heard of the

unfortunate passing of our late great colleague, Senator NEUBERGER:

SENATOR NEUBERGER ASKS CONSIDERATION OF APPEAL FOR APPOINTMENT OF GIRL PAGES

Recently the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. NEUBERGER, brought to my attention an editorial from the Oregon Statesman, a daily newspaper published in Salem, Oreg., asking the question: "Why does not the U.S. Senate provide girls with the opportunity to become pages?"

The editorial cites the ambition of Peggy Price, of Eugene, Oreg., to serve as a Senate page, but reports that Miss Price has found that the fact she is a girl is regarded as a strike against her. "If the Senators someday feel that we might have a woman President, they certainly should feel that lesser positions should be filled by women first," she declares.

Senator NEUBERGER has contacted the Senate Sergeant at Arms, whose office has jurisdiction over Senate pages, urging that consideration be given to the spirited appeal of Miss Price. So that the Senate may be aware of this question, I ask that the Oregon Statesman editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

The editorial I was to present for printing I send forward with the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman, Mar. 2, 1960]

PEGGY IN THE SENATE

Fifteen-year-old Peggy Price wants to be a page in the U.S. Senate but she writes that "my sex has hindered my dream some." Well, Peggy, we don't believe your sex should hinder you at all, and we agree with your observation that "if Senators someday feel that we might have a woman President, they certainly should feel that lesser positions should be filled by women first." And, of course, they are. So why not a page?

Peggy is the daughter of Warren Price, tough and able professor at the University of Oregon Journalism School, some of whose former students are serving capably right here on the news staff of the Oregon Statesman.

Peggy, if it will do you any good, we'll see that the Statesman's opinion gets to both of Oregon's Senators. And we hope you'll find help in other quarters, too. True, Senate pages are traditionally boys. But tradition isn't the sole governor of our lives. If you want to be a Senate page, power to you. And Senator, too, for that matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as I drove to the Capitol earlier this morning and saw the flags flying at half mast I knew their sad portent, that DICK NEUBERGER had passed away. The Senate has lost a great Senator, indeed, we may say a great statesman, and Senators, each of us, have lost a friend here. Mr. NEUBERGER was a man of courage, courage unflinching in the face of a dread affliction, the scourge of humankind, which finally won the battle; but of courage, too, in the business of Government and politics in which we are all engaged, courage which I remember, caused him to rise in his place on the other side of the aisle, when others did not do so, to speak out for the principles which he held dear.

DICK NEUBERGER was loyal to his political party, but he was not subservient to it; and I think his memory might well be

honored by us, his colleagues, in remembering how he conducted himself, steadfast and true to the principles of American Government which he ever followed.

Those on this side of the aisle were proud to call him a friend, as those on his side of the aisle were pleased to do.

Wartime veteran, writer, speaker, legislator, conservationist, in the tradition of Gifford Pinchot, DICK NEUBERGER was a great American, a great Oregonian, a great Senator, and a great friend.

I speak for all of us in giving to his wife and to his family our heartfelt and unbounded condolences in their and our great loss.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it was only last night in this Capitol that with an expressed admission of tardiness for not having done so before, I wrote and mailed a note to Maurine and DICK NEUBERGER in Portland, Oreg.

Now, so shortly afterward, it seems almost incredible that we should be rising on the floor of the Senate to note the death of a man whom so many of us admired and with whom some of us had close ties of friendship transcending and being entirely apart from associations formed because of our service of this legislative branch of the Government.

All of us knew that for over a year now Senator NEUBERGER had been walking with uncertain fate as his constant companion. But his convalescence and apparent recovery from his cancer operation led us to hope and to believe that health would be his again after his return to Washington from his home State.

Mr. President, the news last night that Senator NEUBERGER had been stricken by a hemorrhage came with the force of a hammer blow. It was as shattering as it was unexpected.

And now it is all ended. DICK NEUBERGER is gone. Those of us who knew him well shall miss him greatly, and he will be missed greatly even by those with whom his associations were not formed so long ago, or were not so close. Principally, however, Mr. President, the loss is the Nation's. By that I mean that our country was the better for DICK NEUBERGER's having been born here, having lived here, having worked here and having been in a position these last years as a Member of the U.S. Senate to bring vision and accomplishment into focus.

Mr. President, I shall not here attempt to sketch the life of DICK NEUBERGER even in broad outlines. Only this morning I realized that he was a very young man when we first met. That was a quarter of a century or more ago. As so many others were, I was at once attracted by his personality, by his quick and flashing mind, by his very real interest in and knowledge of a wide variety of subjects. There was constant opportunity to compare DICK NEUBERGER the man with DICK NEUBERGER the writer, for even then he was gaining a reputation as one of the most prolific and one of the most readable authors on the American scene. What he wrote was so easy to read, so well put together, that one might gain the false impression that, without any advance preparation on a given subject, DICK NEUBERGER could sit down to a typewriter and dash off an article.

This was not so. It is true that he wrote with great ease and speed. But it is also true that much preliminary work went into every article, every book. Many times I have had occasion to note this. At social gatherings, and elsewhere, Senator NEUBERGER would frequently advance ideas for comment and suggestions from others. And the next time one was with him in a different group there might well be repetition in discussing the same subject. Then weeks or months later an article would appear in print with the idea or ideas refined and set forth in fast-moving prose.

Mr. President, it was not my intention to refer especially to DICK NEUBERGER's ties with Alaska, close as they were. But since in delivering his tribute the senior Senator from Oregon mentioned Senator NEUBERGER's advocacy of Alaska statehood. I want to say that cause had no more staunch or consistent advocate. Also, it was his leadership which was primarily responsible for bringing Alaska, while still a Territory, within the framework of the Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1956.

Senator NEUBERGER's interest in government came to him early and remained with him always. It was a natural step for him to come to the U.S. Senate from the Oregon Legislature. He arrived in the Senate steeped in the liberal tradition. He never departed from that liberalism. But he was not a blind follower of anyone or any cause. He did his own thinking and acted accordingly.

The personal friendship which grew between DICK NEUBERGER and me was certified during the time he spent at Whitehorse in the Yukon territory as an officer of the Army of the United States in the Northwest Service Command.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER was a Member of the U.S. Senate for just over 5 years. Even in the uncertain world of politics, there is ample reason to believe he would have returned to the Senate for his second term next January. Apart from personal considerations—the kind that must weigh most heavily with us now—it is more than tragic for Oregon and for the United States that he is gone. Great as his contribution already was, it would have been far greater in the future. For he was a young man, just reaching toward the summit of his power, growing, maturing, developing as time went by. And now the book of time for DICK NEUBERGER has been written, printed, read, and closed. It is ended. It is no more. I grieve.

If any consolation at all can be found, it is that DICK NEUBERGER died where his real being always was. He died in the West. He died in his home city of Portland, Oreg.

DICK NEUBERGER often wrote of those adventurers of earlier days who blazed the trails to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. He often wrote of those who followed—who settled the West to become part of it. But long ago I came to the conclusion that none of these—no one—could have had a greater and more continuing love for the place of his beginning than Senator NEUBERGER. He loved the West. It was a very real part of him. He was dedicated to the

proposition that something of the West's matchless beauty should be preserved for those yet to come in this world that constantly becomes more crowded.

So now DICK NEUBERGER is gone. It is perhaps useless in this time of sorrow—and certainly trite—to observe that, although he did not live a full half century as measured by years, yet he lived very fully, and in his life span did more and enjoyed more than many who are on this earth much longer. Yet that observation about him is certainly true.

DICK NEUBERGER was blessed, too, in his latter years by the fact that he had a great lady, his wife, Maurine, to walk with him in time of trial, of defeat, of victory. To her and to the other relatives, my wife, Vide and I, extend our deepest sympathy.

The stars in the western skies will be dimmer this night. A real man has gone.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think sometimes the measure of a Senator and the measure of a man comes in his devotion to a specific task and a specific responsibility. It was my good fortune to be associated with DICK NEUBERGER on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as in the case of many other Members of this body. On that committee I watched the way he worked.

Shortly after he came into this assemblage, we had before the committee a bill for the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam. He was an author, a co-sponsor of the bill; he was part of the spirit behind the bill.

I watched him during the long hearing, a great deal of which I presided over. He was not an attorney, but he was keen and alert, at all times watching to see what he might do to further the cause of a piece of legislation which he regarded as extremely important to his part of the world.

Then we have had many sessions of the Public Lands Subcommittee, to which Senator NEUBERGER had come to sponsor or support individual pieces of legislation. I watched how carefully he presented and how quickly he was willing to withdraw a point if he found that there was something in connection with the legislation which he had not originally anticipated.

I have watched how quickly he would say, "Perhaps we would better examine this further. I would not want it passed until we had a full opportunity to look at every facet of it."

He was on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. I have a very strong interest in what happens to the Indians of this country, and I wondered how his point of view would match in with my own, and with the points of view of many others who were concerned that the fate of the Indians might be resolved in the proper fashion. I must say that I never saw a man preside over a subcommittee with more fairness, with more consideration for those with whom he worked, than did DICK NEUBERGER.

Finally, I know that he had strongly within his system the feeling that we must do something on wilderness mat-

ters. We had many, many propositions before us which required settlement. I have observed uniformly how careful he was to try to find out what he might do to advance the bills in which he was greatly interested, but also to find out what he might do to accommodate the views of other Senators in order that the bill, when finally reported, might succeed.

That is a very important test to put to the individual who is sponsoring legislation. I was proud, indeed, to be associated with him on the same committee, because of the fine way in which he handled matters. Many times, Mr. President, I have walked into the cloakroom and have seen him at work on a typewriter, pounding out an article that might, in the course of a few weeks or months, find its way into print.

I realize that he had industry to a high degree, that he was not satisfied to do a full day's work, or even an amplified day's work, but along with it he wanted to keep his hand in the profession that he loved, the business of writing. I think his life has been an inspiration to all who came to know him, an inspiration to realize that a man may have strong convictions but still may have tolerance for the viewpoint of others.

I have profited by my association with him. I shall greatly miss him, as will all the Members of the Senate, I am sure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but I do wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate, the people of Oregon, and the people of the Nation, in mourning the passing of one of our truly great friends. I liked DICK NEUBERGER very much as a legislator, but, if possible, I liked him even more as a man. He was a sympathetic and friendly man who cared much more about the fate of others than of himself. He was an idealist, Mr. President, at a time when we need idealism very badly.

DICK NEUBERGER was a man of many kinds of courage. Certainly he was a man of great physical courage. More important, he was a man of great intellectual courage. He fought for what he thought was right, regardless of the odds against him and the obstacles to be overcome. He was not afraid to take an unfriendly position. He was a friend of the people, of all of the people. They shall miss him, as shall his family, but not more than we here in the Senate, to whom he was both a friend and a helper.

DICK NEUBERGER and his wife, Maurine, made up a great team for good here in Washington. I extend to her and to the other members of his family my very deep sympathy.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is through one's close association with an individual that he comes to learn the true qualities of a man. I had that opportunity with DICK NEUBERGER. He and I were closely associated in the legislative field, and were personal friends for many years. He was a kindly man. He had a sweet character. He was a man one learned to know, and when we learned to know him, we loved him.

He was also a very courageous man. He never hesitated to stand for his con-

victions. I want to say today that the Federal workers of this Nation never lost a truer friend and a greater supporter than DICK NEUBERGER.

It was my privilege to serve on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with him during his entire service in the Senate, one term as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and following terms as a member of it. I served on the subcommittee that dealt with pay increases and fringe benefits for our Federal employees. I know from experience and personal contact that the Federal worker never had a greater friend and a greater supporter than DICK NEUBERGER.

He was chairman of the subcommittee and spent much time and much hard work on the health insurance program that will go into effect in July of this year. The Federal workers of this Nation are indebted to him for his having given much time and energy at a time when I knew he was not physically strong and physically well.

The U.S. Senate has lost a great Member. I am sure Oregon has lost one of its great Senators. The Nation has suffered a great loss, and personally, I have lost a friend. To Mrs. Neuberger and the family I extend my sincere deepest sympathy.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I join with my colleagues in these very sincere and so well deserved tributes to my longtime friend RICHARD NEUBERGER.

It is difficult to believe that he, who, when he was last here, occupied this seat just one seat removed from me, will no longer be there to raise his voice in behalf of the many causes, the good causes, the deserving causes, the enduring causes, which he supported so bravely, so consistently, so persuasively, and yet with so much toleration and understanding of the views of others. Dorothy, my wife, wept when the tragic news came and I had difficulty in controlling my emotion.

My acquaintance, which ripened into warm friendship, with RICHARD NEUBERGER goes back to before the day he attained the legal voting age. It was in the late summer of 1933 that he dropped into the office of the Nation, a New York weekly magazine, of which I was then one of the editors, to report on what he had seen in his visit to Germany from which he had just returned. Hitler had come to power just a few months before, and there had been little realistic reporting of what had taken place in Germany. In fact, the prevailing comments in the press and magazines of that time indicated that there had perhaps been a welcome change, a new Germany in a better sense.

DICK reported realistically what he had seen after going, with his great intellectual curiosity and his characteristic determination to ascertain the truth, off the beaten path to which tourists had been routed. He realized the horror, the brutality, the ruthlessness of this new totalitarian regime.

I asked him to write of this for the Nation, and he did so. He wrote an article entitled "The New Germany," which was published in the issue of the Nation for October 4, 1933. It was the first realistic firsthand revelation in any American magazine of what was taking place in Nazi Germany. It was an epoch-making article. It was DICK's first literary contribution to any magazine of national circulation. I felt, subsequently, great pride that I was instrumental in introducing him to a career, which, of course, he would have followed anyhow, as a great journalist—perhaps the greatest journalist of our time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I think it may be said, without fear of contradiction, that in the long history of the Senate no man who came to it as a journalist was able to write so ably, to get published so widely, and to have his articles appear in the greatest diversity of magazines, those having a large popular circulation, those appealing to a more limited readership, and those which are read by only a very few in fields of high specialization. But in all of his writings he made a vital and real contribution to the understanding of his subject, and thereby widening the extent of public knowledge.

It is quite impossible for one to rise and extemporaneously pay an adequate tribute to DICK NEUBERGER. A full-length biography needs to be written, and no doubt will be written, of his great and productive career. He had established his career as a great journalist and publicist before he came to the Senate 5 years ago, and his fruitful life is recorded by himself in his many writings, as well by his countless addresses before public gatherings and on the floor of the Senate.

My colleagues have accorded deserved treatment to his great contributions in the field of conservation. He was a great conservationist; but he was also a sane conservationist. He realized that the purpose of conservation is not to conserve wildlife species for themselves or forests for themselves or soil and water for themselves, but for the future benefit and enjoyment of human beings. He was a fervent conservationist, but a practical one.

I remember an article of his entitled "How Much Conservation?" which was published in the Saturday Evening Post, I think, in 1943. In that article he took issue with some of the activities of the late Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, who he felt had not truly interpreted the spirit of conservation as DICK conceived it.

All through DICK NEUBERGER's career we find a combination of qualities which are rarely found in one human being, namely, a great fervor for the causes in which he believed, and moral courage in espousing them, even if they were unpopular. He demonstrated great kindness and tolerance for the differing views of others. Those qualities of dedication to a cause, unflinching determination in

its pursuit, yet with kindness, humility, and openmindedness, are not always found in one human being. Yet DICK NEUBERGER had them.

It is, as I have said, impossible to do full credit, in these few minutes of extemporaneous expression, to DICK NEUBERGER's great service. I would inevitably include the great friendliness which he showed on every possible occasion to Alaska. He was up there in the early days of the war, along the Alaska Highway, then under construction, as a member of the Armed Forces. His interest in Alaska was not merely because it was a Territory, disadvantaged because of its political status, but because he felt it was a part of the great West, to the development of which and to the conservation of whose resources he was so devoted. He never missed an opportunity to come to Alaska's aid, when that aid was often sorely needed throughout the years. His is a long list of accomplishments in Alaska's behalf.

It gave me some satisfaction today, and great sorrow at the same time I had to record this event, to wire the speaker of the House of Representatives in Alaska, which is now in session, recalling DICK NEUBERGER's great service to Alaska, and suggesting the advisability of naming a mountain in Alaska, so many of which are unnamed, after him. No monument would be more worthy appropriate to one so dedicated to preserving the beauty and primitive majesty of our America.

I hope at a future time to amplify these remarks. I can only say that we have lost a man who had won the friendship of nearly everyone in this body, who was beloved and admired by almost everyone; whose kindness, whose breadth of view, whose gentleness, whose great human qualities no one could fail to note.

To DICK's beloved wife, Maurine, who shared his public as well as his private life to a degree unmatched in political annals, and to whom he unfailingly paid homage for his own successes, goes our deepest sympathy.

We have all suffered a great loss. The State of Oregon has suffered a great loss. The Nation has suffered a great loss.

We shall miss him sorely. The Senate—in which he so devotedly represented not only his own State, but the causes directly concerned with human welfare, the cause of the aged, the young, the sick, the underprivileged, the victims of discrimination, as well as the preservation of our natural heritage—is the poorer for his departure. But his legacy is enduring and his efforts will bear fruit for the generations to come.

He was independent. He was a man of vision and of great stature. I believe it is truly correct to say of him that he was a statesman; and the Nation and his own State which he served so well and so devotedly are permanently the poorer for his passing. We shall not see his like again.

EXHIBIT 1

THE NEW GERMANY (By RICHARD NEUBERGER)

"Visit the New Germany," the American tourist reads in the advertising columns of Paris editions of American newspapers. Embellished with photographs of picturesque

scenery and stately cathedrals, the advertisements strive to persuade the tourist that Hitler's new Germany is virtually identical with the old Germany of charm and Gemütlichkeit. That the advertising often appears in issues which carry front page accounts of Nazi violence has been harmful but, surprisingly, not fatal to the purpose of the costly displays. Despite a falling off in the tourist trade, foreigners return home frequently with tales of the peace and contentment that prevail under the Nazis. They stay at the hotel in the larger cities and blandly report that "they saw no outrages," and pay tribute to the new spirit engendered by Hitler. Of this type is Mayor James M. Curley of Boston. It is more surprising, however, to find a supposed scholar like Dean Henry Wyman Holmes, of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, who returned on September 10, reported by the Associated Press as saying: "I think the reports of Hitler's oppression of the Jews have been exaggerated. Some action may have been necessary"; "It is something Germany needed"; "Germany has regained self-respect." This noted educator, author inter alia of "The Path of Learning," arrived at these conclusions, he admits, in France and "from talking with people on the voyage home" (aboard the German liner *Berlin*), and without visiting Germany.

For a week in Paris I listened to tourists who described Hitler's Germany in rosy colors. On questioning, however, I found that they had visited only the places featured in the advertisements. Not one had strayed to a town off the beaten track. I determined to make a different sort of trip to the new Germany, and visit the hamlets and villages of the Black Forest and the Rhine country, places where Americans are not expected. The officials at the border were courteous. On the main streets of the large tourist centers I too saw no violence. Then I left the tourist highway and headed for a little village in the hills west of the Neckar River. It was 30 kilometers from the railway. Only a twisting automobile road penetrated the hills and forests surrounding it. The inn, at which I was the only guest, was run by an old Catholic woman. She was easily led into conversation and told me how her little business had been ruined by the Nazis. It was not difficult to make a person of her political misfortunes my ally, and I persuaded her to introduce me to other victims in the little community.

In a ramshackle house near the outskirts of the hamlet I met a distraught old woman. Two nights before, a troop of brown-shirted Hitlerites had taken away her two sons, partly because they were Jews, partly because their political affiliations had been with the Social Democrats. "Say goodbye to your mother, you may never see her again," ordered the Nazi leader. For 48 hours she had waited for word of her sons. They were her only kin. She had spent all of a small life insurance policy educating one for law, the other for medicine.

It was not in my power to console this frantic gray-haired widow, but I tried to find some trace of her boys. The search did not last long. The next day the two young men, whose "crimes" had been their race and their belief in a government for the majority of the people, were sent home—in plain board coffins. The Nazis asserted that the boys had died of tuberculosis, though neither had been ill when taken from his home. Their mother was compelled to sign a paper agreeing not to open the coffins; the undertaker and the rabbi had to collaborate in this promise. "Otherwise," admonished the Nazi chief, "we will dispose of the bodies ourselves."

But in that village was a young Jewish doctor, a war veteran, and one of the few undaunted victims of the Hitler persecution whom I met. Despite Hitler's promise to ex-

empt Jewish ex-soldiers from discrimination, the young man's entire practice had been taken from him by the burgomaster, and he had been beaten up at the local "Brown House." But he was unafraid. He said to me: "I'll open those coffins if you will help me to get out of the country." I promised. (Today he is somewhere in France.) That night, by candlelight, he opened the oblong boxes. Every major bone in both bodies was broken. The flesh was terribly lacerated; the boys had suffered horribly before they died.

The next afternoon the young men were buried in the Jewish cemetery. Over their coffins the old rabbi, his beard blowing in the summer breeze, spoke a few words of praise. For the offense of eulogizing the two dead boys, the rabbi was beaten at the local Nazi headquarters, and the local newspaper—a mere bulletin—which printed some of his words was suppressed for 3 months. The mother was sent to a sanitarium by the young physician, her mind clouded by the catastrophe. Thus was I introduced to the "new Germany," the Germany advertised as "less expensive, but otherwise unchanged."

After that I was better prepared for what I saw and heard. I saw new mounds in virtually every Jewish cemetery, marking the resting places of victims of "Nazi tuberculosis." Still hoping they can fool their own citizens and the rest of the world, the Hitlerites camouflage their murders. The victim either "committed suicide," "was shot while trying to escape," or "died from tuberculosis." Announcements are printed in the newspapers accordingly. Always the bereaved families are compelled to promise that they will not open the coffin.

Before I left that little town I met the families of two Jewish girls, both of whom had been smuggled across the border to a hospital in Switzerland. Their parents spoke in whispers of a night when the Nazis had come for the girls. They had been stripped and beaten and made to dance naked before their tormentors. Under the threat of death to themselves and their families, they had been compelled to accept the advances of their captors. The girls were only 18. In the morning their families found them, bleeding and senseless, in a meadow near the Brown House.

I put that town behind me like a bad dream. But it proved to be not exceptional. From there I went to Neckargemünd, a small community near the Neckar River.¹ I arrived on a Saturday afternoon, the Jewish Sabbath. At the home of the rabbi I found a portion of his small congregation. The hands of the men were swathed in bandages; the women were sobbing and crying. The rabbi told their story. During the services the Nazis had broken into the synagogue. They had thrown the Torah and other implements of the church into the street. The women they had ordered to clean the town hall, with the command, "It's about time you dirty Jews were doing some work." While the Jewish mothers and daughters scrubbed the floors on their hands and knees, the storm troopers stood over them and beat them with whips. The men underwent worse torture. At gun point they were lined up before the synagogue. Red flags, supposedly symbols of communism, were placed in their hands and set afire by the Hitler troopers. The flags burned down to their hands, but the men were not permitted to drop them until their fingers and knuckles were seared. One old man whose trembling hands dropped the burning rags was shot through the shoulder.

I stayed 3 days with those forlorn people. At night they sat in total darkness, trem-

¹In order to protect his informants the author has switched the names of the small towns mentioned in this article.—Editors, the Nation.

bling lest the Nazis come and inflict further punishment. By day they stayed in their homes, afraid to venture on the streets. Slowly they watched their savings dwindle, knowing the day would come when they would no longer have money to buy food.

Next I went to Heidelberg. Surely, I thought, that citadel of German culture, the site of the famous university, could not be the scene of such brutalities as we had witnessed in the Neckar country. The train was crowded with brown-shirted troopers. The streets were dense with men in uniform. Every building flew the swastika flag. Even on the streetcars Nazi banners fluttered. The occasion was the appearance that night of Dr. Alfred Rosenberg. Britain had given him an icy reception, but he was a hero in Heidelberg. A vast throng jammed the amphitheater of the historic castle to hear him. Its howls of approval as he denounced democracy and urged purification of the Aryan race echoed along the cliffs below the ancient walls.

The next day I visited the university. The first thing apparent was that Heidelberg had gone "football" in a big way. All incentives to culture, intelligence, and independent thought had been removed. The laboratories, where experiments had enabled Otto Warburg, expelled for being a Jew, to discover the difference between cancer cells and normal epithelial cells, were deserted. But the dueling ring was not. Before Hitler ascended to the chancellorship dueling had been forbidden for several years at Heidelberg. Now it is the rage. Youths with fresh scars on their faces, courtplaster on their cheeks, and swastikas on their arms have replaced the thinkers and scientists to whom Heidelberg owes its reputation.

I also noted the paradox of the one new building at Heidelberg—the Robert Schurman lecture hall. It was built largely through the generosity of American Jews, but Jewish professors may not mount its rostrum. On the bronze plate which lists the donors are the names of such prominent American Jews as William Fox, Julius Rosenwald, Mortimer Schiff, Adolph Zukor, and Samuel Sachs. Also included is the name of William H. Woodin, Secretary of the Treasury. I wanted a photograph of the plate and opened my kodak. Uniformed attendants wearing swastikas came running. "Kein Bild, kein Bild!" they cried. I was hustled from the building. A young Nazi with a bayonet at his side and a revolver in his belt forbade my reentrance.

In Heidelberg I talked with many brilliant scholars, most of them non-Jews. They deplored the havoc Hitler has wrought in the university and confided the fear that the once great school was ruined forever as a center of culture. One old man, a Socialist and liberal, raised his voice louder than the rest. For 44 years an instructor, he had been dismissed summarily for his political views. "America must help us," he said. "This is not alone a fight of the Jews. It is the battle of everyone who believes in democracy and freedom. You will do a great service if you carry this message to the liberal and fearless men in your Congress." The old man continued to talk freely on the cause of democracy all the time I was in Heidelberg. When I left there I promised to help him obtain a visa for America. But it was not necessary. Three days later the Nazis invaded the old professor's home at night. In the morning his wife found him at the foot of the stairs, his skull crushed in.

From Heidelberg I turned again to smaller communities. Everywhere I saw evidence of cruelty, violence, and death. At Landau a Catholic merchant and his Jewish secretary, whom he had refused to discharge after 5 years' faithful service, were paraded through the streets. About the girl's neck was hung a sign, "I have been this man's

Jewish prostitute for 5 years." In the same town three Jews and two non-Jewish Socialists were dragged from a cafe in the middle of the afternoon and beaten in an adjacent lot with whips of hose and steel cord. I saw their lacerated and torn backs. At Durkheim an old Jewish butcher from whom my friends occasionally purchased cold meat or sausage paid with his life for his refusal to obey a Nazi command to close his shop. One morning we found the store closed. The old man was in a hospital, bleeding from a score of wounds inflicted by clubs. His case was diagnosed on the chart as the result of a "fall downstairs." Three days later he died.

Hitler and his lieutenants must smile behind their hands when they watch tourists leave Germany with stories of the courtesy and fine manners of Nazi officials. In the August issue of the National Geographic magazine Alicia O'Reardon Overbeck describes Freiburg as one of the most gemütlich cities of Germany because of the friendliness of its people. In Baden Baden we met a score of refugees from this haven of peace and tranquillity. One of the refugees was a lawyer who had dared to say in public that the people should run the government. While he was away on a brief trip to plead a case, Nazis entered his home and sold at auction all his possessions—his law library, his files, valuable art treasures, his furniture. He and his son protested; the latter was fatally wounded and the father had to flee to avoid arrest. He was at Baden Baden under an assumed name and with his appearance disguised. The others who had fled from Freiburg, the most gemütlich of cities because of the friendliness of its people, were Jews, several of them schoolboys burned on the legs and feet. Their Nazi schoolmates had forced them to run through a bonfire of burning books.

It is difficult to comprehend how any tourist with the slightest knowledge of German can return from the Third Reich with praise for the Hitler dictatorship. Hitler's "Mein Kampf," approximately 800 pages of the chancellor's egotism and hatred, is on sale at all bookshops, available to visitors and citizens. Listen to this brief excerpt from its pages:

"If the Jew wins * * * his crown of victory is the death wreath of humanity, and this planet will again, as it did ages ago, float through the ether, bereft of man. * * * While I defend myself against the Jews, I fight for the work of the Lord.

"The black-haired Jewish youth lies for hours in ambush, a devilish joy on his face, for the unsuspecting girl whom he pollutes with his blood and steals from her own race. * * * By every means he strives to wreck the racial basis of the nation * * * he deliberately befouls women and girls * * * it was and is the Jew who brought Negroes to the Rhine, brought them with the * * * intent to destroy the white race * * * by continual bastardization, to hurl it from the * * * heights it has reached * * * he deliberately seeks to lower the race level by corruption of the individual."

It is this book which has filled the vacancies left on the library shelves by the destruction of volumes by Heine, Thomas Mann, Remarque, Feuchtwanger, Einstein, Sinclair, and London. The Chancellor's unrelenting fanaticism is reflected in the cruelty of his followers. Not once in the score of small communities we visited did we see a Nazi show mercy or understanding toward the objects of his hate. Even small children are victims of the brutality. We saw one little Jewish girl come from school with a great welt on her forehead. Between sobs she told her mother that the son of a Nazi had hurled an inkwell at her, and the teacher, a man in S.A. uniform, had commended the act.

Horrible as these systematic persecutions are, there is another equally ominous aspect to the new Germany. It is Hitler's obvious intent to lead the country into war sooner or later. He is converting Germany into a fortress bristling with hate and martial fervor. The saber rattles more loudly than under the Hohenzollern. In the parks and public squares one hears military bands and the tread of marching feet. The Nazi troopers are armed with bayonets and revolvers. They have official permission to carry firearms, a privilege denied to those they persecute. The children also are active participants in martial revival. In the foothill districts of Bavaria and Württemberg we saw boys—none of them more than 15 years old—parading in review with wooden spears on their shoulders, and children of six practicing the throwing of hand grenades, crawling on their stomachs as to a trench attack.

Despite the contention of Walter Lippmann or any other erudite authority that Hitler's May peace address was sincere and "the authentic voice of a great people," no one who looks behind the barrier of censorship and deceit in Germany can doubt that one of the major premises of the Nazi movement is intense preparation for a war of aggression. I wish those who were deluded by Hitler's peace speech before the Reichstag could have been with me one afternoon on the train between Frankfurt and Munich and overheard a high officer in the Reichswehr talking to a friend:

"Yes, we're fooling the French and Poles all right. We're only supposed to have 100,000 men under arms according to the treaty, but we're training 250,000 new ones every 3 months. At my camp I command a squad of lawyers—the Chancellor now makes all new lawyers enter a training camp. Then we have the S.A. and the S.S. men and the Reichswehr. We'll have 2 million in arms in another year, besides all the children we're teaching to fight for Germany. Then watch us conquer again."

It is the old story of "Deutschland Ueber Alles" but under worse auspices than before. No ingenious means for inflaming and arousing the people has been overlooked. In cabarets I heard the music of the "new Germany." The masterpieces of Strauss and Wagner have been subordinated to the Nazi marching song and filthy ditties denouncing the Jews. I saw the official Nazi propaganda film, "S. A. Mann Brand." Its appeal was based largely on military enthusiasm. Communists were portrayed as brutes who spent their time shooting down little children or lolling in luxurious apartments with scantily clad women. The villain was a Semitic-looking merchant who discharged his employees for trivial reasons, but was made atone for his deed when Hitler came into power. But the Nazis—ah, they were pictured as the very flower of German manhood. Sir Launcelot in search of the Holy Grail could have appeared no more noble and courageous than the stalwart Apollos who portrayed Herr Hitler's gentle disciples.

Daily publications fan the fire of hatred and bitterness. In Nürnberg a notorious Jew-baiter named Julius Streicher publishes *Der Stürmer*, a newspaper devoted entirely to anti-Semitic propaganda. Every Jew who achieves prominence, among them such Americans as Governor Lehman of New York and Samuel Untermyer, is denounced as a murderer and a criminal. Across the bottom of the paper each day is written in black inch-high type: "Die Juden sind unser Unglück" (the Jews are our misfortune). Frequent bulletins from Goebbels' office put more kindling on the funeral pyre of culture and tolerance.

Much else that I saw in the "new Germany" further substantiates the conclusion that those who believe in liberty are finished in Hitler's Reich. Jewish merchants, professional men, and humble workers and

their families are facing slow starvation. Jewish children live in an atmosphere they cannot understand, in which they are persecuted by their schoolmates. Jewish families are afraid to venture on the streets; they have no protection, no rights. Jews are barred in many towns from the public swimming pools. Jewish athletes can belong to no sports clubs, which makes the German efforts to retain the 1936 Olympic games in Berlin on the ground that there will be no discrimination, one more piece of hypocrisy. Socially and economically, as well as politically, the Jews have been ruined. Those who have not suffered physical violence are experiencing mental torture almost as severe.

The fate of those who sponsored the cause of the masses has been equally terrible. Labor union officials, Socialists, and liberals have been murdered and their homes plundered. Under the guise of saving Germany from the Communists Hitler has crushed ruthlessly all "left" tendencies. He poses as the savior of the laboring man, but the staunchest advocates of workers' rights have suffered most at his hands. Thus we see the "new Germany" as a land in which a racial and religious minority has been sacrificed on the altar of political expediency and intolerance, in which democracy and civil rights have been abolished, from which culture and independent thought have been expelled, which is preparing its children to be cannon fodder on the battlefields of a future war.

But ruthless and relentless as Hitler and his lieutenants are, there is one weapon they fear. The Nazi mayor of a large German city told me his party dreaded economic pressure. At pistol point the storm troopers have forced their victims to deny all stories of atrocities in an attempt to lessen the indignation abroad. They realize a tight international boycott can kill even the monster they have created. A boycott which shuts out German merchandise, reduces the passenger lists of German liners, and keeps tourists out of Germany can soon write an end to the most gruesome chapter of modern history by dethroning Hitler and Hitlerism.

This is not alone the battle of the Jews—I saw intellectuals, liberals, pacifists, Social Democrats, almost as badly off. It is the fight of everyone who believes in personal liberty and civil rights, a fight for the principles on which America was founded. For that reason it is depressing on returning to the free and wholesome air of America to find such a concern as R. H. Macy & Co., chiefly owned and operated by Jews, purchasing merchandise in Germany—because it is cheaper. One of the store's principal owners is Jesse I. Straus, American Ambassador to France, who ardently voiced his belief in democratic ideals in an Independence Day address in Paris. Actions speak louder than words, however. The Strauses might better follow the example of their Christian competitor, Lord & Taylor, which recalled its buyers from Germany shortly after Hitler inaugurated his reign of terror, and regardless of price established the policy of not buying 1 pfennig's worth of Nazi goods.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in mourning the loss of a great public servant, a loyal friend, a warmhearted human being, one who was the friend of all the people of the United States.

DICK NEUBERGER was a man of the highest character. His work in the Senate typifies his greatness, his creativeness, and his usefulness to his fellow men. What has been said so eloquently by our colleagues this morning bears that out.

DICK NEUBERGER was not simply a conservationist. He was a human being. He was extremely desirous of utilizing his very great talents and his great heart to conserve human values, and ennobled material values only in order that human values might be more certainly preserved. This I think he showed in the Senate by taking positions which were in accord with his fundamental liberal philosophy. His thirst was after justice, and he followed wherever that path led. He was a just man, and this was really the hallmark of his life.

No one could ever speak about DICK NEUBERGER, his work, his life, and his duty, without speaking about Maurine, who was inseparably connected to him. She is a gracious lady. To use the language of an older day, she is not only gracious, but was good to him, as well as dedicated herself to the same purposes to which he was dedicated. Indeed, I believe that to Maurine could be applied, with the greatest of propriety, the Biblical phrase "loving kindness."

I saw her at very close range in London, at the Atlantic Conference, last year, where she represented Dick with such charm, such feeling, and such ability, that she truly bespoke his views and his mind, so as to impress all who were there and to leave them permanently in her debt.

I think it would be fitting particularly for me, because I believe it represents the hallmark of the common faith I shared with DICK NEUBERGER, to read as a part of my remarks, upon the occasion of his very sad passing, at so very young an age, the words from the Old Testament Prophet Micah, in chapter 6:

Hear ye now what the Lord saith: Arise, contend thou before the mountains, and let the hills hear thy voice.

And in the eighth verse of chapter 6:

He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

This was RICHARD NEUBERGER.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it was a crushing blow for me to learn this morning of the death of our beloved colleague, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

To his good wife, Maurine, my wife and I extend our deep and abiding sympathy.

We Senators have lost a friend who was ever modest, ever gentle, ever clean, decent, and compassionate.

Oregon has lost a Senator of rare candor, exemplary courage, and genuine conviction.

Our country has lost a leader worthy of her finest days.

The flags are at half-mast in Washington to mourn the passing of a great man.

May God rest his soul.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, our hearts are saddened today by the death of RICHARD NEUBERGER, the junior Senator from Oregon.

His brave fight against cancer and his devotion to duty, even when he was stricken with illness, won the admiration of Congress and the people of the Nation.

But I call attention to the qualities which distinguished him, at least to my mind, since the first day he came to the Senate.

As we know, he was a strong fighter for the interests of his State and the great Northwest country which he represented. His fight for the preservation and conservation of the country's natural resources will be long remembered and will continue to influence the Senate and the Nation.

But we remember also today the profound qualities of his character, for he was a man of character.

He was independent, and did not bow to coercion. He was courageous, and he was just. There was no cant about him. But his concern and his heart were for the individual, and his desire for larger opportunities for the unfortunate and the underprivileged was deep and sincere. He was truly a good and great man.

There is nothing we can say here which can give help to his wife, but all of us who knew her devotion to DICK NEUBERGER believe that she can find solace in the knowledge that she helped him and stood always by his side, and that she contributed to his great achievements and to his noble life.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER was an articulate American who, fortunately for America, in pen and speech—in voice and vote—was sincerely dedicated to the common good. This dedication he translated into practical advocacy of the underprivileged and into defense of the public interest as against the overprivileged.

His insights into the pretenses of politics and his ideals of public service gave RICHARD NEUBERGER the stature of a statesman. The legislation that he promoted and the literature that he created will live long after him as the heritage of the thinking citizen.

We of Rhode Island knew him as a summer visitor when weekends could be spared from our summer-long sessions. Here, in these Senate halls, he was a tireless worker, with a will that rose above all physical weariness and weakness, and with an intellect that lent clarity and vitality to our debates.

The U.S. Senate will miss his presence—humble, genial, generous.

RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER, son and Senator of Oregon, was a great American.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Richard and Maurine Neuberger have been two of the dearest friends my wife and I have ever had.

We loved Dick very much, and we admired him. He loved the striking places of natural beauty in this country, of which his region contained so many: The majestic mountains, some of them snow clad; the forests; the swift-flowing rivers, and even the tawny deserts. He wanted these preserved in their beauty, for the use of the people of the United States and to protect them from being defiled, debased, or exploited.

But he also had a deep feeling for people, and he was anxious to help the poor, the sick, the old, the weak, and yet in doing so he was scrupulously fair to the strong.

Dick had a basic and fundamental feeling for freedom; for freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of assemblage. He believed in

a diffusion of both economic and political power, so that all men may have enough power to be secure, and yet none have so much as to threaten the liberty of others.

Dick had an extraordinarily able and analytical mind. He also had great literary skill and energy; he was certainly one of the most gifted writers of our time. To all this he added great industry and personal kindness.

As I have said Dick had a scrupulous sense of fairness. He was highly ethical in his private and in his public life. He was in fact everything that a man should be, and, to my mind, everything that a Senator should be.

I should like to take the liberty, if I may, of reading into the RECORD a telegram which my wife and I have sent to his beloved wife, who also is our dear friend:

MARCH 9, 1960.

Mrs. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Portland, Oreg.:

Our love and deepest sympathy are with you. We have lost a beloved friend and the Nation has lost a spokesman for all that is best and needed. In his one term DICK NEUBERGER embodied creative statesmanship in fostering our country's resources, both human and environmental, and was the living embodiment of a sensitive and courageous ethical conscience. His services will endure and you who have been his true helpmate and inspiration will realize some of his projects for him.

PAUL AND EMILY DOUGLAS.

Mr. KEATING. The entire Nation has indeed suffered a grievous and irreparable loss in the death of DICK NEUBERGER. This sense of loss is the more deeply felt by those of us who were privileged to know him, to work with him, to enjoy the warmth of his friendship, in the Senate of the United States. DICK NEUBERGER's life could not be called wholly his own, because he gave much of it away in his selfless dedication to the causes and the purposes in which he believed. He gave it, too, unstintingly, and despite the heavy cross of illness that he bore, to the people of his beloved State of Oregon, who have suffered this sudden loss of so able and admirable a public servant. We who were favored to live in the happy circle of DICK NEUBERGER's friendship will forever keep his face and his memory fresh in our hearts. We walked with him in the sunlight of his distinguished career, we sympathized with him in the shadow of an illness that conquered his body but never his spirit. In this hour of supreme tragedy for his bereaved wife and family, we bow our heads with them and pray that their burden of sorrow may be lightened by the knowledge that it is shared so deeply, so fully, by every Member of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it is difficult to add to what has been said so well and so eloquently here on the floor this morning in tribute to the memory and life of DICK NEUBERGER.

It was my privilege to serve with him for a time in the Senate Committee on Public Works. There he speedily demonstrated that his devotion to the cause of conservation was something more than a nominal one.

In every matter that came up, he endeavored to express a deep conviction that in conserving the natural resources of this country, we were making a contribution to the country forever.

The three words which would describe him to me and to us forever, would be "character, courage, and courtesy."

His idealism was expressed in his character, or perhaps his ideals were the result of his character. His courage frequently was demonstrated when he would speak for causes or for propositions which might not have been entirely popular with the audience to which he expressed his views.

DICK NEUBERGER was unfailingly courteous. He treated others as he would have them treat him.

I feel that DICK NEUBERGER understood that governments are instituted for certain purposes—to achieve and to bring about better life, more liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. DICK NEUBERGER's life was a living dedication to the furtherance of those principles and those purposes of government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my contacts with Senator NEUBERGER were very limited; they covered a span of 3 years, and were comprehended by the association I had with him in the Senate.

However, I had numerous opportunities to observe his great qualities, particularly his ability, his honesty, his courage, and his industry. In recognizing those qualities of his, I began to weigh the source of his great attributes.

I heard him argue in the cause of conservation. Finally, I concluded that the preeminent qualities which he possessed came primarily from his love for the mountains, the valleys, the streams, the grasses, the shrubs, and the trees. He saw in them an immutable and eternal truth. He saw in them a mighty power. My belief is that in the power which he beheld there, he recognized that there is a mighty Power which rules all things. It was for that reason, I believe, that he espoused the cause of conservation, and did so probably with greater industry and greater energy than did any other Member of the Senate.

My belief is that he had a great fear that, instead of being a land covered with shrubs, trees, and grasses, our land would be covered by concrete; that instead of beholding forests of trees, future generations might behold forests of smokestacks. Above all things, DICK NEUBERGER aimed to bequeath to posterity a bit of the primitive beauty that is our legacy from those who have preceded us.

His love for nature made him an undeviating disciple of the truth. The ruggedness of nature which he beheld in the rocks, and even in the desert, caused him to vow to be courageous on the Senate floor. He was gifted with an intellect that commanded our admiration, and he also had the possession of a great industry.

Today, his voice is stilled; the seat he occupied is empty. It will be most difficult to replace his voice; and the void now in the Senate will be extremely difficult to fill.

So, Mr. President, I rise, with my colleagues, on this Senate floor to express my sincere condolences to his family and to express my deep regret that our country has on this day suffered the loss of a great man.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the news came this morning that DICK NEUBERGER had died, it seemed incredible; it was hard to believe that one so young and one so valuable to his country should be taken from us.

DICK NEUBERGER was my idea of a statesman. His personal honesty, his loyalty to his fellow beings and to his country, his understanding of good government, and his implicit belief in people marked him as one of the real statesmen of all time. I would not say that he was partisan in character; and, in my book, that is always the mark of a statesman—his country always came first.

DICK NEUBERGER believed implicitly in good government, and he lent character to this Senate body.

He will be particularly missed by all those who love the natural resources of this country—the wildlife, the pure water, the good, deep soil, the trees growing tall. In this respect, I do not know how his place can be filled.

I do know that not only the Members of the Senate but the entire country will miss DICK NEUBERGER; and I do know, too, that the sympathy and the heartfelt grief of all of us go out to Maurine Neuberger, who shared his character, who shared his work, and who shared the respect we had for DICK.

It is hard to find fitting words to express our feelings at a time like this, Mr. President. I am sure that Maurine will understand how we feel, even though we are unable to find the proper words to express our deep sense of grief over the loss of this truly great man.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was shocked to hear of the death of our colleague and my friend, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

Senator NEUBERGER and I came to the Senate the same year. I had the pleasure of serving on one committee—the Committee on Public Works—with him, and had the opportunity to observe his work there. I learned of his great interest in the outdoors and his distinct appreciation of nature. I learned to admire him for his qualities as a man, for he was a man of ability and integrity, and he was kind and industrious.

If there were two qualities about him which possibly were outstanding in his services as a U.S. Senator and as a public servant, perhaps they were his deep interest in the national resources of the Nation and his services to the underprivileged. He was truly a friend of the underdog, so to speak.

DICK NEUBERGER was a human sort of fellow. He was a man that you felt you could become close to, and in whom you could place your trust and your confidence.

I deeply regret his death. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his gracious and devoted wife. I am sure that all of us will long miss him very greatly here in this body.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I stand in the shadow of the passing of RICHARD NEUBERGER. He was my seat-mate; and today I remember the personal confidences we shared, and I recall the official privilege I had of serving by his side.

He was a man of brilliant mind and of gentle spirit.

Mr. President, sometimes it is appropriate to turn to poetry; and I believe these words could well be said of him:

In "pastures green"? Not always; for sometimes He
Who knoweth best, in kindness leadeth me
In weary ways, where heavy shadows be.
And by "still waters"? No, not always so;
Ofttimes the heavy tempests' round me blow,
And o'er my soul the waves and billows go.
But when the storms beat loudest, and I cry
Aloud for help, the Master standeth by,
And whispers to my soul, "Lo, it is I!"
So, where He leads me, I can safely go;
And in the blest hereafter, I shall know
Why, in His wisdom, He hath led me so.

Mr. President, DICK NEUBERGER worked as if he were to live forever. And—bless his memory—he lived as if he were to die tomorrow.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late departed friend, RICHARD NEUBERGER. I use the word "friend" advisedly, because in the last 6 years I feel that he has become my friend, and a friend of whom I have been very proud. I had an unusual respect for Senator NEUBERGER. I regarded him as something of an intellectual giant. He had a highly disciplined mind, and mentally addressed himself to our problems in a very orderly way. He expressed himself exceedingly well in connection with the problems of the Senate and the problems of our day politically.

I believe that his writings on current issues, on politics, and about the Senate, have been outstanding contributions to American literature since he has been a Member of the U.S. Senate, but his charm for me was not entirely intellectual by any means. I sensed in him a man of warm spirit; a "gentleman's gentleman," indeed, he was at all times. He was always reasonable. He was always willing to discuss the pros and cons of any issue in a reasonable way and in good spirit. He was never an extremist, so far as I could see, but always patient and considerate of others when we were working on problems together.

I had some experience with him in his first 2 years here when we were both members of the Senate Public Works Committee, and at that time we had before us some very controversial legislation. I always admired Senator NEUBERGER's tolerance and his approach to solutions of our problems.

So I join with my colleagues in assuring Mrs. Neuberger of the warm sympathy of Mrs. Bush and myself, and our full understanding of her feelings at this most difficult time.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, this morning the country lost one of its most dedicated champions of human rights in the

untimely passing of our beloved colleague, DICK NEUBERGER. DICK NEUBERGER was not only my personal friend, he was my neighbor. He was well known in California, and especially in northern California, and particularly in the bay area, at the University of California, and other of the educational institutions of northern California, which he often visited, and where he frequently appeared at speaking engagements. I am sure that the profound shock I feel in his sudden passing is shared by thousands and thousands of his close friends and admirers in our State.

The impact of DICK NEUBERGER's death among his colleagues in the Senate will be felt for a long time. We will miss him in every fight we make to improve the health of our people. Particularly in recent months his inspiring recovery from the dread disease which first assailed him has been a beacon light to thousands of people who faced the same calamity, and his courage and his strength in the face of it, his intelligence and his careful and objective evaluation of what can be done to help cancer victims, will long be an inspiration and a help to those who face the same tragedy and the same problem.

We will miss him in every fight we make to hold the line against discrimination and bigotry. We will miss him in every attempt to keep private business interests from usurping the natural resources of the country. There is no area, as has been stated here today, where his views were more strongly known or more intelligently and eloquently advocated throughout the country than in the field of the conservation of the natural resources of this great Nation.

He was truly a man of the outdoors. He loved the outdoors, and he loved to do those things that would develop and promote the development of the intelligent conservation of the natural resources of this Nation.

In short, we will miss his relentless and selfless dedication to help the aged, the sick, the needy, and the oppressed, as he will be missed by those who knew him to be a great and sincere conservationist.

The loss, of course, will be a more personal one to some of us. We will miss his warmth, his humanity, and his friendly smile.

Mr. President, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his devoted wife, Maurine, and to his whole family.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, our late friend and colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, came to the Senate with one strike on him, in a measure, because he succeeded a very popular and a very able and worthy Member of this great body, Senator Cordon, of Oregon. Senator NEUBERGER was a stranger to me at that time.

He also came here as branded by a small segment, at least, in some editorials or press items that listed him as being somewhat irresponsible. They could not possibly have been more mistaken. I found him to possess many elements of greatness. I want to mention first his kindness, and next he was

a great fighter. That is a rather rare combination, Mr. President. But he himself had those qualities to a very high degree.

I have said more than once on this floor that I thought various organizations, pressure groups, economic associations, and various other enterprises were gradually changing our form of government, and discounting Senators' judgments here, pressing them into positions they would rather not take. I never saw any evidence that this man was ever so affected. He believed in what he stood for, and he voted for what he believed in.

Mr. President, Senator NEUBERGER brought great character to this body, in my opinion, and he is going to take great character with him to his grave, because public life did not cause him to lose it.

I do not know of any more trying test that a man can go through than service in public life. In that respect, he has come through with a great, high, and creditable score.

I want to remember Senator NEUBERGER as the greater conservationist he was. I remember his very earnest plea here for the Hells Canyon Dam. I remember his talk with me about it, his great love for the outdoors, and his strong belief in the conservation of our natural resources.

I should like to associate myself with another great conservationist in this body, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], in his tribute to this man from the West.

Mr. President, I close as I started, with emphasis on Senator NEUBERGER's kindness and his great fighting qualities. He had true virtues of character, and he utilized them all the way.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of RICHARD NEUBERGER and to express my condolences to his wife and his family.

DICK NEUBERGER was known as a liberal. He carried that title in the face of some criticism which was irresponsible and undeserved, but he demonstrated in his life the characteristics of a true liberal.

DICK NEUBERGER, in the face of great physical suffering and in the face of criticism and opposition, was found to have a genuine optimism. His brand of optimism was not the kind which accepts necessarily that everything is getting better and better, but was the kind of optimism which is based on an understanding of realities, of history, and which, in the face of those realities, remains somewhat hopeful and confident that mankind can, in common effort, move ahead in the way of justice and move ahead in the way of approaching something in the nature of a sound social, economic, and political order.

RICHARD NEUBERGER was a progressive, but he was not the kind of progressive who accepted change for the sake of change. He was not the kind who held that there was nothing good in the past, but one who, understanding the past, attempted to build upon it, who, knowing the past, attempted to meet the needs of the present and attempted to anticipate

the problems of the future. This is the mark of genuine progressiveness.

Mr. President, RICHARD NEUBERGER bore a third mark which I think is essential to the mark of a true liberal, that of tolerance. Members of this body know that he was not one to say that one man's opinion is as good as that of another, but he understood that there might be differences among men, and in the face of those differences, he remained understanding.

His criticism was always restrained and always within bounds. His was a genuine tolerance which was based on understanding that men and human institutions have failures, but which reflected, at the same time, an acceptance and understanding of the basic dignity of all persons.

Mr. President, this body has been well served by RICHARD NEUBERGER, as has this country, and the Senate does well today to pay tribute to him in the manner in which it has been done.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, we are all saddened by the great loss of our colleague RICHARD NEUBERGER.

As one who knew him very well, as one whose life was enriched by knowing DICK NEUBERGER, having come to the U.S. Senate at the same time that he did, we sat over in that far corner of the Chamber, Dick in the last seat, I in the next one, and Alben Barkley on my right, when we were freshmen together. Both of these distinguished Americans, Alben Barkley and RICHARD NEUBERGER, have now passed on to their eternal reward.

Much has been said about DICK NEUBERGER and his contribution to public service generally. Almost nothing could be added to the fine tributes which have been paid to his memory here today.

Many Senators have remarked about DICK NEUBERGER's interest in conservation. He certainly had a great interest in conservation and a great love for the outdoors; but his real interest, Mr. President, was in people. He demonstrated over and over again that he was a pro-people public servant. I do not think anything greater can be said about any American than just that.

Mr. President, DICK NEUBERGER's place will not easily be filled in this Chamber. Truly we are saddened, and we express great sympathy to his family and to his devoted wife in this hour of great sorrow.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I utter these few words of tribute today to the memory of DICK NEUBERGER, a beloved colleague, whose gallant fight for life ended early today.

It is difficult to realize that the Senate has been deprived of this warm and friendly man. His constant goal in life was almost entirely to enrich the lot of his fellow Americans. He was endowed with a generous heart and an unflagging zeal. He was proud to be described as a fighting liberal.

Mr. President, I too came into the Senate at the same time as DICK NEUBERGER. During these past 5 years I came to know him well, not only as a cooperative colleague from my native West, but as a warm, a true, and a devoted friend.

His courageous fight against the ravages of cancer gave renewed hope to thousands of others similarly afflicted.

On his return to the Senate from his own illness, he immediately aligned himself with spearheading a frontal attack on cancer and other diseases which beset our citizens.

Coupling his stature as a U.S. Senator with his facile pen, he was prodigious in the all-out attack against these man-killers. I am certain, Mr. President, that his efforts will bring bountiful returns as the fight against disease continues under men who were inspired by his courage and by his determination.

DICK NEUBERGER bequeathed a legacy of hope for a stronger, a happier, a healthier America to which he dedicated his energies and his life. Dick often said that whatever success he may have achieved would have been impossible and pointless without the true teamwork provided by his wife Maurine, a working partner in a wonderful and exhilarating relationship. Maurine richly deserves the credit her husband gave her. To her in this time of profound sorrow, I wish to express my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we were all deeply grieved this morning to learn of the death of DICK NEUBERGER. I suppose those of us who heard the late broadcast last night telling of his having had a stroke had been put on notice. There have been many fine expressions here regarding Senator NEUBERGER, his life, his interests, his accomplishments. I could do nothing more than duplicate many of the statements that have been made.

I never knew DICK NEUBERGER until he came to the Senate a little more than 5 years ago, although I had had the pleasure of reading many of his writings. When I learned that he was running for the Senate, I became greatly interested, because I felt an interest in him as a result of having read his writings. I enjoyed service with him here. I endorse all of the fine things that have been said about him. How true they are.

He was a man of patience, tolerance, conviction, and of tenacity.

Mr. President, Dick has gone from among us, yet I like to think of the richness of the life he lived during the relatively short time he was a Member of the Senate. He died a young man.

I recall, and I have often thought of this, that back in my school days, when I was studying Latin, I learned that there was no expression in Latin for "He has died." Instead, the Romans said "He has lived." I like to think of that statement in connection with DICK NEUBERGER, because he did live a full life, a life that embodied all of these various activities that have been detailed here this morning, and which I shall not again recount. I feel better for having known him. My sympathy and that of Mrs. Sparkman goes to Maurine, his beloved wife and, indeed, his full partner in this rich life that he lived. As has been truly said, his place will be hard to fill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Members of the U.S. Senate are notably individualistic. The reason for this is not difficult to find. When men rise by their

own efforts and talents from positions of obscurity, through various stages, generally of public service, reaching membership in this, the greatest legislative body upon earth, they both have and develop characteristics peculiar to themselves, characteristics which endear them to their associates and friends.

When Senator NEUBERGER arrived in this Chamber as a freshman Member, he and I became deskmates on the back row. For 4 years we sat together, and I enjoyed the confidence and friendship of this distinguished man. Being a confidant, during the course of sometimes long and weary sessions, we exchanged friendly, frank, low-voiced asides, remarks on issues and tactics, on human frailties and nobility. In this way, I came to know this man in a very personal way. He, too, was individualistic, but in a quite different way. His career had not followed the usual pattern, if there is a usual pattern, and in other respects he was unusual. His outlook on life was one of gentleness. His attitude toward his fellow man, his fellow Senators, was one of tolerance and kindness. This extended equally to the page boys.

His devotion to the public interest was genuine—but more particularly with people, as the senior Senator from Michigan has said. With this kindness, with this gentleness, this personality coupled a brilliant intellect and skill in expression. He was a facile writer, an eloquent spokesman, and, with all, a noble man. He has served well. His has been a life of usefulness in public service.

With his devoted wife, Maurine, to members of his family, and to his legion of friends, I share in the deep sense of loss at his passing and extend sympathy.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, what has been said here this morning by my colleagues with respect to the gifts and accomplishments of RICHARD NEUBERGER is true.

I want first of all to extend to Maurine, for my wife and myself, our deepest sympathy and condolence in this hour of sorrow.

What I have to say is not about the accomplishments of RICHARD NEUBERGER in the political field, in the economic field, or in the field of writing, but, rather, to the accomplishments of RICHARD NEUBERGER with RICHARD NEUBERGER.

I know of no greater sin, Mr. President, than the failure or refusal of an individual to take advantage of all the gifts with which God endows him. These may be physical gifts. They may consist of combinations of physical gifts and mental gifts, or cultural gifts. But it surely is one of the great sins if any man does not take advantage of these gifts.

I think probably, to my mind, the greatest thing I could say about RICHARD NEUBERGER would be that he did take advantage of the gifts with which his Creator endowed him, and through his own great self-discipline—he utilized them to the maximum to which they could be utilized.

He did discipline himself; and he humbly looked at himself, perhaps thousands and thousands of times in his life,

to determine whether he was fulfilling his own private contract with the Divine Creator to do the best he could with the abilities he had; and we are all agreed that he did.

Mr. President, when it became known that DICK NEUBERGER had cancer, and when he made it known, I wrote him a letter; and in that letter I included a passage from the prophet Isaiah. When he returned to the Senate, Dick told me that the passage had been a source of great consolation to him, a source of solace, and that with his mind dwelling upon the words of the prophet, he had been able to help sustain the faith which he already had, but which probably under those circumstances would always need reinforcement.

So my private bond with DICK NEUBERGER will be a word from the prophet Isaiah, in which the prophet said:

Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee; because he trusteth in Thee.

So let it be with DICK NEUBERGER.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Mrs. Ervin and I sorrow with Mrs. Neuberger in the irreparable loss which has befallen her and the Senate and the country. In the passing of our colleague and friend, DICK NEUBERGER, we encounter again the oft recurring experience which is best described in those words of an ancient poet of Persia:

For some we loved, the loveliest and the best
That from his vintage rolling time hath
prest,
Have drunk their cup, a round or two before,
And one by one crept silently to rest.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mrs. Yarborough and I are shocked, with our colleagues and their wives, at the tragic loss of RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. It is difficult to realize, when we consider his record, that DICK NEUBERGER had served in the Senate only 5 years, but that already his name and real achievements are more widely known throughout the country than those of most Senators ever will be. He attained greater stature and achieved greater accomplishments than most Senators are destined to achieve in a period of service far longer. This was due to his articulate expression and facile pen, which were well known to the country.

My friendship with DICK NEUBERGER began on the day I came to the Senate 3 years ago. On the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I sat next to him. When I first came to the Senate, hearings were being held on the postal pay increase and postal rate increase bills. I have never known any other Member of this body who knew as much about publications and their different categories, including those for the dissemination of news, than DICK NEUBERGER. I think he was the best versed among us in the magazine field, including magazines for public subscription, for private subscription, and for giveaway. He contributed to the Senate a vast body of knowledge, not merely in the category of publishing, but also in writing, he himself being successful in his profession as a writer. But that was the smallest of his contributions.

The greatest of his contributions was for the benefit of the health and welfare of the employees of the Federal Government and, through them, for the benefit of the people of the country as a whole. Senator NEUBERGER was the leader on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in sponsoring measures which would give to the classified employees and the postal workers a living wage scale. We were only partially successful in our endeavor, but Senator NEUBERGER was in the forefront in introducing similar bills having the same objective in mind.

He was a leader and protagonist in the introduction of the health insurance bill, which has since become law and will take effect in July of this year. Under this law, more than a million and a half Federal employees will have the benefit of public health and hospitalization insurance. Eighty-nine million Americans have the benefit of such insurance today, including the employees of State and city governments, but it had not been available to the officers and employees of the great Federal Government under government auspices until DICK NEUBERGER, by his leadership and help, steered such legislation through the committee, the Senate, and Congress.

Mr. President, the accomplishments of DICK NEUBERGER have been dwelt upon and dealt with more ably by those who have known him and served with him longer in the Senate than I. But having sat next to him in the committee, and having had the benefit of seeing that brilliant mind at work, I have a special tribute in my heart for what he felt and what he saw and for his ability of execution. He not only wanted to see these things done; he was able to get them accomplished. His interest encompassed the whole range of human activity of man's environment upon earth.

He worked for the passage of well-known bills. One matter closest to his heart, next to his concern for medical research in cancer, and the other killer diseases and crippling diseases, was the improvement of the physical environment in which man lives. He sponsored legislation to create the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, and, together with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], sponsored the wilderness bill. He was interested in many measures which were designed to help improve the natural habitat of man, so as to make this world a good place for people to live.

RICHARD NEUBERGER was a cosponsor of legislation concerned with the elimination of pollution from the streams. He realized what the virgin wilderness had meant to the men who discovered and first lived on this continent, and to those who followed them.

He worked diligently and gave of himself, and now he has passed away at a youthful age, after spending only 5 years in the Senate. He put much of his brain, energy, soul, spirit, and body into the bills in which he believed. It seems to me that he was trying to understand, perhaps, that destiny had foretold for him a short life, because he tried to encompass in a few years the work of a

lifetime, in order to help to develop a better environment for man, and to improve the natural resources, such as rivers and forests.

He was interested in the welfare of youth, through the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. He helped in the fight to overcome delinquency problems in the cities, as well as for the development of our national forests and our recreation areas.

Senator NEUBERGER had the broadest grasp of the problems of men, through youth, middle age, and old age, of any Member of this body.

The Senate has suffered a great and irreparable loss in his untimely passing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, RICHARD NEUBERGER was elected to the Senate of the United States in 1954 in a startling political upset. In his campaign that year he showed those qualities of energy, intelligence, and ability to debate which he evidenced to such an extraordinary degree after he came to the Senate.

It was my misfortune not to know DICK NEUBERGER before I came to the Senate, in January of 1957. During the brief intervening years, I came to count on him as a warm and close friend. During that period, my wife and I came to have a feeling of deep friendship for Mrs. Neuberger as well as for Dick. His passing is a real and personal loss to both of us.

I know no finer tribute could be paid to him than to state what seems so clear to me, that here was a man of decisive mind, of keen intelligence, of almost inexhaustible energy, who, nonetheless, loved his neighbor as himself.

I have lost a friend, as have many others in the Senate. The country has lost a great public servant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had never had the privilege of seeing or knowing Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER until the day when he took his oath as a Senator of the United States. From some of the things I had heard about him, I am frank to say that I was somewhat predisposed against him.

As I served with the Senator here, I was tremendously impressed with the fact that he possessed to a high degree those traits of character which I think are of great importance to anyone in public service and that are all too often lacking in those who occupy high political office.

Mr. President, no honest man could live long with Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER without being completely impressed with his sincerity of purpose and his political courage. We often voted against each other, because there was a great deal of difference in our basic political philosophy. But I came to respect and to admire this man, whose passing we mourn here today.

Mr. President, in the years that I have been privileged to serve as a Member of this body, I have been associated with several hundred men who bore the title of Senator of the United States. I have seen a great many who professed to be liberals; I have seen those who admitted their conservatism, and others who did not care how they were labeled. But I consider, Mr. President, that Senator

RICHARD NEUBERGER was a true liberal. There was nothing synthetic, there was nothing spurious, about his liberalism. He did not feel that it was necessary for him to make a flaming speech on the floor of the Senate every few days to impress himself or to impress any groups that may have contributed to his election. He pursued the even tenor of his ways.

It was refreshing to see a man who was a genuine liberal, and a Senator who was without the slightest trace of demagoguery.

This was a tolerant man, Mr. President. He was a liberal who actually admitted that he might not know everything about the issues before the Senate; and he was a liberal who could confess that there might be some validity to the position that was taken by those who opposed him in legislation.

I came to admire him greatly. He was a gentle and a kindly soul. He was incapable of hate. This man loved all of God's creatures and all of God's creation. But, with it all, Mr. President, he had the courage, in things political, of a lion.

I have seen him here on this floor when he was advocating increasing greatly the compensation of those who work in the Postal Department; but, by the side of that bill, he had one to increase the revenues of the postal service by increasing its rates, in order to take care of that increased pay.

Mr. President, he was one who espoused vast spending on the highway system of the United States. But no man could have fought more stoutly than did he to levy taxes. It is going a great way, in this day and era, for a man who is advocating expenditures to advocate taxes, along with them. He advocated taxes to meet the increased costs.

Mr. President, men of this type are rare.

He did not undertake to deceive himself; and he was incapable of attempting to deceive others.

I shall miss those characteristics here in the Senate of the United States.

I, too, wish to convey to his wife and to all the other members of his family my expressions of profound regret and profound respect for the departed Senator.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying a well-deserved tribute to Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, who departed this life a few hours ago.

I wish to associate myself particularly with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I served on committee with Senator NEUBERGER. We often differed; but one always understood exactly where he stood, and one could never question the sincerity of his stand.

He never resorted to the expedient.

I wish to join my colleagues in expressing to his wife, who has been his partner in his political endeavors, as

well as in all his other endeavors, the deepest sympathy.

I shall miss RICHARD NEUBERGER and his fine qualities here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the death of RICHARD L. NEUBERGER has taken from me one of the best friends I ever had. In the nearly 20 years that I have served in Congress, no other Member of Congress extended more friendship to me than did DICK NEUBERGER. He and his wonderful wife, Maurine, were without question the most constant congressional bestowers of praise upon me.

In fact, they were so generous in their public statements of commendation of me that they told me that once Maine Democratic leaders went to them and complained and asked them to please refrain from any further public statements praising me.

Such nonpartisan courtesy and friendship these days is indeed rare. It is neither easy nor wise politically to express support of a member of the opposite political party. But DICK NEUBERGER, loyal Democrat that he was, did that for me, a Republican, at every chance and opportunity that he had.

That in itself is enough to make me mourn deeply over the untimely passing of DICK NEUBERGER. But there is something far more important that makes me mourn all the more deeply his passing. What I refer to is his gentle and tolerant attitude. It was, indeed, most rare. It was something all of us need so desperately in greater measure than we now possess.

And there was a quality of simple magnificence in the gentle and tolerant attitude of DICK NEUBERGER. He, himself, acknowledged that he did not have that gentle tolerance until after he had won his battle against cancer.

One of the finest articles I ever read was his article in the July 1959 issue of the magazine *Think*. It was a truly moving and inspiring message, which I would hope every Member of this body has read.

If DICK NEUBERGER were here today, I am sure that nothing would please him more than to have every Member of this body read that article. Because of that, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THOUGHTS ON A BRUSH WITH DEATH

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER¹)

During the first month of anxiety and tension after surgery, I would awaken with pounding heart and choking breath in the still hours of the night watch. Were the doctors telling me the truth that my cancer really was curable by radiation? Their steadfast assurances, so heartening in the bright hours of daylight, seemed to fade into

¹ RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, 46, is the junior U.S. Senator from Oregon and a native son of that State. In August of 1958 he underwent surgery for cancer. Because of early detection and the cell type of his malignancy, his doctors feel hopeful and optimistic regarding his recovery.

remote unreality when darkness mantled our bedroom and medical counsel was as distant as the far-off dawn. After all, I would not be the first cancer patient to whom merciful lies had been told.

In those interminable nighttime ordeals, I hesitated to arouse my wife. She had enough to do in stabilizing me between sunrise and going to bed. Yet our cat, Muffet, somehow sensed that something was wrong. From his customary bivouac at the foot of the bed, he would march up the counterpane until his face was next to mine. In the stygian gloom, his white collar gleamed like phosphorous. As his purring rose to a deep rumble, Muffet snuggled next to me and I would find the furry head with trembling fingers. There we would lie for hours—man who feared he was soon to die, and animal which knew, perhaps intuitively, that he was needed.

A small thing to be encouraged and comforted by, you may say—and you would be right. Yet, Muffet's nocturnal companionship helped to preserve my composure and rationality in that trying and difficult period, before the searching cobalt 60 beams began, to destroy the metastases which had spread in few but potentially lethal numbers to my lungs.

When a person is terrified over the possible imminence of death, small things can become of vast importance—a doctor's inflections, the slightest twinge of pain anywhere, even the solace of a cat's presence. And when a reprieve has wondrously been given because one's cancer proves to be of a cell-type susceptible to destruction by tolerable doses of radiation, these commonplace events assume a rich, new significance. All at once, experiences formerly taken for granted become a source of quiet and continuing pleasure. And, to cite the obvious, I am more concerned over the relatively small sums which we invest in medical research generally and in cancer research in particular than in a good many of the causes which originally sent me to the United States Senate in the first place. This is especially so when I remember that 50 million of my fellow Americans will have cancer.

I am quite a different individual now than when I was told in August of 1958 that I had cancer. I know I shall never be the same again. Then, death loomed at my elbow, a constant specter. I wondered how long I had left. Would I be remembered? Would my wife marry again? Who would take care of Muffet? Gradually, over many weeks, my forbearing and devoted doctors persuaded me to believe that this particular tumor could be cured by the miracle of high-voltage radiation, aided with one of the new chemotherapeutic agents known as actinomycin-D.

Today I am 23 pounds heavier than at the time of my surgery. I have just undergone an intensive medical checkup, which the doctors regard as corroborating their confidence in my recovery. How does one feel under such dramatic circumstances? I would say that a dominant result has been to make me profoundly appreciative of what was formerly mere routine, and to place in true perspective a whole series of essentially trivial happenings which previously had the power to distress or trouble me.

Driving our 1954 sedan through the wooded park, "raiding" the refrigerator for a peanut butter sandwich and glass of milk, kissing my wife goodby in the mornings, seeing the prismatic display of a summer sunset, reading a book that holds my fascination, a quiet conversation with intimate friends, strolling beside the Potomac or the Willamette—mundane and prosaic events, to be sure, but not to a man who felt certain a year earlier he was going to die. Now each such experience is savored to the full.

I even revel in the tingle of shaving lotion on my face or in feeling the cool rustle of a clean, white shirt. Life is the sum total of many conventional experiences. But does a person truly appreciate life until he finally realizes, with stark and brutal awareness, that sometime he must die?

Conversely, I crimson now with shame when I recall how idle gossip and intrigue once disturbed me, how I became indignant when press releases from my office failed to reach the headlines, how superficial political criticism could prick my vanity. Could anything be less important than this? Recently, in the Senate dining room, I watched a famous Senator and his wife pout publicly because their regular table was occupied by some visitors from the Interior Department. At length, the harassed maitre d'hotel had to move the newcomers. Restored to their customary habitat, the senatorial pair were properly triumphant. I could only observe them with pity. Yet I wondered incredulously if I ever was like that, before cancer taught me the ephemeral nature of seating arrangements and similar minutiae.

I think often of what might have been my fate if only one of many occurrences had turned out differently—if I had not gone to our family doctor for a sore in my mouth which proved to be innocent, if he had not casually suggested that I get on the examining table, if his diagnostic skill had been less or his vigilance not so great, if the tumor had been a type resistant to radiation rather than sensitive to its mysterious beams, if the radiologist had not detected on the X-ray films several tiny lesions which some had thought to be only "artifacts."

Let any one of these circumstances have developed differently, and my headstone might have been carved long ago. To a man who has been through such an ordeal, whether he speaks first or last at a banquet becomes an amazingly unimportant matter. My pulse never flutters now over things which once greatly annoyed me. Despite the strain of my illness, the staff in my Senate offices mentions frequently how much more relaxed I am since it happened. When some of them ask about it, I have a stock reply: "I guess I have perspective on things, at last."

When I spoke at the annual Lasker Medical Awards luncheon in New York City this past spring, I introduced my wife Maurine as "my psychiatrist." This was not done to elicit an appreciative chuckle from the crowd assembled in the ballroom at the Sheraton East. A patient struggling with the psychological difficulties imposed by a disease like cancer requires much assistance from the individual closest to him, be that person wife or parent or nurse. Maurine always has told me the truth, so when she relayed on what the doctors had said to her, I had implicit faith in what she reported. The result has been a firmer bond between my wife and me than we ever have known before. Long ago I stopped complaining about burned biscuits, bedcovers not tucked in or her minor kitchen and wardrobe extravagances. She, in turn, has not pampered me, and I think this has been all to the good.

With the exception of certain scarring on the periphery of my lungs from the effects of radiation, the doctors insist I am not damaged or handicapped. My wife has accepted this verdict at face value. When she believes I should empty the wastebaskets into the incinerator, she says so—cancer or not. Furthermore, she talks about my disease to our friends just as though it had been influenza or a sprained ankle. She never mutes or muffles the dreaded word "cancer." The doctors have pronounced that I am going to get well. For Maurine, that is that. What more is there to add? And why exempt a man from household chores simply because he has had cancer? What sense does that make? I may be approximately like my old neurotic self, but

never a day passes that I do not offer thanks for a wife who is as natural and matter-of-fact as the south wind.

A narrow brush with death gives one an appreciation of people for themselves. Superficial symbols get lost. A time there was when I looked at my Senate colleagues exclusively as Democrats or Republicans, liberals or conservatives. These are external qualities now. I see in my colleagues today people who have the capacity to suffer, to grieve, to be elated, to harbor either zest or lethargy for the personal problems ahead. I make allowances for the Senator with an ailing wife or wayward son. I am acutely and sensitively conscious of the Senator who, 11 years earlier, had a malignancy very similar to mine. He seems in good health, doesn't he? And when I watch a Senate liberal being rude to pageboys or colored washroom attendants, I wonder if truly liberal he may be. My colleagues are human beings, not mere public officials. And, thinking this, the excesses of political oratory become readily apparent in my mind. Can one side really be 100 percent right and the other side 100 percent wrong? Do human frailties ever divide so categorically?

Perhaps the personal equation has become too large, all of a sudden. Yet, instead of inquiring whether a Senator is a Democrat or Republican, I presently speculate regarding his attitudes toward other people. Does he actually like his fellow human beings? Does he respect their fears and hopes and aspirations? Does he cherish mankind as individuals or merely as voters, in the mass? Once these things never came into my mind. I based my verdict on how a colleague viewed the sales tax or public power or monopolies. I ponder how they would be on a picnic or camping trip—or if they had cancer. Behind each senatorial facade lurks a person who, when pricked, can bleed. I am aware of this in my colleagues rather than of their oratorical aspect, which issues high-sounding statements.

I believe it was Plato who wrote that no man ever really grew up until he realized he inevitably was going to die. I cannot evaluate whether or not my experience with cancer has added to my maturity. Others will have to make such an assessment. I do know, however, that it has made me profoundly cognizant of the tenuous nature of our passage through this troubled world. Nobody can rely upon indefinite time in which to advance his carefully nurtured plans. Occasionally I hear an acquaintance talk about the office he is going to run for 6 years hence or the business venture he will undertake in the next decade or so. And, for him, I add under my breath "Deo volente—God willing."

I look forward now to each moment in the outdoors. I have a new interest in the phenomena of birds, insects, flowers, and plant life beyond our doorsill. I believe it was Albert Einstein who told his biographer that the universe would endure for 3 billion years. That is a long time for each of us to be occupying the dark recesses of some sarcophagus. Why not be under the sun and bright heavens and stars during our fleeting hours above ground? Should we immolate ourselves in steel and masonry when we are alive? My mind even played with the idea of suggesting that the Senate meet outside, under the stately trees of the Capitol Plaza, for its debates on fine spring or summer days. But I decided such a proposal would make my associates question my sanity. Yet is it so absurd, after all? Why not discuss man's transitory problems under the Almighty's eternal canopy?

The human soul and mind can tolerate much travail. Who has not wondered what his own thoughts would be if he heard a doctor declare that he had cancer? I suppose the speculation is never too vivid be-

cause each of us has held a fatalistic notion that it always would be the other fellow who received the grim verdict. Yet it has happened to me and, with much help, I have endured it. Of course, in all candor, I doubt if I can accurately assess what my thoughts might have been had the malignancy turned out to be resistant to radiation, rather than of a type which cobalt and high-voltage X-rays are able to destroy. But I believe our inner selves can tolerate more than we know. My wife and I have friends who lost their only child, a beautiful little girl, in a tragic automobile accident. How can people bear such anguish? Yet, somehow, they do and they go on with their daily lives.

"We are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow." So it is written in Job, viii: 9. But we cling to this wraith, shadowy though it may be. It ties us to those we love and to the pleasures of human existence, fleeting and transitory as they are. A tortoise is under guard in the Tongas Islands which saw Capt. James Cook, discoverer of the South Seas, come ashore from H.M.S. *Resolution* in 1776. When I look at Mount Hood's eternal snows from our home in Portland, I know I am seeing exactly the same profile of lava rock that came within the telescopes of the first westbound Americans. And so will Mount Hood remain when our descendants have landing platforms in outer space. Man's days may be brief and transient and low numbered, but he finds them sweet, nevertheless. "Life, if well used, is long enough," wrote the wise Seneca, and who is there to gainsay him?

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, we have been going through a most unusual continuous session of the Senate, when men of good will and honor have differed very sharply on a most important issue, a period when the tempers and the physical stamina of the Members of this body have been put to a very severe test, because advocates on both sides so strongly adhere to their deep convictions that they were willing to endure what they have passed.

Less than a year ago—on June 11, 1959—I placed in the body of the RECORD another article by DICK NEUBERGER. It appeared in the June 1959 issue of the Reader's Digest, and had the title "The Best Advice I Ever Had." The theme was very simple—that it is far easier and happier to go through life willing to grant that the other fellow may be right. If DICK NEUBERGER were here today, I am sure that would be the advice he would give to all of us in the controversy over the matters we are now debating at such great lengths.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Best Advice I Ever Had" be again printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and I urge every Member to read it. As I have stated, it was published in the June 1959 issue of the Reader's Digest.

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

THE BEST ADVICE I EVER HAD

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator from Oregon)

I still remember my encounter with a band of silent and forbidding Chipewyan Indians building longboats in a primitive shipyard along the Athabaska River. They stared at me hostilely until I mentioned that I was a friend of Inspector Denny La Nauze, a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in these northern solitudes. With that,

their hospitality knew no bounds. Afterward on the trip, whether at a trapper's lonely bivouac or in a remote mission hospital, the same magical result occurred whenever I mentioned my friendship with La Nauze.

Later, at his home in Calgary, I asked the famous manhunter of the Mounted how he accounted for such affection, rarely given to a man with the stern task of upholding the law. La Nauze looked at me out of pale-blue eyes that had squinted across bleak miles of frozen tundra. "Dick," he replied, "I suppose those people in the North Country still think well of me because I followed a rule that I would recommend in all human relationships. No matter how decisive things seemed to be on my side, I always kept in mind one thought: The other fellow may be right."

Perhaps because of the impressive dignity of the man, his advice has lingered in my memory and guided me. It has given me second thoughts in situations where once I felt all too sure of myself.

Not long after my last visit with La Nauze I spoke to a convocation at Oregon State College. It was during the 1954 senatorial campaign. A member of the faculty asked a question challenging the consistency of a position I had taken on inflation and taxes. Instead of retorting belligerently, as I was tempted to do, I hesitated for a moment, then answered, "I never thought of it that way before. I believe you are right. My stand isn't wholly consistent."

After the election the president of the college, Dr. A. L. Strand, said, "Nothing that happened won you as many votes on our campus as that answer. Too many politicians are certain they are right on every issue. You made your best impression with that simple admission of human fallibility."

This has not invariably been easy advice to put into practice. On one occasion I was debating on the Senate floor with my former colleague, Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, over a bill proposing a huge storage dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. He had used up his allotment of time; I had about half an hour left. When he asked if I would yield him a little of my time, I obeyed an impulse to press my advantage and replied testily that I thought the Senator had spoken long enough.

From the rustle which went through the Senate Chamber, I knew I had said the wrong thing. I also realized that Watkins might be right in his request. If his argument was so effective that I could not afford to be generous about granting him 10 or 15 minutes more, did I deserve to triumph in the debate?

I wrestled this over in my conscience, and then admitted publicly that I had been wrong and arbitrary in my attitude. Not only did the admission make for me some personal friends out of Senators who had merely been acquaintances before, but it won an invaluable ally in Arthur Watkins. A year later, when the Klamath River watershed in my State needed urgent legislation to protect timber and waterfowl marshes, he gave it strong support.

Denny La Nauze's rule, it seems to me, can benefit almost anyone. How many times in casual conversation are we led into quarrels because we bristle up and stubbornly refuse to admit that the other fellow may have a case? How often a parent confuses a youngster by insisting that father knows best when a textbook has just proved the old man wrong. Whenever I hear some dubious claim arrogantly advanced, I wonder how many humiliations might be avoided and friendships saved if we could always remember the Mountie's simple rule. I, for one, have found it far easier and happier to go through life willing to grant that—the other fellow may be right.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in closing, I want to extend my most heartfelt sympathy to Maurine Neuberger and hope that the fact that I share her deep sorrow will be of some small solace to her. Dick and Maurine Neuberger were a team. Much of his greatness resided in the full partnership that she gave him. If there ever was an instance of a widow deserving to succeed to and carry on the work of her husband, it is Maurine Neuberger because she is the surviving member of a partnership that inspired the people of Oregon and those of us in Washington who saw that partnership in action.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, 350 years ago Shakespeare wrote of the dead king:

After life's fitful fever he sleeps well.

We who knew DICK NEUBERGER would pray for that now; and we who knew him are confident that he sleeps well. His life was such that he could not sleep otherwise.

Mr. President, I knew the Neuberger family long before Senator NEUBERGER came to the Senate. In the everyday affairs of life in Portland, Oreg., and all over Oregon, he behaved exactly as he behaved in the Senate of the United States—a humble man, a meek man, but not servile; a man dedicated to his fellowmen.

I desire to join my associates in saying, "God bless him." And, Mr. President, I join the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in everything he said, and I say "Amen" to everything that has been said by our other colleagues about Senator NEUBERGER.

May his good wife—and she is the type who will have the fortitude to bear her cross bravely, as a fine person should—receive the comfort of the Almighty.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, much has been said, and well said, on the floor of the Senate in eulogy of our colleague, Senator NEUBERGER; and it seems impossible to add anything new to the statements already made.

However, I could not let this occasion pass without joining my colleagues in paying my respect to his memory.

When Senator NEUBERGER first came to the Senate, it was my privilege to serve with him—as I did for 4 years—on the Committee on Public Works.

Much has been said here today about DICK NEUBERGER's tolerance and his love for his fellowmen. But it should not be forgotten that he was also intolerant of the things he thought were wrong, and he was a lusty, two-fisted fighter for the things he thought were right.

He was passionately devoted to his own principles, and in the early days of his service here there were many of us who found him a fiery antagonist. So it was in my first acquaintance with him on the committee when we differed on the question of public power.

It was not until later, as our service together continued, that I came to see, to know, and to love the real DICK NEUBERGER, because he was the type of man who grows upon one as time unfolds. He was the kind of man who "wears well." In other words, the longer one knew him,

the better he liked him—and that is high praise. It has been my privilege in the latter years of his service here to have his friendship and to be his friend, and I join with every word that has been said on the floor this morning. My deep sympathy goes out to his widow. He was able, he was honest, he was fearless, he was kind, and, above all, he was completely sincere. We shall all miss him and the country is poorer because he is gone.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President I should like to join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sorrow on the passing of Senator NEUBERGER, and my feeling that the Senate and the Nation have suffered a great loss. Few men have served in the Senate during my service here who so completely won the hearts, friendship and loyalties DICK NEUBERGER won in the brief period he was permitted to so ably serve his great State of Oregon and this Nation. He was the soul of kindness, a man who while he maintained strong and most courageous views on many issues, always met opposition with a feeling of reasonable kindness that contributed always to finding the very greatest and best possible solution.

In his personal life with his lovely wife, in his life both in Oregon and Washington, he was a leader among all men, a man of vision, a man of character, a man of great consideration, always looking at the views of the other man, studying his own and then trying to find, with his deep sense of justice, whether his position was the one that should be maintained. Thus, he always made a very strong decision when he made it, but was dedicated to carrying out to the fullest the will of the majority once it was reached.

I had the privilege of serving with him for several years on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I know the deep compassion he had for our aging public workers. I knew his interest in helping to preserve their health, and to give them a health plan that is not only for the benefit of those still in Government, but those who had already retired. It was due to DICK NEUBERGER's continuous drive and his strenuous study that led to the passage of what I hope will be called the Neuberger bill, the bill that will guarantee to all public workers the benefits of a health and hospitalization program, which will be a suitable tribute and memorial to a man who always thought of the other man first.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when a man in the prime of his life leaves us we are always saddened, but when one who is talented, who has imagination, who had ideas, and the courage to express those ideas, passes away, we all feel a personal loss because we lose the opportunity to hear his views and to get his ideas.

I did not have the privilege of serving on any committee with DICK NEUBERGER so I did not know him in that way, but I grew to know him from my associations with him on the floor of the Senate and outside. I grew to like him. I grew to trust him. I felt that he always gave me his views sincerely. I respected those views, even though I might not always

agree with them. He was an honest man. He was a sincere man. He had a fine sense of humor, and we will all feel the loss we have sustained in his sudden and untimely passing. I join with the others in my expression of our loss and expressing my sympathy to his wife.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mrs. Humphrey and I heard this morning of the death of our good and beloved friend, RICHARD NEUBERGER. We were saddened, as I am sure every one of his many friends were. Our entire family extends to Maurine Neuberger, Dick's wonderful wife, our heartfelt sympathy and condolences.

I should like to say just a few words about Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, more affectionately known as DICK NEUBERGER, as a man, as a legislator, and as a leader. I did not have the privilege of knowing him individually or personally until just a few years before his coming to the Senate. I have known of him as a public figure, a leading citizen, because of his writings, because of his deep and abiding interest in conservation, because of his wholesome interest and dedication to the great out of doors. Many of us had read of his trips in the wilderness areas, in the forests, lake country, the mountains, and we knew that this man was a man who literally communed with God in the great outdoors.

First, I should like to note that DICK NEUBERGER in a very personal sense was a deeply spiritual and religious man. I say this because he always loved and had respect for the things created by God. As has been indicated here by the testimony of our colleagues, DICK NEUBERGER was a tolerant man, and yet had deep convictions, and he was a man who loved his fellowman. Yet he was never moved primarily by the quest for popularity. He was a man of principle and thus a man of leadership. He not only had respect for his fellow human being, and truly believed in and practiced respect for human dignity, but he loved the other great creations of the Almighty—the land, the forests, the mountains, the timber, the water, the beasts of the field—he loved all of creation, and his whole life was a symphony of respect for, love of and admiration for the works of divine providence.

I knew RICHARD NEUBERGER, our friend DICK, as a man of keen mind, a happy countenance, a rich and wonderful soul, and a noble spirit. I liked him, and I shall always like him and respect him. Mrs. Humphrey and I have been in the home of Dick and Maurine Neuberger many times. We have shared in their friendship, and have had the rewarding experience of their affection and their stimulating creative thought.

As has been said here today, Maurine Neuberger was Dick's partner. These two wonderful people were, and are, inseparable. There is an immortality and an eternity in this relationship, and I know that whatever we say of DICK NEUBERGER in a very real sense applies to his wife. What a wonderful relationship.

Now let me say a word or two about DICK NEUBERGER as a legislator. First of all, to be a good legislator, one has to be a worker, attending to the duties of leg-

islation, the little things, the details. There are many Members of this body who are seldom given public praise, who seldom get a headline, who are great legislators, because they work at it, they understand the processes of legislation, they lend their talents to the details of perfecting a legislative proposal. After all, a Member of the Congress has, as his first duty, legislation—the discussion of it, the preparation of it, and the examination of it.

DICK NEUBERGER was a legislator supreme, with honors. He was here on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of every bill in which he had an interest, and his mind was one that ranged over an area of subject matter that covered the subject from foreign policy all the way to the care of little children.

He was interested in agriculture, in conservation, in resource development, in public power, in recreation, in our national parks. Never was there a greater champion of national parks in the Senate than DICK NEUBERGER, because he saw in national parks the playground of the people. Here was a man who looked ahead half a century, or a century, and he fought for conservation of our great natural resources and the protection of our wilderness areas so the people of the next generation would have really an opportunity to commune with God in the great out of doors, unspoiled and untouched by human hand.

Senator NEUBERGER was an active proponent here in the Senate of measures relating to public health and medical research before his own sickness, and even more so after the scourge of cancer had touched his body. It is something to me that will always be an exemplification of his courage how he literally overcame that malignancy with an indomitable spirit; and he spoke even more movingly and even more frequently of the imperative need to utilize our country's resources to combat the disease called cancer.

I hope every Senator will always be mindful of how many Members of this body have been stricken by the terrible disease, the malignancy that takes so many, called cancer.

Mr. President, I speak now of his interest in other areas of legislation. I speak of social welfare. DICK NEUBERGER was interested in Federal aid to education. He was interested in education, and not only education as a topic, but as a way of enriching the soul and enlightening the mind. He was the protector of the handicapped.

I wonder how many of my colleagues know of the articles DICK NEUBERGER wrote on employment of the aged, better housing for the aged, and the care of our elderly.

As was stated here a few moments ago by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the particular legislation enacted on behalf of Federal employees, the health and welfare legislation, ought to become a living memorial to DICK NEUBERGER.

Mr. President, DICK NEUBERGER was concerned about life and about the living. He was concerned about the good

life, the life abundant, the life meaningful. And a man who has that concern never dies. He just goes on to other work and other rewards.

So I salute DICK NEUBERGER today, as I did while he was living, for his stalwart championship of things important, yes, of the truly great things of life—the children he worked for, fought for, and, in a sense, died for; the elderly who needed the warm heart of a generous and a good man, as well as the fighting spirit to protect them.

I salute DICK NEUBERGER for his everlasting dedication to conservation of human and natural resources. And what is there that is more wonderful to conserve than to conserve and develop and enrich both the human mind and body and the great resources that have been granted and given to us by a generous and beneficent providence?

Mr. President, this man was one of courage, one of conscience, one of concern; and I hope that all of us will, in our own little way, whatever it may be, let his wife know, not only by this printed Record, but by a friendly word, privately, or a letter, or a telephone call, our sense of deep loss and our sense of sympathy. I only hope that my life can be as rewarding and as good as that of the one who has passed on.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, we meet this morning with heavy hearts. In the busy turmoil of our daily activities, especially when we are in the midst of acute and difficult problems like the one with which we have been dealing for the past several weeks, we often forget how much each of us means to each other, how much this quite rare companionship in the Senate signifies to all of us; and it is only when news like that which we heard this morning, of the death of DICK NEUBERGER, comes upon us with a shock that we realize the great blessings that all of us enjoy in each other's company and in each other's companionship in our day-to-day work and in our lives here in Washington. And to that life everyone contributes, but no one has ever contributed more than DICK NEUBERGER and his lovely and devoted wife, Maurine.

Mr. President, DICK NEUBERGER means as much to us in memory as he did in actual service and companionship here in Washington.

It is impossible for me to say anything to equal the tributes that have been made to DICK already. As an individual—and he was an individual, Mr. President—he left his mark upon this body and upon the lives, minds and hearts of all of us; an individual with very distinct and definite views which he never feared or hesitated to express; an individual who consistently followed through on his convictions. And he held his convictions not with arrogance, but with great firmness.

He was a very consistent man. For him to believe something was to put it into action, and in this day, when the appearance of things seems sometimes more important than the actuality, that quality is of special value.

He was a man who was involved, as the Senator from Minnesota has just

said, with all of God's creations, and especially with other human beings. No one whom he knew suffered without Dick suffering, too, or rejoiced without his sharing in that joy.

This very involvement had, I really believe, something to do with the fact that he died at such an early age. There was no check-rein on him. He was constantly pouring out his feelings, his mind, his emotions, with everything that came before him and into everything that came after him.

This morning my beloved former colleague, Alexander Smith, phoned me and asked me expressly to say to my colleagues here today that he was deeply shocked to learn of Dick's death. He wanted me to say, and he joins with me in saying, that he had the highest regard for DICK NEUBERGER as a very fine Senator and as a wonderful person.

This influence of Dick's, this imprint that he made upon people, is deeply shared by Alexander Smith.

Rightly, everyone who has spoken has mentioned his relationship with Maurine, and surely there never was a happier marriage, one more deeply satisfactory or satisfying. My wife and I knew them both well, were fond of them in a very deep and personal way, and she shares with me the sense of loss that we feel this morning. My wife joins with me in our most heartfelt sympathy, good wishes and deep affection for Maurine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I am certain that all of us here this morning realize that our ardent friend and colleague has attained an immortality that is very meaningful to us, and readily understood by all of us. He will live on in the hearts and the affections of his friends and his colleagues, and also in the minds, the affections, of a great multitude of people that never had the privilege of knowing him.

He will also live on in the beneficial influence of the constructive legislation that he sponsored. In a very real way he will live on in the influence of the numerous books that he wrote.

Back in 1954, shortly after I had the privilege of becoming acquainted with him, and discussing some of the problems in which we had a mutual interest, problems and hopes, he sent me an autographed copy of what was then his latest book, "Adventures in Politics," and he called my attention particularly to the second chapter.

The title of it is "Give the Young Folks a Chance."

I think it is fitting at this time that I read the opening paragraph of this 18-page chapter, the closing paragraph, and four intervening paragraphs. They are warm; they are human; they point to an interest that he had, perhaps, that surpassed all others, that of an interest in young people.

My wife and I are in our early forties. Although we still can climb snowcapped mountains and brave the Pacific's chilly surf, we realize that we are getting on in years. After all, each of us has been voting for two full decades. Our college days date

back to the great depression, and that is now history. Yet we are younger than at least two-thirds of the other Senators and Representatives who serve with us in the legislature of a typical State of the Union.

In our opinion, youth ought to have a far greater role than this in the drafting of laws that affect such questions as child welfare, public schools, courts, mental hospitals, and the degree of financial responsibility that grown sons and daughters owe to needy parents. These often are youth's problems, but youth has only a faint voice in their solution.

State government seems upside down to us when young legislators are merely a small and isolated minority. My wife and I wish that we qualified, even at our present ages not as comparatively junior members of Oregon's Legislature but as its venerated elders. Yet the political deck frequently is stacked against the presence of young men and women in the State capitols of our 48 States.

My wife and I definitely refuse to string along with the ancient Greek notion of "old men for council, young men for war." Young men—and young women, too—should sit in their country's councils, and a State legislature is the place to begin.

I remember a public hearing at which Maurine presided as chairman of the Education Committee of the House of Representatives. The question at issue was a State-supported university for Portland, the only large city in the West without such an institution.

The hall was full of hundreds of high-school seniors. They listened intently. Their opportunity to be a surgeon or a chemist or a teacher was being decided, right in that hearing chamber. One could feel the tension and anxiety. The speakers addressed the legislative committee with a new intensity and fervor. Why should Portland, alone, be without a State college? A young lawyer, a veteran of the Korean fighting put this question in urgent tones which stirred even the drowsiest committee member.

This was the right of petition, the right of citizens to voice an appeal to their Government. Another young man, Jefferson, had written movingly about this basic right when America as a Nation was very young, indeed.

That night, as we walked to our rented cottage in the State capital city of Salem, my wife said to me: "For the first time I think I really appreciate what a wonderful thing it is to participate in politics and government in the United States. Why, if we pass this bill for a college, we'll be giving countless boys and girls a better chance in life. Think of what that means. That's real and tangible. All of a sudden, my election to the legislature seems more important to me than it ever has before."

I looked behind us for a moment. In the distance Oregon's soaring capitol dome pointed upward to the stars.

I like to think of our departed colleague as one who, through difficulties and every phase of life, kept his eyes on the stars.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in mourning my very close friend, the late junior Senator from Oregon. When he first came to the Senate, he was assigned to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and it was natural that he and I, from an adjoining State, should have many mutual interests. We did not always agree on some controversial issues, but we learned to respect each other.

In paying a tribute to our late colleague, it would be entirely appropriate to point out that when serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Af-

fairs of the Interior Committee, he rendered outstanding service. I am sure that the members of that committee were well aware of his profound interest in doing everything possible to serve the interests, and safeguard the welfare of the Indians, not only of his own State, but of the entire Nation.

I recall one experience very vividly in November of 1958, shortly after his operation, when he served as chairman of a subcommittee which held a hearing at Bend, Oreg., on the pending wilderness bill. I was the only other Senator in attendance at that time. We heard as many as 100 witnesses. I was very deeply impressed by the fairness and courtesy which he displayed as chairman. I was also aware of the deep affection for him which was shown by the people of his State during those proceedings.

Much has been said today about DICK NEUBERGER's devotion to his fellowmen, his deep religious convictions, and his untiring efforts to serve his State and his Nation. I am certain that throughout his service he constantly grew in stature. He displayed tolerance, which is so important in serving as a Member of the Senate.

I believe also—and it was generally recognized—that his influence was constantly expanding, and that he had a deep understanding of the problems facing our country today.

Another characteristic of Senator NEUBERGER's, which I think we should emphasize at this time, is that he displayed a steadfastness in defending his convictions. Frequently, he was in a small minority. But that did not seem to disturb him greatly, because he had an abiding faith in his own judgment. I might mention particularly that although early in his senatorial service we disagreed on some of the fundamental issues which affect the welfare of the Columbia Basin States, we were closely associated, and we became intimate friends. I respected him as an able legislator and a patriot who was dedicated to the preservation of American ideals and traditions.

Oregon has lost a faithful public servant.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues with respect to the untimely passing of our friend, and my personal friend, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the junior Senator from Oregon.

DICK NEUBERGER was well known and respected in my State. It was only a few months ago, in Denver, that he delivered the principal address at the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Research Institute, at the American Medical Center.

While in Denver, he was the principal speaker at a regional meeting of the B'nai B'rith of the western area, known as the Mountain States Area.

I know that I bespeak thoughts which could be better expressed by Palmer Hoyt, the present editor and publisher of the Denver Post, and who formerly was associated with the Portland Oregonian, and of Robert Lucas, of the Denver Post, all personal friends of DICK NEUBERGER, when I express sorrow and shock at his untimely passing.

It was only a short time ago—a few days ago—that I received a warm personal note from DICK NEUBERGER. I was shocked this morning to learn of his passing, because many of us had been led to believe that he was on his way to recovery.

So I express on behalf of my family, which is very close to the Neuberger family, our deepest sorrow and sympathy.

I wish to say a word about Senator NEUBERGER along the line expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who also is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We found Senator NEUBERGER to be a warmhearted, sincere person who, in his first term as a Senator, established a remarkable record as a great humanitarian. His great interest was in the people. He displayed great interest in the conservation of the Nation's natural resources, not because of the material and physical plant structure, but because of what they meant to the people.

As a newspaperman, DICK NEUBERGER was one who had a passion for the truth.

A great contemporary writer, Ernest Hemingway, has defined courage as grace under stress. No other description better fits the courage shown by DICK NEUBERGER during the years he was among us.

Senator NEUBERGER was of great service to his own State and to the West. He worked constantly in his private career, and later in public life, for good conservation practices and for the wise development of America's priceless natural resources for the benefit of all—those of the generations to come as well as those of our own time.

The CARROLL family extends the deepest sympathy to DICK NEUBERGER's lovely wife, Maurine, who worked so closely with him in his public life, and who was so close to him in all the things which he did.

We express our sympathy not only to Maurine but also to DICK NEUBERGER's many friends throughout the Nation. We shall all miss him very much indeed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in their expressions of sorrow upon the occasion of the death of our colleague, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

It is always difficult for me to express myself at a time like this, because I have never found words adequate enough to express sorrow over the loss of a friend, or to express the feelings I have for those of the family who are left.

I asked myself this morning, as I often do, "What do we remember about this departed man, this good friend?" Oh, I could recount numerous incidents that I recall, and will always recall with great pleasure—the political debates in which Dick and I engaged in different places in the East and in the West; our differences of political opinion, which while at times they were violent, were always pleasant; the many meetings that he and I attended throughout the years on the subject of the Indians, a subject in which his leadership was preeminent. To him the Indians of this country owe an everlasting debt.

To me, the things I will always remember about DICK NEUBERGER were his personal characteristics. It is sad to realize that today too few people have those characteristics, which were the characteristics of the pioneers and the founders of our country; characteristics which we used to expect to find in people. He was a man having characteristics which today we too seldom see.

His first great characteristic was his sincerity. I think the thing which characterized him far and above the average man was his sincere application to the things in which he believed.

His second great characteristic was his complete honesty—devotion to the honesty of his convictions. I have never known Dick to deviate one inch from a principle in which he believed.

That leads me to the third characteristic, the sincere application of his thinking and the dedication of his life to the principles in which he believed.

Mr. President, I am one who will have bettered himself by having had the opportunity to be associated with DICK NEUBERGER during a portion of my life. To his memory, I pay my deepest respects.

To his wife, Maurine, and to the other members of his family go the heartfelt sympathies of my wife, Peggy, and our family.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, "No man reaches true maturity until he faces death."

These are the words of our late colleague, Senator RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER. He said them after he had faced death from cancer and apparently had emerged victorious.

His maturity of mind and heart was indicated by the sincerity of his convictions and the straightforwardness and clarity of the words he chose to express those convictions.

As writer, author, soldier, statesman, RICHARD NEUBERGER was a warm and upright human being. He wrote a book he called "Our Promised Land." Now he has gone there. As it must over all mortals, death won the final victory.

His presence and his voice will be missed in the Public Works Committee, on which I had the privilege of serving with him, and in the Senate of the United States.

I join in mourning the loss of our distinguished colleague and extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of regret that I learned of the untimely passing of my friend, the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mr. NEUBERGER.

During his term in the Senate, it was one of the great pleasures of my life to know DICK NEUBERGER. He was a man of integrity, ability, and honor in the true sense of the words. He was a devoted and dedicated public servant, and a great American who ably represented his great State and the people of this Nation.

DICK NEUBERGER was a man who not only espoused the principles of Christianity, but practiced them in their true and real meaning. He was a God-fear-

ing, courageous man, who labored tirelessly in the vineyard for the good of mankind.

The example of the illustrious endeavors of this noble man will remain indelibly imprinted in the hearts of his countrymen.

DICK NEUBERGER was a great Senator, a great patriot, and a great American.

The Senate of the United States, the people of the State of Oregon, and the Nation as well have suffered a grievous and irreparable loss.

Mr. President, I want to take this occasion to extend my sincere and deepest sympathy to his family in their hour of bereavement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that if Maurine Neuberger and the mother, father, sister, and other members of DICK NEUBERGER's family had been here today to hear these beautiful tributes—which have really turned our session today, Mr. President, I think, into a memorial service for this great colleague of mine—they would want me, as we close, to express their deep appreciation for the things that have been said here today, for the beautiful expressions of faith—which is what these expressions have been—in tribute to the character and the life and the contributions of this man.

So, Mr. President, I exercise the prerogative of speaking in their behalf these words of appreciation and thanks, and also in my capacity as senior Senator from the State of Oregon, I express the appreciation of the people of my State for the tributes that have been paid here this morning.

I would have the RECORD show, Mr. President, that there have been seated with me on the floor of the Senate this morning throughout this meeting of tribute, the very able administrative assistant of Senator NEUBERGER, Mr. Lloyd Tupling, his very able legislative assistant, Mr. Larry Hobart, his friend and associate for many years in the State of Oregon, his research assistant, Mr. Walter Dodd, and a staff consultant who has been of assistance to him on many issues affecting natural resource problems, Mr. Mike Mapes.

I am privileged to say, Mr. President, that they, through me, too, wish to express to the Senate of the United States their gratitude and thanks for these services—because I like to think of this session as a memorial service in honor of the memory of the man who meant so much to them, to whom they are so indebted, and who, in turn, I am sure, if he were here, would say that he would want me to express his gratitude to them.

Mr. President, as the colleague of Senator NEUBERGER, I also wish to express my personal thanks to the Senate for the tributes which have been paid.

I am about to send to the desk a resolution, and ask for immediate consideration. Before I offer the resolution, I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, our hearts are profoundly saddened by the loss

which the Senate, the State of Oregon, and our Nation have suffered in the untimely death of our beloved colleague, Senator RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER.

We have lost a dear friend, and this generation and the next and the next will continue to hold precious the example of his good works and the inspiration of his matchless courage.

Throughout his lifetime, as soldier, traveler, sportsman, conservationist, journalist, historian, member of the Oregon House of Representatives, member of the Oregon State Senate, and U.S. Senator, DICK NEUBERGER's services and his contributions reflected his deep conviction that America's greatness will be protected and preserved in direct proportion to the degree in which we protect and preserve our Nation's God-given resources, not only our great material resources, but the even greater resources inherent in the health and vigor and determination of our people.

Before he came to the Senate of the United States, DICK NEUBERGER was widely recognized for his contributions to the conservation of our Nation's water resources, forests, soil, and wildlife. He wrote prolifically and challengingly on these and other subjects and did so much to dramatize and to advance the cause of conservation of our material resources.

After he came to the Senate, DICK NEUBERGER worked long and effectively in the urgent and vital field of conservation of our people. He was untiring and completely dedicated to his constant work in behalf of better health, better education, and longer, happier lives for all our people.

DICK NEUBERGER nowhere better demonstrated the quality of mind and spirit that made him great than when he seized upon his tragic illness, not as a defeat, but as an instrument to help accentuate the increasing need and to challenge our people toward greater effort for legislation, for funds, and for education to mount a major medical research offensive against not only the insidious cancer such as had stricken him, but against all the killing and crippling diseases which have plagued and baffled mankind through the centuries.

Today we give our thanks for DICK NEUBERGER's leadership, for his statesmanship, and, above all, for the courageous example of humanitarianism which he bequeathed us.

He was in truth a servant to all mankind.

To his devoted wife, who was his wonderful and inspiring helpmate through the years, and to the members of his family, I join in extending my deep sympathy in their great loss.

AGREEMENT FOR VOTE ON CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make two announcements for the information of the Senate.

I have conferred several times with the Senator from Oregon and with Mr. Tupling, the administrative assistant to

the late Senator NEUBERGER, and with Mr. Lloyd.

I am authorized to make this statement.

I am informed that there is no possibility of the funeral of Senator NEUBERGER being set for Thursday. The likelihood is that it will be held on Sunday. I have conferred with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and with the minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I now renew my previous request, modified:

I ask that it be ordered that the vote on agreeing to the cloture motion on the so-called Dirksen substitute for the bill H.R. 8315, the Stella, Mo., school relief bill, be taken at 2 p.m. tomorrow, and that the time intervening between the hour of meeting—which I propose to ask be 9 o'clock—and 2 p.m. be equally divided between the proponents and opponents, and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and the minority leader, who will yield time to those Senators whom the proponents of the cloture resolution may recommend.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection except to this time allocation. I desire to have some clear understanding about that. We are here undertaking to defeat the proposition advanced by the minority leader, and yet it appears from this request that we are to be wholly dependent on his beneficence for any opportunity to speak against this cloture motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We normally allocate time between the majority leader and the minority leader; he would allocate it for the opponents, and I would allocate it for the proponents as they qualify. We frequently do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have a great deal of confidence in the distinguished majority leader, but in the absence of any assurance that we can get any time at all, I cannot agree to this proposal. If the Vice President is going to preside and we have a gentleman's agreement that the time will be evenly divided, I am willing to accept that, but I want some understanding that some of us will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I can give the Senator that assurance, that the time allotted will be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents. I know of no more distinguished opponent than the Senator from Georgia, and he and his group, those who oppose the cloture motion, will receive half of the time.

I felt that if we did not divide the time, then some Senator who got recognition could hold the floor for an indefinite period.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I thought about that, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that the Senator will find that we have had very little complaint as to the way that the two leaders allocate time. We will make a list of those who request time, and then adjust that within the time we

have. That is one reason why I moved the time of meeting up to 9 o'clock tomorrow morning, so that we will have 5 hours for discussion of the question tomorrow—2½ hours will go to those who favor the cloture motion, 2½ hours to those who oppose it. I know of no more equitable way to divide the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The only understanding I would like to have is from the distinguished minority leader. I am willing to accept his statement. There are Senators here who oppose cloture but are in favor of the so-called Dirksen substitute. Some of us are opposed to the Dirksen amendment and opposed to cloture, and that is the group who, I want to be sure, will have some time to discuss this matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has my unqualified assurance on that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well. I am content.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That the vote on agreeing to the cloture motion on the so-called Dirksen substitute for H.R. 8315—the Stella, Mo., school relief bill—be taken at 2 p.m. tomorrow, and that the time intervening between the hour of meeting and 2 p.m. be equally divided between the proponents and opponents and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution (S. Res. 286) offered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1960, at 9 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Isaiah 55: 4: *Behold, I have given Him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people.*

Almighty God, we humbly beseech Thee that in this Lenten season, we may seek to accept and apply more wholeheartedly the teachings of our blessed Lord, to the end that the beauty and strength of His character may be more fully realized and manifested in us.

Make us daily more sensitive and responsive to the high calling of God in Christ Jesus and show us how we may be victorious in the difficult task of being a true follower of the lowly Man of Galilee.

May we never be tempted to feel that this is far beyond our reach to achieve, and that in our day and generation we must needs be satisfied to live below His level and walk a less lofty way.

Inspire us to see life in a new perspective and may it be our most ardent longing to be lifted from the lowlands of doubt and fear to the higher altitudes of faith, hope, and love.

Hear us in our Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—
HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 345

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President, House Document No. 345, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 18, be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE MALCOLM C. TARVER

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, March 5, I lost a good friend and the Nation lost an outstanding citizen.

On that day a former Member of the House of Representatives, Malcolm C. Tarver, of Dalton, Ga., passed away.

Malcolm Tarver was a man of courage, a man of conviction, and a man of integrity.

It was my great privilege and honor to serve with Malcolm Tarver in the Georgia State Legislature from 1909 to 1912. Following this period of service in the Georgia House, he was elected to the Georgia State Senate during the 1913-14 session.

He left the Georgia State Legislature to serve as a judge of the Cherokee superior court circuit, where his outstanding ability as a jurist was recognized and appreciated by all who came before his court.

In 1927 he became a Member of the House of Representatives from the Seventh District of Georgia. Here he served with distinction until 1946.

Those attributes of Malcolm Tarver which made him an outstanding member of the Georgia Legislature and a circuit court judge without peer, became even more evident as a Member of the House of Representatives. He contributed much to the welfare of our Nation, and did as much as any one human being can do in an effort to solve our agrarian problems.

He was a member of the Appropriations Committee and served as the chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee. In this capacity, he earned, as he did in every pursuit, the respect, the admiration, and friendship of those who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, Malcolm Tarver was my friend and I shall miss him.

He was also a great American. He was the kind of American that we can ill spare in these trying times.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his wife and his family; but they can take great solace in the knowledge that Malcolm Tarver left his indelible mark upon his State and the Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were privileged to serve in the House with Hon. Malcolm C. Tarver were saddened to learn of his death at his home in Dalton, Ga., on March 5.

Judge Tarver served his State and the Nation well throughout his long and useful life. He was a graduate of Mercer University Law School and began the practice of law at Dalton in June 1904. He was a member of the Georgia House of Representatives from 1909 to 1912, served in the State senate during the 1913-14 session of the general assembly, was judge of the superior courts of the Cherokee circuit of Georgia from 1917 to 1927, and was a Member of Congress from 1927 to 1947. Upon leaving Congress he resumed the practice of law at Dalton.

Judge Tarver was a man of the highest ideals and one who had the courage to stand by his convictions. He rendered outstanding service in every public office he held. He had a keen intellect. He devoted his full time and ability to each position of trust. He was a successful lawyer, an able and impartial judge, respected by members of the bar, and had the confidence of everyone. He was an outstanding Member of Congress, held in highest esteem by all Members, Democrats as well as Republicans.

I had known Judge Tarver in Georgia, but it was after I was elected to the House of Representatives in 1933 that we became warm personal friends. In his passing I feel a keen personal loss.

To his beloved wife, Miss Jewell, and the other members of the family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and others in paying tribute to the late Malcolm C. Tarver, who for 20 years represented the Seventh District of Georgia in the House of Representatives.

Although our service in the House of Representatives never coincided, I, nevertheless, knew Judge Tarver over a long period of years. My earliest recollection of him was during the period of his service as a judge of the superior courts of the Cherokee Judicial Circuit of Georgia, which, at that time, embraced some six counties of the district he later represented in Congress. He and my father had known each other since early young manhood, during their respective service in the Georgia House of Representatives and in the State Senate of Georgia. Their association in the legislative branch of our State government and in the judiciary of our State was one which spanned a period of more than 40 years.

Later, beginning in 1941, I came to know Judge Tarver more closely. Mrs. Flynt was a resident of Judge Tarver's hometown, Dalton, Ga., and since our marriage, on frequent visits to her

mother and father in Dalton, I regularly called upon Judge Tarver there, both during his service in Congress and since he returned to the active practice of law. It was with deep regret that we learned of his death on last Saturday.

Malcolm Connor Tarver was born in Rural Vale, Ga., in Whitfield County, on September 25, 1885. He attended the public schools of his native county and later enrolled at Mercer University, Macon, Ga. He graduated from the law department of Mercer University in 1904, and in the same year was admitted to the bar of Georgia and commenced practice in Dalton, Ga.

In 1908 he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives from Whitfield County, where he served from 1909 through 1912. In 1912 he was elected to the Georgia State Senate, representing the 43d senatorial district where he served during 1913 and 1914. In 1916 he was elected judge of the superior courts of the Cherokee judicial circuit and was twice reelected superior court judge.

While serving as superior court judge, he was elected as a Democrat to the 70th Congress and was consecutively reelected to the 71st through the 79th Congresses. He served in the House of Representatives continuously from March 4, 1927, through January 3, 1947. At the time of his retirement from Congress he was a high ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and was known and respected for his keen knowledge of budgetary and fiscal affairs. He served as a subcommittee chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Judge Tarver is survived by his wife and by his son, Malcolm C. Tarver, Jr., both of whom reside in Dalton, Ga. He is also survived by a brother, Fletcher Tarver, Gillette, Wyo., and a sister, Mrs. G. W. Barnes, Milledgeville, Ga.

Mrs. Flynt and our children join me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Tarver, Mr. Malcolm Tarver, Jr., and to the other members of their family.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep feeling that I join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at the passing of a friend of long standing, Malcolm Connor Tarver. As has been pointed out, he was a superior court judge and prior to that served both in the house and the senate in the General Assembly of Georgia. He served with great distinction in those bodies. My association with Judge Tarver, as he was known, was close, both professionally and personally. We had law offices in the same building since I first engaged in the practice of law. Many times, on many occasions, I talked with Judge Tarver for hours on end about matters we both considered to be of local and national import; and certainly I profited by his advice.

The judge had a tremendously strong personality. He had a determination to fight to the end for what he believed in. I think an exhibition of that fine trait of character is the fact that although he had a serious heart ailment for some 16 years before his death, one which caused him extreme pain, he had a perfect at-

tendance at church for the immediate 10 years preceding his death.

This, in my judgment, is an example of a dedicated American who gave most of his life to the progress and the security of his country. Certainly his name and memory should not be forgotten and will not be forgotten by me.

In his passing the Nation has lost a great patriot, his family has lost a devoted husband and father, and I a warm friend. I extend to the family my deepest sympathy but at the same time commend them for their constant love and moral support which was so vital in Judge Tarver's rise to greatness.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Judge Tarver who served in this body with great ability and distinction for about 20 years was one of the most highly respected Members of this body. He was a dedicated legislator, a serious man, a man who contributed in a marked way to the legislation that came before this body during his years of service. He was a member of the Committee on Appropriations during practically his entire service in this body and, as we all know, that committee is one of the hardest working committees of either branch of the Congress.

During my period of service in this body Judge Tarver and I became very close personal friends. Not only as a legislator did I admire and respect him, but on the personal level I entertained for him a strong feeling of very high regard. He was a man who was honorable and trustworthy in every way, a man of integrity in every respect.

I join with my colleagues from Georgia in expressing my regret at the passing of this grand American and I extend to Mrs. Tarver and her son my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with Judge Tarver in a very close relationship in our work here in the Congress. When I first went on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, Judge Tarver, as we knew and loved him, was chairman of that committee. In the service that I have had in the Congress I have never known a brighter mind, a more energetic memory, a more tenacious worker for what he believed to be right.

We have had many outstanding Members of Congress in the years that I have been here, but Judge Tarver was one of those outstanding Members who set a fine example for the membership, one whom the Members could emulate, and one from whom practically any Member could learn.

His contributions through his own work and in his service in the Congress were outstanding. The effect he has had on Members who have served since then has been such as to add to the benefits he brought to the American Nation.

We hate to see him go. We extend our deepest sympathy to his loved ones who

can take to themselves the comfort that he lived a full life and contributed his share during his days here through works that will redound to the benefit of all of us in the future.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to lay a flower on the memory of a great American, Judge Tarver. He was a great American. He was a very fine legislator. He left a deep impress on the work of this Congress and on the legislation of this Republic. I knew Judge Tarver well and saw him often in the Halls of Congress and walking to and from the House Office Building and this Chamber. He was always fair, loyal, and capable. The Nation in his passing has lost a most devout and capable personality.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the gentlemen from Georgia in their tribute to Judge Malcolm Tarver. Along with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], I served under Mr. Tarver in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. In such service you really begin to know a man if you did not before. There never was a more honorable or more dedicated man than Judge Malcolm Tarver. I feel that the country has lost a great man in his passing.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I also should like to pay tribute to one of my very, very dear friends. For many years I was associated with Judge Tarver here in the House of Representatives and also, in our rare periods of leisure, on the golf course. He was a real sportsman in every sense of the word. In my years of service here I know of no one who could analyze his bills with more thoroughness and clarity than Judge Tarver. As ranking member of the Appropriations Committee he handled much important legislation here over a long period of years.

I regarded him as a very close friend and I will miss him. I extend to his family my heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the life and services of the late Malcolm C. Tarver.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in everything that has been said here today regarding Judge Malcolm Tarver.

My first visit to Washington was during World War II when I was stationed in Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., which was in Judge Tarver's district. After calling on the Tennessee delegation I went over to see Judge Tarver. He really rolled out the welcome mat, called several Members of the Georgia delegation over to his of-

fice, and I had a fine visit with all of them.

Later when I came to Washington as administrative assistant to Senator Stewart in July of 1945 we again renewed our friendship. He was most helpful to me and was very understanding of the problems that each of us had.

I certainly regret his passing.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of the Honorable Malcolm C. Tarver, for many years a distinguished Member of this body. I knew him very well, always with appreciation for his patient, careful, and effective work.

Both as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as a member of the House of Representatives he rendered outstanding service to his State and Nation.

Although it probably is true that few people, other than his colleagues here, knew the full story of the long hours and tireless efforts that he devoted to the work of Congress, the good effects of that work still benefit the Nation.

As a friend and admirer of Judge Tarver for many years, I extend my deep regrets to his family in their bereavement.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes?

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 398, nays 11, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]
YEAS—398

Abbott	Baring	Bowles
Adair	Barr	Boykin
Addonizio	Barrett	Brademas
Albert	Barry	Bray
Alexander	Bass, N.H.	Breeding
Alford	Bass, Tenn.	Brewster
Alger	Bates	Brook
Allen	Becker	Brooks, La.
Andersen,	Beckworth	Brooks, Tex.
Minn.	Belcher	Broomfield
Andrews	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Ga.
Anfuso	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Mo.
Arends	Bentley	Brown, Ohio
Ashley	Berry	Broyhill
Ashmore	Betts	Budge
Aspinall	Blatnik	Burdick
Auchincloss	Blitch	Burke, Ky.
Avery	Boggs	Burke, Mass.
Ayres	Boland	Byrne, Pa.
Balley	Bolling	Byrnes, Wis.
Baker	Bolton	Cahill
Baldwin	Bosch	Canfield
Barden	Bow	Carnahan

<p>Casey Cederberg Celler Chamberlain Cheif Chenoweth Chiperfield Church Clark Coad Coffin Cohelan Colmer Conte Cook Cooley Corbett Cramer Cunningham Curtin Curtis, Mass. Curtis, Mo. Daddario Dague Daniels Davis, Ga. Davis, Tenn. Dawson Delaney Dent Denton Derounian Derwinski Devine Diggs Dingell Dixon Donohue Dooley Dorn, N.Y. Dowdy Downing Doyle Dulski Durham Dwyer Edmondson Elliott Everett Evins Fallon Farbstein Fascell Feighan Fenton Fino Fisher Flood Flynn Flynt Fogarty Foley Forand Ford Forrester Fountain Frazier Freilinghuysen Friedel Fulton Gallagher Garmatz Gary Gathings Gavin George Giaino Glenn Goodell Granahan Gray Green, Oreg. Green, Pa. Griffin Griffths Gubser Hagen Haley Halleck Halpern Hardy Harris Harrison Hays Hébert Hemphill Henderson Herlong Hess Hiestand Hoever Hoffman, Ill. Hogan Hollfield Holland</p>	<p>Holt Holtzman Horan Hosmer Huddleston Hull Ikard Irwin Jackson Jarman Jennings Jensen Johnson, Calif. Johnson, Colo. Johnson, Md. Johnson, Wis. Jonas Jones, Ala. Jones, Mo. Judd Karsten Karth Kasem Kastenmeier Kearns Kee Keith Kelly Keogh Kilburn Kilday Kilgore King, Calif. King, Utah Kirwan Kitchin Kluczynski Knox Kowalski Kyl Lafore Laird Landrum Lane Langen Lankford Latta Lennon Lesinski Levering Libonati Lindsay Lipscomb Loser McCormack McCulloch McDonough McDowell McFall McGinley McGovern McIntire McMillan McSween Macdonald Machrowicz Mack, Ill. Mack, Wash. Madden Magnuson Mahon Mailliard Marshall Martin Mason Matthews May Meador Metcalf Michel Miller, Clem Miller, George P. Miller, N.Y. Milliken Mills Minshall Moeller Monagan Montoya Moore Moorhead Morgan Morris, N. Mex. Morris, Okla. Morrison Moss Moulder Multer Murray Natcher Nelsen Nix Norblad</p>	<p>Norrrell O'Brien, Ill. O'Brien, N.Y. O'Hara, Ill. O'Hara, Mich. O'Konski O'Neill Oliver Osmer Ostertag Passman Patman Pelly Perkins Pfof Philbin Pillner Pillion Pirnie Poage Poff Preston Price Prokop Pucinski Quie Quigley Rabaut Rains Ray Reece, Tenn. Rees, Kans. Rhodes, Ariz. Rhodes, Pa. Riehlman Riley Rivers, Alaska Rivers, S.C. Roberts Robison Rodino Rogers, Colo. Rogers, Fla. Rogers, Tex. Rooney Roosevelt Rostenkowski Roush Rutherford Santangelo St. George Saund Saylor Schenck Scherer Schwengel Scott Selden Shelley Shipley Short Sikes Simpson Sisk Slack Smith, Calif. Smith, Iowa Smith, Miss. Smith, Va. Spence Springer Staggers Steed Stratton Stubblefield Sullivan Taber Taylor Teague, Calif. Teague, Tex. Teller Thomas Thompson, La. Thompson, N.J. Thompson, Tex. Thomson, Wyo. Thornberry Toll Tollefson Trimble Tuck Udall Ullman Utt Vanik Van Pelt Van Zandt Vinson Wainwright Wallhauser Wampler Watts Weaver Weis Westland Wharton</p>	<p>Whitener Whitten Wier Wilson Winstead Abernethy Dorn, S.C. Gross Harmon Anderson, Mont. Baumhart Bonner Buckley Burleson Cannon Grant So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed. The Clerk announced the following pairs: Mr. Porter with Mr. Baumhart. Mr. Walter with Mr. Merrow. Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Widnall. Mr. Reuss with Mr. Mumma. Mr. Hargis with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED CORPS PERSONNEL ACT OF 1960 The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 2220) to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service through revision and extension of some of the provisions relating to retirement, appointment of personnel, and other related personnel matters, and for other purposes, as amended. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill? The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table. AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR MILITARY DEPARTMENT'S The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on passage of the bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill. Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 407, nays 4, not voting 19, as follows: [Roll No. 18] YEAS—407 Abbutt Abernethy Adair Addonizio Albert Alexander Alford Aiger</p>	<p>Whitrow Wolf Wright Yates Young NAYS—11 Siler Smith, Kans. Williams NOT VOTING—21 Hargis Healy Inouye Merrow Mumma Porter Powell Randall Reuss Rogers, Mass. Sheppard Walter Widnall Willis Baldwin Barden Baring Barr Barrett Barry Bass, N.H. Bass, Tenn. Bates Becker Beckworth Belcher Bennett, Fla. Bennett, Mich. Bentley Berry Betts Biatnik Blitch Boggs Boland Bolling Bolton Bonner Bosch Bow Bowles Boykin Brademas Bray Breeding Brewster Brock Brooks, La. Brooks, Tex. Broomfield Brown, Ga. Brown, Mo. Brown, Ohio Broyhill Budge Burdick Burke, Ky. Burke, Mass. Byrne, Pa. Byrnes, Wis. Cahill Canfield Cannon Carnahan Casey Cederberg Celler Chamberlain Cheif Chenoweth Chiperfield Church Clark Coad Coffin Cohelan Colmer Collier Conte Cook Cooley Corbett Cramer Cunningham Curtin Curtis, Mass. Curtis, Mo. Dague Daniels Davis, Ga. Davis, Tenn. Dawson Delaney Dent Denton Derounian Derwinski Devine Diggs Dingell Dixon Donohue Dooley Dorn, N.Y. Dorn, S.C. Dowdy Downing Doyle Dulski Durham Dwyer Edmondson Elliott Everett Evins Fallon Farbstein Fascell Feighan</p>	<p>Fenton Fino Fisher Flood Flynn Flynt Fogarty Foley Forand Ford Forrester Fountain Frazier Freilinghuysen Friedel Fulton Gallagher Garmatz Gary Gathings Gavin George Giaino Glenn Goodell Granahan Gray Green, Oreg. Green, Pa. Griffin Griffths Gubser Hagen Haley Halleck Halpern Hardy Harris Harrison Hays Hébert Hemphill Henderson Herlong Hess Hiestand Hoever Hoffman, Ill. Hogan Hollfield Holland McCormack McCulloch McDonough McDowell McFall McGinley McGovern McIntire McMillan McSween Macdonald Machrowicz Mack, Wash. Madden Magnuson Mahon Mailliard Marshall Martin Mason Matthews May Meador Metcalf Michel Miller, Clem Miller, George P. Miller, N.Y. Milliken Mills Minshall Moeller Monagan Montoya Moore Moorhead Morgan Morris, N. Mex. Morris, Okla. Morrison Moss Moulder Multer Murray Natcher Nelsen Nix Norblad</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---

Schwengel	Sullivan	Wainwright
Scott	Taber	Wallhauser
Selden	Taylor	Wampler
Shelley	Teague, Calif.	Watts
Sheppard	Teague, Tex.	Weaver
Shipley	Teller	Wels
Short	Thomas	Westland
Sikes	Thompson, La.	Wharton
Siler	Thompson, N.J.	Whitener
Simpson	Thompson, Tex.	Whitten
Sisk	Thomson, Wyo.	Wier
Slack	Thornberry	Williams
Smith, Calif.	Toll	Wilson
Smith, Iowa	Tollefson	Winstead
Smith, Kans.	Trimble	Withrow
Smith, Miss.	Tuck	Wolf
Smith, Va.	Udall	Wright
Spence	Ullman	Yates
Springer	Utt	Young
Staggers	Vanik	Younger
Steed	Van Pelt	Zablocki
Stratton	Van Zandt	Zelenko
Stubblefield	Vinson	

NAYS—4

Gross	Hechler	Meyer
Harmon		

NOT VOTING—19

Baumhart	Jackson	Reuss
Buckley	Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Burleson	Merrow	Walter
Grant	Mumma	Widnall
Healey	Porter	Willis
Hoffman, Mich.	Powell	
Inouye	Randall	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Porter with Mr. Mumma.
- Mr. Powell with Mr. Merrow.
- Mr. Walter with Mr. Jackson.
- Mr. Reuss with Mr. Widnall.
- Mr. Buckley with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
- Mr. Willis with Mr. Baumhart.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW FARM PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, after several months of intensive effort on the part of many farm and commodity organizations and individuals, a new marketing program for wheat has been developed.

A bipartisan group of Members of the House have today introduced this new program in legislative form. Those of us who helped draft the new program and introduced it today earnestly urge all Members of the House to study the proposed legislation.

We sincerely believe this legislation offers the best possible solution to the present wheat problem. We believe the new program would be fair to the producers, because it would stabilize their income at reasonable levels, and to the taxpayers because it would greatly reduce the cost of the wheat program.

Reduced to its simplest terms, this is how the new wheat program would operate.

The Secretary would set an annual marketing quota to meet total domestic and export requirements, then subtract 150 million bushels before breaking it down to an individual farm basis.

This provision would force the grain trade to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation for 150 million bushels of wheat each year. Inasmuch as CCC would be barred from selling wheat below parity, this would result in a price to the farmer at or near full parity.

No wheat could be sold for primary uses without a certificate based on individual marketing quotas expressed in bushels rather than acres. To be eligible a producer would have to retire at least 10 percent of his base acreage to non-commercial use and an additional 10 percent if funds are available.

To help Members obtain a complete understanding of the proposal, I urge them to read the following explanation prepared by the group which drafted the program:

This program was developed in conference with the National Grange, National Farmers Union, and National Association of Wheat Growers and, in addition, is supported by the National Farmers Organization, Missouri Farmers Association, National Corn Growers Association, American Soybean Association, and the Grain Sorghums Producers Association.

WHAT IT WILL DO FOR THE WHEAT PRODUCER

1. Stabilize producers' income at reasonable levels.
2. Allow freedom to plant and harvest crops best adapted without Government interference.
3. Permit producers to carry reserve for short crop years.
4. Prevent wheat prices from reaching disastrously low levels.
5. Enable wheat producers to market best quality wheat in domestic food and export market, and lower grades in feed market.

WHAT IT WILL DO FOR THE FEED GRAIN PRODUCER

1. Prevent shifting of diverted wheat acreage to feed grains.
2. Materially reduce feed grain production on wheat farms.
3. Make a substantial contribution to the balancing of feed grain supplies with demand.
4. Aid in an orderly reduction of present surplus feed grain stocks.

WHAT IT WILL DO FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

1. Materially reduce cost of wheat program to the taxpayer.
2. Stop buildup of Government holdings and start orderly reduction.
3. Provide adequate supply of high quality wheat for domestic food and export at reasonable prices.
4. Contribute to orderly marketing of highest quality wheat through regular commercial channels.
5. Insure continued ability of wheat producers to buy the products of industry and labor.
6. Stabilize incomes of small businesses in rural communities.

HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS

1. The Secretary shall determine the total quantity of wheat for the primary use. This shall be the amount of wheat to be used for domestic food consumption and total exports for the next marketing year.

2. Establish a national wheat requirement for primary use in an amount 150 million bushels less than the amount determined in No. 1 above.

3. Allocate the national wheat requirement for primary use among individual wheat producers on the basis of the established wheat base acres and normal production on each farm, except that if a producer has a base of less than 15 acres his base shall be his average annual acreage of wheat planted for harvest during the preceding three-crop year.

4. Before the start of the marketing year, each qualifying wheat producer will be issued marketing certificates for his share of the national wheat requirements for primary use.

5. To qualify for primary-use certificates a wheatgrower must retire annually an amount equal to 10 percent of his wheat base to a land-retirement, soil-conserving use, without rental payment. If, however, funds are available for a land retirement program he shall place a minimum of an amount equal to an additional 10 percent of his wheat base acres in this program.

6. A farmer may plant, harvest and sell or store all the wheat he wishes, but wheat sold for primary use must be accompanied by marketing certificates.

7. Marketing certificates are not required for wheat sold for secondary use such as feed, seed, or commercial use.

8. Certificates are valueless unless accompanied by wheat. They are not transferable and are valid at the producer level only for the marketing year for which they are issued.

9. No person shall be allowed to process for food or to export any wheat not covered by marketing certificates.

10. CCC shall not sell any wheat for this primary use at less than 100 percent of the effective parity price. After the program has operated for 1 year, the demand for this primary use will require at least 150 million bushels of CCC wheat, thus the price to producers at the marketplace should approach parity.

11. The CCC inventory of wheat will be reduced in an orderly manner since a substantial portion of the primary use market will come from CCC stocks.

12. Continuation of export subsidies, paid in cash rather than in kind, will be required through the adjustment period.

13. In order to assist in orderly marketing a 75 percent of parity loan would be offered to qualifying producers only on certificate wheat.

14. When CCC stocks have reached a reasonable level, the share of the national wheat requirement for primary use to qualifying producers shall be increased to meet the market demand for primary use.

Analysis of savings in costs between present wheat program and proposed wheat marketing program—Production relationship effects of programs on wheat base acres

[In thousands]

	Present program	Wheat marketing program
1. Wheat base acres.....	82,000	82,000
2. Wheat acres retired.....	2,300	15,600
3. Wheat base available for production crops.....	79,700	66,400
4. Wheat base acres abandoned yearly.....	5,000	5,460
5. Wheat acres harvested, seed.....	2,900	3,000
6. Wheat acres harvested for wheat market.....	47,100	39,000
7. Total wheat base acres used for feed.....	24,700	18,940
8. Reduction in total wheat acres devoted to feed.....		5,760
9. Estimated yield per acre 0.3 ton shows net reduction in feed under wheat marketing program produced on wheat base acres (5,760,000 acres X 0.8 tons per acre).....		4,608

Annual comparison of present program and wheat-marketing program after 1st year of operation

1. Additional annual cost present program:		II. Annual savings wheat marketing program—Continued	
A. Net annual change in inventory, 200 million bushels at \$1.81	\$362,000,000	C. Cost export subsidy—Continued	
B. Annual cost storage on above, 200 million at 17 cents per bushel	34,000,000	5. Estimated export	million bushels..... 440
C. Annual cost interest on above series at 4½ percent	17,820,000	6. Additional cost export subsidy	\$162,800,000
D. Total additional cost, present program and year	413,820,000	7. Interest on above at 4½ percent	7,326,000
II. Annual savings wheat marketing program:		8. Total additional export subsidy costs	170,126,000
A. CCC inventory recovery:		D. Cost land retirement program:	
1. 150,000 bushels per year at \$2.36	354,000,000	1. Acres of land retired of wheat base	million acres..... 15.6
2. Storage on above at 17 cents	25,500,000	2. On half without rental	do..... 7.8
3. Interest on above	17,077,500	3. Cost on half at \$15	\$117,000,000
Total	396,577,500	4. Less cost present program 2.3 million acres at \$15	34,500,000
B. CCC savings on feed grain price support operation:		5. Net cost land retirement program	\$2,500,000
1. Savings to CCC from reduced acquisition of feed grains (4.6 million tons at \$40 per ton)	184,000,000	6. Interest on above at 4½ percent	3,712,500
2. Storage on above (4.6 million tons × 42 bushels per ton (estimate) = 193.2 million bushels) at 16 cents per bushel	30,900,000	7. Total cost land retirement	86,212,500
3. Interest on above	9,670,000	Total additional cost C and D	256,338,500
Total	224,570,000	Total savings new wheat marketing program:	
Total savings, A and B	621,147,500	A and B	621,147,500
C. Cost export subsidy:		Total additional cost now C and D	256,338,500
1. Estimated domestic price (farm level) bushel	2.12	Savings	364,809,000
2. Export subsidy	.92	III. Annual net monetary results of wheat marketing program:	
3. Export subsidy under present program	.55	Additional annual cost present program	413,820,000
4. Net subsidy increase	.37	Annual saving wheat marketing program	364,809,000
		Total	778,629,000

Analysis of reduction of CCC inventory extended for 5 years
(Million bushels)

	Present program		Wheat marketing program	
	Increase	Total	Decrease	Total
I. CCC wheat inventory projection: On hand July 1—				
1961		1,400		1,400
1961-62	200	1,600	80	1,320
1962-63	200	1,800	150	1,170
1963-64	200	2,000	150	1,020
1964-65	200	2,200	150	870

SPECIAL PROVISION FOR PROTECTION OF INCOME OF SMALL GROWERS (15-ACRE EXEMPTION)

Under the general proposal the national marketing quota is divided up among individual farms in accordance with the distribution of each farm's wheat base multiplied by normal yield. The provision for small farmers is designed to maintain this general allocation formula by establishing a fair definition of wheat base as applied to the small grower whose wheat base acreage is less than 15 acres.

1. Establish marketing allotment for all farms on same basis.

2. Producer whose wheat base acreage is less than 15 acres may request an adjustment in his base.

3. Maximum upward adjustment for any such producer would be:

(a) Consider his actual average annual planting of wheat for harvest of immediately preceding 3 years as his readjusted acreage allotment;

(b) Adjusted base would be such actual plantings plus products of the average national ratio of diverted acres multiplied by such average annual plantings of wheat for harvest.

4. The total of the farm marketing quotas required for these adjustments would be added to the original national marketing quota.

5. To protect the market for small producers, Commodity Credit Corporation would be directed to buy not to exceed the quantity of the added marketing quota if the market price should at any time drop below 90 percent of parity.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the acting majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the distinguished minority leader, there is no further legislative business today. Consideration of H.R. 5 has been put over to some future time and will not be considered this week.

Starting tomorrow it is planned to consider the civil rights bill, and it is expected that the House will remain in session Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, probably late into the evening of each day.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the last session the Congress considered legislation permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a food stamp program at his discretion, and this is now Public Law 86-341 which amended and extended Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress.

The Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, decided not to comply with the provisions of the law and has so notified the Congress.

On January 27, 1960, Senator HART, of Michigan, introduced S. 2920, a bill to

provide for the establishment of experimental food stamp allotment programs. The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary to undertake not less than three nor more than six food stamp demonstration programs in rural and urban areas where there is a substantial labor surplus; it would authorize the expenditure of \$20 million for the project and require the Secretary to complete the demonstration programs and report to the Congress by January 1, 1963. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a companion bill.

Since the provisions of Public Law 86-341 permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the stamp system only on the specific request of a State or political subdivision thereof, I wish to cite the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit and submitted to the Department of Agriculture by Mr. Thomas D. Leadbetter, city clerk:

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he is hereby authorized and directed to advise the Secretary of Agriculture that the city of Detroit wishes to participate in the food stamp system, for the distribution of surplus food commodities, provided for in Public Law 86-341, 86th Congress, H.R. 8609, September 21, 1959.

H.R. 5, FOREIGN INVESTMENT INCENTIVE TAX ACT OF 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5 is not timely legislation. My "no" vote on the rule authorizing debate on H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960, as recommended to us by the Ways and Means Committee under the distinguished authorship of the gentleman from Louisiana, being a proposal

"To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance," which is the statement in the title of the bill, was made by me, because the closed rule before us eliminated any opportunity to offer amendments to this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, the last couple of years I have had such experiences in the matter of imports and exports and our tariff program, especially as relates to small steel manufacturers in my congressional district, and textile and pottery factories also in my district, I felt it imperative that this bill be subject to reasonable amendment. Let me now make it clear, that, while I recognize that the bill is a tax payment differment bill, it does not excuse taxes nor obviate necessary payment thereof. But, Mr. Speaker, the payment date only comes when, and if, any net profits made under the terms of the bill by American corporations operating in foreign countries brought those net profits back to the United States. This they might never do, but could reasonably pyramid their net profits in the purse of their foreign corporation and operations in foreign nations. Why not?

Let me read you a telegram dated January 27, 1959, to me from the Southwest Steel Rolling Mills in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County. The contents of this telegram tell something of my fixed concern for congressional constituents on account of their being unable, under present law, and present tariff regulations and present executive directives to compete in the U.S. market with foreign imports of certain items of steel, largely imports from Japan.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., January 27, 1959.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference January 20 addendum to bid CIVENG-04-353-59-19 dated December 9, 1958, called by U.S. Army Engineers District, Los Angeles Corps of Engineers, covering Los Angeles County drainage area, California, Santa Anita wash channel improvement, including supply of reinforcing steel. Said addendum announces Government policy of applying Buy American Act clause permitting procurement from foreign sources whenever differential in prices between lowest American bidder and foreign bidders exceeds 6 percent. We understand this announcement was made pursuant to instructions by Department of Defense, Washington, D.C., which is said to have issued similar instructions to other branches of Armed Forces.

Our company which is leading steel bar mill in southern California employing almost 500 people as well as other steel mills throughout United States are already deeply perturbed by alarming increase in imports of steel from Japan and Europe against which the high labor cost in our industry prevents us from competing. Present foreign steel bar prices approximately \$40 per ton or about 35 percent below American prices. If above policy of Defense Department carried into effect it will place almost entire supply of steel to our Government in hands of foreign mills, thus barring American steel mills from doing business with their own Government, which they support as taxpayers. The result would be widespread shutdowns and unemployment in our industry.

This would be most disastrous among smaller manufacturers such as ourselves who

are small business enterprise to which our Government proposes to give sympathetic consideration. Disastrous results of the crippling of our industry at times national emergency are obvious. Since Buy American Act permits buying from domestic sources, notwithstanding price differential exceeding 6 percent whenever factors of national security and vital economic considerations warrant, we respectfully request you urge Defense Department not to apply above 6-percent rule. We shall appreciate your immediate help and early reply concerning results.

SOUTHWEST STEEL ROLLING MILLS.

Both before and since the date of that telegram, January 27, 1959, I have been benefited by extensive and thorough-going information and experiences in the premises, the composite of which compels me to object to this bill in its present form. For instance, whereas my congressional constituents are already outcompeted by Japanese and other foreign imports made by cheap labor under existing controlling regulations and administration policy, this bill, H.R. 5, expressly proposes to allow up to 10 percent of a U.S. foreign corporation, or subsidiary, to import back into the United States up to 10 percent of its products made in a foreign country and by exactly the same cheap labor and operating cost which presently outcompetes the products of my congressional constituents. Too many items, particularly those produced by small and medium sized steel manufacturers in my congressional district, and elsewhere, particularly naming steel bar products, prices for imported steel bar products range from about \$40 a ton, or approximately 35 percent below the prices necessarily quoted by the producers thereof in my congressional district and other corresponding small business manufacturers. I speak for the small business producers because those in my district all employ less than 500 employees.

Furthermore, German steelworkers today earn a weekly wage rate less than one-third of our American counterparts and in Japan, industrial wages are about 15 percent of comparable American wages. These are, of course, general figures. For the first 8 months of 1958 relating to imports of reinforcing steel bars showed an increase of 113 percent over the corresponding first 8 months of 1957 for a like period. And, I am informed, the percentage is sharply increasing.

And, here is a letter dated March 18, 1959, to me from the Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C., with reference to their interpretation of the Buy American Act under which it is the present administration to apply policy in such matters as we are discussing:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1959.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This is in reply to your letters of January 28 and February 18 on behalf of the Southwest Steel Rolling Mills, Los Angeles, Calif.

The Buy American Act (47 Stat. 1520; 41 U.S.C. sec. 10a-d) requires generally that only domestic construction materials shall be used in the performance of contracts for

construction. However, among other exceptions, the act does not apply where it is determined that the use of a particular construction material would unreasonably increase the cost or be impracticable. Executive Order No. 10582, dated December 17, 1954, and Department of Defense Directive No. 4105.22, dated February 21, 1955, provide that the price of materials of domestic origin shall be deemed to be unreasonable if the price thereof exceeds the price of materials of foreign origin by more than 6 percent.

In further implementation of the above, paragraph 6-204 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation requires the inclusion in invitation for bids for construction of provisions allowing bidders to propose the use of nondomestic construction materials. The regulation further provides that the use of such materials will be permitted if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) The bid specifically designates the nondomestic construction materials proposed for use;

(b) The cost of any available acceptable domestic construction material, delivered at the construction site, would exceed by more than 6 percent the cost of the designated nondomestic construction material delivered at the construction site (including any applicable duty); and

(c) The lowest acceptable bid using only domestic construction materials exceeds the bid designating nondomestic construction materials by more than 6 percent of the aggregate cost of the designated nondomestic construction materials delivered at the construction site (including any applicable duty).

Invitation for bids No. CIVENG-04-353-59-19 issued by the district engineer, Los Angeles, Calif., for construction of the Santa Anita Wash Channel Improvement, Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, contained the provisions prescribed by the Armed Services Procurement Regulation. The low bid received pursuant to that invitation proposed the use of domestic construction materials only and award was made to such low bidder. Accordingly, foreign steel will not be used in the performance of the contract.

I am hopeful that the information furnished above will be of assistance to you. The telegrams which were forwarded with your letters are inclosed.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. PERSON,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Assistant
Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

You will note therein under subdivision b of said letter that it expressly recognizes that they are obligated to purchase construction material wherein the price for the same commodity made domestically in the United States would exceed by more than 6 percent the cost of the designated nondomestic construction material. This, my friends, is in accordance with what is known as the Tallamy directive, the Federal Highway Administrator in the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Roads, Washington, D.C., dated April 23, 1959. Let me read this directive:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1959.
Circular memorandum to: Regional and
division engineers.

From: E. D. Tallamy, Federal Highway
Administrator.
Subject: Materials of foreign origin in
Federal-aid highway work.

Restrictions upon materials of foreign origin in Federal-aid highway work may be imposed by State highway departments provided such restrictions do not limit the use

of such materials to any greater extent than is permitted for Federal construction work under the so-called Buy American Act (41 United States Code 10a-d) and Executive Order No. 10582, dated December 17, 1954. The Buy American Act, in substance, prescribes certain preferences for domestic materials, subject to considerations of reasonableness of price and the public interest. Executive Order No. 10582 is designed to effectuate uniformity in the application of the Buy American Act and provides methods for determining the reasonableness of the price of domestic materials in relation to the bid or offered price of materials of foreign origin.

Public roads will not interpose objection to restrictions upon materials of foreign origin (otherwise meeting approved technical specifications) in Federal-aid highway work that are no more stringent than the restrictions applied by Federal agencies in Federal construction work under such act and Executive order. Such restrictions, however, may be imposed only in conformity with the following requirements:

1. The contract specifications or other contract or bidding documents shall clearly inform bidders of the restrictions and identify the particular materials or articles subject to the restrictions;

2. The restrictions may be imposed only upon a material or article that is set forth in the bid or proposal form as a bid item for the furnishing of such material or article (but not including its incorporation in the project) for which a separate bid price is required;

3. If any bidder intends to provide a material or article of foreign origin under any such bid item, he shall be required to indicate this fact in his bid, and he shall not be permitted to furnish such foreign article or material unless he so indicates;

4. The bid or offered price for any such bid item of any bidder offering a material or article of foreign origin thereunder shall be required to include applicable duty and all costs incurred after arrival in the United States, including costs of delivery of the material or article to the place specified in the contract documents;

5. It shall be provided in the bidding documents that for the purpose of comparing bids the total bid price on the contract submitted by any bidder offering a material or article of foreign origin in conformity with the requirements herein shall be increased by an amount equal to 6 percent of the bid or offered price for such material or article; and

6. The contract amount of any contract awarded as provided in the preceding paragraph shall be based upon the bid as submitted, without regard to such differential.

Restrictions presently imposed by State highway departments should be carefully reviewed and, if necessary, revised to conform with the requirements hereof to avoid jeopardizing Federal participation in the projects involved. Public Roads will not approve plans, specifications or other contract document or contract award which is inconsistent with this memorandum.

This memorandum does not apply to State highway departments that do not impose or contemplate imposing in Federal-aid highway work, restrictions upon materials of foreign origin otherwise meeting technical specifications.

The requirements of this memorandum shall become effective only as to any contracts for Federal-aid highway work for which bids are initially advertised or invited on and after July 1, 1959.

A policy and procedure memorandum on this subject will be issued at a later date.

And whereas the last paragraph in this directive states that "a policy and procedure memorandum on this subject

will be issued at a later date," I am pleased to read to you a letter to me from the Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., dated March 4, 1960, and signed by Mr. Philip McCallum, Administrator thereof, indicating that the application of Federal "Buy American" standards to the Federal aid highway program has been again postponed this time until April 30, 1960:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1960.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Further reference is made to my letter of February 4, 1960, concerning the application of the Federal "Buy American" standards to the Federal-aid highway program.

I have been informed that the effective date of the application of these standards has been postponed for 60 days from March 1, 1960. The effect of this postponement is to enable the respective States to continue to apply their own "Buy American" requirements to the Federal-aid highway program until April 30, 1960.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MCCALLUM,
Administrator.

I herewith present to you the table of steel imports and exports provided by the American Iron & Steel Institute from the U.S. Department of Commerce reports. Said table being crystal-clear evidence of the fact that under the present policy guided by the said Tallamy directive the small steel bar and other small steel item manufacturers similarly cannot survive and continue in a solvent condition:

American metal market—Steel imports and exports—Foreign trade in steel mill products

	[Net tons]			
	Imports		Exports	
	1958	1959	1958	1959
January.....	70,833	229,369	326,845	161,375
February.....	68,085	240,769	241,879	167,586
March.....	92,196	287,417	263,817	177,901
3 months.....	231,114	757,555	832,541	506,862
April.....	114,024	266,943
May.....	118,094	244,622
June.....	126,408	163,309
July.....	171,179	169,345
August.....	156,666	171,120
September.....	179,555	180,685
October.....	200,569	251,410
November.....	174,611	238,998
December.....	230,599	169,508
Total.....	1,702,819	2,687,415

EARLIER YEARS

	Imports	Exports
1957.....	1,164,516	5,176,289
1956.....	1,344,000	4,156,747
1955.....	975,558	3,870,889
1954.....	787,596	2,659,017
1953.....	1,674,468	2,807,078
1952.....	1,185,746	3,918,097
1951.....	2,178,481	3,051,211
1950.....	1,075,329	2,879,860
1949.....	287,876	4,082,110
1948.....	151,254	4,354,996

¹ 1950 and earlier figures on slightly higher basis than later, due to changes in classifications.

Source: Compiled by American Iron & Steel Institute from Department of Commerce reports.

Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us is not in contravention, nor does it change

a single comma or letter of the present Tariff Act, nor of the Tallamy directive, the application of which is driving manufacturers of small steel out of business in my congressional district and other congressional districts over the Nation. But, it is especially related to the present existing tariff provisions as to steel bar imports, as you have seen, because it increases by 10 percent the right of American capital to produce these very same competing bars in foreign countries and then ship back in competition with American manufacturers and domestically made steel bars. It is a case of American capital going to a foreign country to make more money, but the result is to lower both the numerical volume and the level of living of American labor and, reasonably, to close out and freeze out of existence, altogether too many small business establishments in our Nation. Rather, the appropriate congressional committee should actively and immediately make investigation of the application of the present tariff regulations in this and other areas and bring in a bill changing same consistent with changed economic conditions in the world. There have been such underlying and huge changes in the cost differential between U.S. producers and their more recent competitors abroad that it is time for a restudy and reconsideration of what our tariff policy in such matters should be. This bill proposes to help bring against the U.S. domestic manufacturers even more untimely and unmatched competition of products made in foreign lands—but primarily with cheap labor.

This bill would further aid American money to go abroad, and then outcompete American domestic manufacturers because of the competitive advantage of shockingly low wage levels in foreign countries and also resulting from the fact that the workers in these foreign countries have not yet achieved any reasonable bargaining power such as we know as collective bargaining. Who can gain-say, that the manufacturers in western and even southern Europe have rehabilitated themselves sufficiently to compete successfully with American products by way of import and foreign made products to the American market in very many instances. And production with such substantially cheaper labor has far exceeded and expanded beyond the prewar levels, so that they are now not only producing their domestic needs and wants, but in many cases outcompeting U.S. producers for commodities we make and use in the United States. No longer can we logically claim the need of expanding foreign markets in order to ship our surplus goods and also as a means of absorbing our surplus production. That condition does no longer hold true in many cases.

Mr. Speaker, while I concede that I am neither qualified as an expert, nor do I claim to be an expert in this area, I do claim that I am aware of my great congressional district in Los Angeles County already being too materially penalized in several cases, because of the existence of the Tallamy directive and the application of our present tariff

policy in the manner in which it is applied. I again repeat that the proposals in H.R. 5, now before us, are closely enough related to our whole tariff policy and regulations and interpretations thereof as put in practice by this administration, so that the enactment of any such policy as today proposed in this bill should be postponed and taken into consideration in connection with a reassessment and restudy of such policies. I recognize and compliment the diligence and desires of our committee to aid American capital to safely and logically invest abroad. I commend the committee chairman and members for their fine presentation today.

NAVY HYDROGRAPHER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H.R. 10966, for appropriate reference. The bill seeks to amend section 7391 of title 10 of the United States Code to establish the rank, pay, and allowances of the hydrographer of the Navy.

The purpose of this bill is to increase the rank of the hydrographer of the Navy from rear admiral, lower half, to rear admiral, upper half, and to upgrade the deputy hydrographer accordingly. The bill is consistent in its terms with other legislation involving increased responsibilities in the military services.

Mr. Speaker, until recently we have been guilty of a blindness that, on reflection, is inexcusable. We have been grossly neglectful of the need to develop, as rapidly and as fully as possible, knowledge of the marine sciences. The need is both strategic and economic.

I suppose the oceans have been so close and so familiar for so long that until very recently we have not thought much about them. But the revolution in sea-power created by the atomic submarine, and the sound, well-conceived and searching study made by the National Academy of Sciences in the past few years have served to restore our attention to that huge area of the earth that we use so much but about which we know so little—the oceans.

I have had the honor and the privilege of serving on our Armed Services Committee for an appreciable time; more recently, I am serving as a member of our new Committee on Science and Astronautics; and for slightly more than the past year I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I mention these things only to show that I feel qualified to introduce and support the bill I have offered today.

In our new appreciation of an old and familiar environment we tend to forget that hydrography has come a long way since the days of that great Virginian, Lt. Mathew Fontaine Maury, over 100 years ago.

An unsung but greatly important part of our Government, the Hydrographic Office has served not only the needs of our Navy but of our merchant marine and, indeed, the shipping of all the world. There is no nation whose ships are without the most recent charts of the Hydrographic Office for their navigation of the seven seas.

Our Subcommittee on Oceanography has carefully studied the activities of the varied Federal interests concerned with the sciences of the sea. The one overwhelming conclusion is that we must learn much more, rapidly and completely.

The Hydrographic Office of the Navy, performing its dual tasks for defense and merchant shipping, is in the forefront of our efforts to unlock the manifold mysteries of the deeps.

Hydro's job is vast. And I believe that as things are today we would be gravely remiss if we do not upgrade this essential and vital organization to the status it deserves, and to assure its ability to carry its increased responsibilities.

H.R. 5, FOREIGN INVESTMENT INCENTIVE ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable surprise I learned today of the decision to suspend general debate and the vote on H.R. 5, commonly referred to as the Foreign Investment Incentive Act.

After yesterday's extensive debate, I remain more and more convinced of the impropriety of this legislation and hope that the decision to defer vote on the bill will constitute its obituary.

During the course of debate on this bill, I inquired of its sponsor whether there was anything in this bill to prohibit the subsidiary of an American corporation from continuing operations as a subsidiary as long as it serves its tax purposes, then qualifying as a foreign business corporation for those years when it may present the maximum tax advantage, and then return to its former status for tax purposes as a subsidiary.

The reply I received inferred a presumption in my question that the only purpose in using this bill would be to avoid taxes. This is a wise legislative presumption when revisions of our tax laws are being considered.

As I further study this legislation, I am convinced that it would have created a gaping hole in our tax structure by permitting American corporations with subsidiaries abroad to transfer these assets abroad without payment of the capital gains tax to the U.S. Treasury.

Along with other undetermined corporations, this bill would have resulted in tremendous tax savings to the Singer Co., RCA-Whirlpool, and the Kaiser industries. They are among the many corporations operating abroad under American charter with extensive income pro-

ducing assets subject to U.S. income taxes.

However, the most glaring objections to this bill from every standpoint are its provisions to permit the deferral of tax on income from branch operations of American banks in foreign countries. It would have provided a unique tax bonanza for the First National City Bank of New York, the First National Bank of Boston, and the Chase Manhattan National Bank.

The bill would have permitted a wide-scale escape from tax on fabulous banking profits, particularly in South America.

It is my understanding that current rates for business loans in Peru call for an interest rate of 20 percent. In Chili, American investment capital can call for a rate as high as 24 percent, while in inflation-weary Argentina, the sky is the limit with some business loans commanding rates as high as 36 to 40 percent. In Brazil the interest is reported to be as high as 4 percent per month.

If American capital abroad is extorting or participating in the extortion of such exorbitant rates of interest to help in the development of South America and other underdeveloped areas of the world, it would be doing this Nation a grave disservice.

H.R. 5 has all the earmarks of being a private bill—for the benefit of a privileged few. It is my hope that this bill will be permanently tabled.

WE'RE STILL ASLEEP ON CBR

Mr. HECHLER. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the whole structure of our Nation's policies in regard to chemical, biological, and radiological warfare has long been of deep concern to me.

I have spoken out before on the grave moral issues which I believe are raised when our supposedly peace-loving Nation builds up vast stockpiles of chemical and biological substances without a single international agreement barring our preemptive use of them.

I also have expressed deep regret that the President and the Defense Department have chosen to shroud the progress of our Nation and Russia in the cloak of secrecy. As a result, our people are uninformed of United States and Soviet potential in the field of CBR, and cannot discuss the moral aspects of the issue in qualified, informed ways.

But even more serious is the fact that the American public is completely in the dark about Russia's capabilities in this field, and knows little about the dreadful effects the most modern developments in CBR warfare could wreak upon a nation.

In short, we are defenseless. Our people have never been told how to defend themselves against these awesome weapons, a full year after the chief of the Army Chemical Corps conceded that upwards of 30 million citizens of the

Soviet Union have been trained in defenses against chemical and biological warfare. In the United States, very few people would be able to cope intelligently with a chemical or biological attack.

Recently the American Chemical Society released a report which it prepared at the behest of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—this request was actually made by OCDM's predecessor, the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The shocking statements contained in this report merit the attention of every American.

In general, the ACS conclusions are meritorious, for they help to focus the spotlight of public opinion and public awareness on this vital and neglected subject.

However, even though the ACS report indicates the urgent need for making the people aware of the strategic menace of chemical and biological agents, I feel that the society endorses a few optimistic conclusions which are totally unwarranted.

For instance, the ACS has reprinted—along with its summary report—a statement from the trade publication *Chemical and Engineering News*, in which Editor Walter J. Murphy claims:

There is now better understanding of the extreme urgency to plan better defense against chemical and biological warfare agents. A positive program is at long last under way by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Speaker, if this is true, the American people have not been so informed. And if they haven't been informed, then the program is self-defeating.

For example, the OCDM—at the very time it is arguing the necessity for providing fallout shelters for our citizens in case of nuclear attack—has failed miserably to inform the people of the danger of chemical and biological agents, and the means for personal or family defense against them.

Mr. Murphy also says:

We are glad to note a shift in Pentagon and State Department thinking, because the American public should know all the aspects of CBR.

This also does not seem true—unless we consider an apparent shift in Army policies toward establishing a position that would permit the preemptive use of CBR agents. And I can't see how this possibly could "protect" the public. The President is not informing the American people. And neither is the Pentagon.

Nevertheless, Mr. Murphy's article and the summary of the American Chemical Society report make thoughtful and worthwhile reading, and I commend them to the attention of the House; and, under unanimous consent, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

[From *Chemical and Engineering News*, Oct. 19, 1959]

CIVIL DEFENSE AGAINST CBR—SPECIAL ACS COMMITTEE MAKES STARTLING DISCLOSURES IN LENGTHY REPORT

In this issue is a lengthy report of a special committee under the ACS board of directors appointed to investigate ways the society and its members could assist in civil defense planning.

The request to perform such a service came 2 years ago from the Federal Civil Defense

Administration (FCDA). It opened a Pandora's box of questions. As a result, there is now better understanding of the extreme urgency to plan adequate defense against biological and chemical warfare agents. A positive program is at long last under way by the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization (OCDM).

Seldom has any ACS committee labored so persistently, diligently, and under more difficult and, at times, more frustrating conditions. Results warrant unlimited praise and gratitude from the membership.

The committee found, as it started to function, that national defense planning had relegated biological and chemical warfare to such a minor role that only passing attention had been given to the problem. The reason is not difficult to find. For years, the State and Defense Departments thoroughly discouraged any real disclosures or discussions on CBR research as conducted by the Chemical Corps. This, despite certain knowledge that the U.S.S.R. was supporting major research programs in these areas.

Excuse given for this heads in the sand policy was an attempt to keep the Soviets from using such information for internal and international propaganda purposes. We have been severely critical of such a policy, for it did not deter the Red Chinese, and it left the American public uninformed. We are glad to note a shift in Pentagon and State Department thinking, because the American public should know about all the general aspects of CBR, as it does about nuclear weapons and space missiles.

We urge every reader to study the detailed report, but if you cannot spare the time, at least read the summary on page 30.

What can be of more immediate importance than developing preparation to nullify possible sudden use of biological and/or chemical agents by an enemy? Complete unpreparedness resulting from ignorance and indifference only invites the enemy to employ such weapons.

With the introduction of bigger and still more powerful atomic bombs, the American public has drifted into an attitude of "What's the use? There's no defense, no escape, if we are forced to trade hydrogen bombs in an all-out war."

But a smart enemy might very well elect to employ weapons which would not leave this and other countries in shambles. A completely devastated nation with millions dead or maimed and with physical facilities destroyed is no prize for any victor.

The work of the ACS Committee on Civil Defense must continue for obvious reasons. It has had to labor in silence, and has wished to be constructive, not destructive. It has not sought sensational headlines, but rather to convince officials of the need for action. The committee feels the time has arrived for the chemical profession to take active leadership in planning and executing, at the community level, a workable civil defense program against biological and chemical warfare agents.

This includes informing the public and overcoming its lethargy. To postpone action further is to run risk of ignominious defeat. We must not keep ignoring facts as though they were only a bad dream.

The excellent work of the committee will be lost unless an aroused and informed public demands action. Many positive steps at the national and local level are in order and the ACS must not pass up this opportunity to serve.—(Signed) WALTER J. MURPHY.

ACS GIVES WARNING ON CBR DEFENSE—COMMITTEE TAKES WRAPS OFF HUSH-HUSH TOPIC, GIVES NOD TO BALANCED EFFORT ON NONMILITARY DEFENSE

The oft-censured U.S. civil defense program gets backing from a new quarter—the ACS Committee on Civil Defense—in a sum-

mary report released this week. The committee found glaring weaknesses in the old civil defense program, especially in the areas of chemical and biological warfare. By now, however, the reorganized civil defense unit has responded quickly to the CW-BW problems highlighted for it by the committee.

The committee urges public endorsement and support of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and its CW-BW programs.

The committee originally found, for instance, that:

National defense planning assumptions had relegated biological and chemical warfare to such a minor role that only passing attention had been given to them.

Many of the civil defense staff had not received updated briefings on the possibilities and effectiveness of chemical and biological agents.

Research on defense against BW and CW was lagging. For example, progress in developing an inexpensive civilian protective mask (against all CW, BW, and RW agents that would be inhaled) was inordinately slow.

Meanwhile, the Soviets were quoted as placing high priority on the BW threat, both offensively and defensively. "Biological weapons," they indicate, "are regarded today as more dangerous, not only than conventional weapons, but also more dangerous than atomic weapons."

The quantities of an aerosol needed to carry infective doses of BW agents to humans are fantastically small. A person breathing air with only 1 aerosol particle per liter will take into his lungs at the normal breathing rate 15 such aerosol particles per minute. Those particles, if carrying a virulent BW agent, mean a massive infective dose.

Some of the committee's early criticisms of the civil defense effort were headed off by merger of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization into one agency—Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. OCDM's delegation of specific responsibilities to other Federal agencies resulted in greater progress since October 1958 than that made over many previous years.

Some of the committee's recommendations to the ACS board of directors have been implemented, such as its request that the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization brief its top-level staff on the use and effectiveness of modern BW and CW agents. This was done in December 1958, and the committee sees evidence that it has been effective.

Among other recommendations, the committee urged:

Highest priority to research and development on detection, early warning, and rapid identification of BW and CW agents.

At least minimum production of the civilian protective mask as soon as possible after tests are completed, with possible distribution through commercial retail channels.

Declassification of enough BW and CW information to permit education of and discussion among the citizenry of the real threat of enemy attack by BW and CW.

Bringing in an outside research agency to evaluate BW and CW data and suggest means of defense, as has been done with radiological data.

MARKETING PROGRAM FOR WHEAT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I and other of my colleagues have intro-

duced a bill to provide a marketing program for wheat. I consider it to be an effective bill. It will stop the buildup of wheat surpluses. It will systematically reduce present stores of wheat in storage. It will stabilize the producers' income.

The ever-increasing growth of stocks of surplus wheat have two detrimental results. The first is to tie up large amounts of Federal funds in these inventories. The second is to inflame the public generally because of the costs of the wheat problem.

This discrediting of the farmer in the eyes of our urban citizens is creating the implication that the farmer is living luxuriously on a Federal dole and that the farm program itself is the problem. Neither is true. The net farm income of farmers dropped 15 percent during the past year. We must go back to the years prior to 1940 to find a time when the farmer has been in such an unfavorable position comparing his ability to buy with what he gets for his products.

The farm problem is simply that the farmer can produce more than can be sold profitably under existing marketing conditions.

This legislation will establish for the farmer a situation where he will receive somewhat near a just return for his share of the production for which there is an available market—domestic use of wheat and foreign markets.

Under the existing program he never gets a price anywhere near a level that will offer him a fair return on his investment and labor for any of his products; and in addition the cost to the Federal Government rises.

The millions that are being spent are being eroded. The very aim of a Federal farm program is to aid the essential farm industry at a time when it needs assistance. But we have failed if the cost goes up and the farmer's income goes down.

I am convinced that this legislation will put this phase of the agriculture industry back into a manageable condition.

This program will help the wheat farmer, reduce drastically the cost of the wheat program to the Federal Government, and at the same time will not affect adversely any of the other farm commodities.

This program has the strong support of the Nebraska Wheat Growers Association which is a highly responsible organization. Nebraskans have been very active in the development of this program under the leadership of the National Wheat Growers Association.

It has long been my belief and that of the wheat producers of Nebraska that Congress needs the help of an honest appraisal from a commodity group to bring about the best legislation to cure the ills of that particular commodity.

I think that this legislation is proof of that opinion. This bill is an honest bill that will require further sacrifice on the part of the producers. My people accept this responsibility and their acknowledgment of the need for sacrifice before order can again return to agriculture is further proof of their intelligence and integrity.

CVI—318

Mr. Speaker, this program is simple. There will be ample opportunity for my colleagues to learn about this legislation and I would encourage them to take advantage of the chances that will come their way to study it carefully and I am confident that they will join me in their hearty approval of the bill.

H.R. 5

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this is a strange procedure when we wind up the regular business of the House at 1:10 in the afternoon with H.R. 5 still the unfinished business. I wonder if this is an admission of defeat, or what is it?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield, if the gentleman can shed any light on this strange procedure.

Mr. HAYS. I think the sponsor of the bill is aware of the old maxim that he who fights and runs away may live to fight another day.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the leadership of the House, having arbitrarily suspended action today, will give the Members ample notice before this bill is called up again.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last week I furnished the Members of this House with some interesting and vital statistics showing the revenues that Government-run lotteries produce in some of our foreign countries.

Today I want to add to that list. I have compiled additional data from other countries which have long recognized and accepted the indisputable fact that the desire to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings.

Mr. Speaker, these illuminating reports come from foreign countries where controlled and regulated gambling has resulted in not only pleasure to their people but financial benefit to their treasuries. These are the countries which discovered a long time ago that Government supervision, control and regulation are the only sensible and profitable approach to this entire question of gambling.

Mr. Speaker, while the wheels of fortune continue to spin in almost every foreign nation producing for their governments greatly needed revenues, we, in the United States, allow ourselves to be blinded by an unfounded fear—fear that there is something evil in capitalizing on the gambling instinct of man.

How foolish can we get? If there is any wrong in gambling—and we find no condemnation of it in the law of God—it lies in the fact that we permit and allow it to go on unchecked and uncontrolled.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we wiped out hypocrisy and started to treat this entire problem with common sense. It is about time we showed some courage and combined the gambling spirit of our people together with the ever-growing need for more revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the revenue figures I have so far given as well as those listed below will help convince this Congress that a national lottery in the United States would not only satisfy the American appetite to gamble but would channel into our Government coffers \$10 billion a year in added income.

Last week's figure showed that the gross receipts from government-run lotteries in 17 foreign countries amounted to over one-half billion dollars. In the 10 additional foreign countries listed below, the gross receipts for 1959 were \$100,475,602 with the governments receiving \$35,038,354. Not bad at all.

Country	Population	Gross receipts	Government's share
1. Argentina.....	20,613,900	\$19,630,265	\$10,464,003
2. Belgium.....	9,144,000	16,800,000	6,000,000
3. Brazil.....	65,000,000	17,465,000	6,090,000
4. Chile.....	7,550,000	18,700,000	5,250,000
5. Denmark.....	4,500,000	6,042,000	280,000
6. Haiti.....	3,500,000	1,628,800	100,000
7. Netherlands.....	11,400,000	9,654,204	2,500,000
8. New Zealand.....	2,343,000	1,677,519	614,961
9. Paraguay.....	1,728,000	1,363,934	279,738
10. Turkey.....	26,000,000	7,513,880	3,456,652

NEGATIVE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over removal or retention of the negative disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act continues unabated. Those who seek the removal of this ineffective and discriminatory oath cannot understand why its defenders are so adamant. Those who defend it cannot, in all sincerity, I would judge, see why anyone should object to the affidavit. Some valuable light, utterly bereft of the heat this issue usually arouses, is shed by a recent editorial in the Catholic Sentinel, the weekly newspaper of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Portland in Oregon. This editorial points out some of the reasons for the removal of this oath and, I believe, helps further discredit the argument that opposition to the oath is evidence of following the Communist line.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LOYALTY OATHS AND THE COLLEGES

On February 18 the Sentinel printed a story which told of St. Louis University's

opposition to the loyalty oath and nonsubversive affidavit required of students seeking Federal loans under the National Defense Education Act. To a casual reader such opposition must seem perplexing. Why should any patriotic American hesitate to attest to the allegiance he owes to his country?

But the administration of St. Louis University and Providence College did not lightly join their objections to those of institutions like Harvard and Yale. Those superpatriotic American Catholics who accused the Ivy Leaguers of merely following the Communist Party line must be somewhat jolted by the actions of these respected Catholic schools. St. Louis is conducted by the Jesuits and Providence by the Dominicans. When these two orders agree on an action it can hardly be considered heterodox.

Now to return to the heart of the matter—the objection to the loyalty oath. Educators consider it an insult to the academic world. Farmers who apply for Government price supports and businessmen seeking Government contracts are not required to swear to their loyalty under oath. If students must take the oath, so should everyone else, which would be ludicrous in the extreme. Picture the long line before the parcel post window during the holiday season as all stamp purchasers stop to take an oath and sign a non-subversive affidavit. The avowed purpose of the regulation, to stop Communists from receiving Government help, does not take into account the Communist disdain for the truth.

At the same time the two Catholic schools should be commended for not withdrawing from the program, as Harvard and Yale did. As the spokesman for St. Louis pointed out, such a move would deny students free choice in the matter. The actions of objecting institutions have moved Senator KENNEDY to introduce a bill in Congress calling for the repeal of the loyalty oath. The bill has the support of President Eisenhower.

What of those institutions, Catholic or not, which have not objected to the oath? Well, it's still a free country.

THE LATE SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the Members of the House the passing of my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

DICK NEUBERGER passed away in his home city of Portland, Oreg., this morning. His departure will be a tremendous loss to the State and to the Nation which he served so well for the past 6 years, and in whose service he gave forth every promise of an even more brilliant career in years to come.

DICK NEUBERGER was a many-sided man. His contributions to the culture of the Nation, through his talented pen, were manifold. His contributions to the art of government were numerous. If any one facet of his many-sided character stood out it was his unparalleled and passionate devotion to humanitarianism. DICK NEUBERGER never faltered, never wavered, in his fight to secure public recognition for the public responsibility in the struggle against

disease, against the neglect and waste of human resources.

DICK NEUBERGER, as we all knew, suffered greatly in his last year of life from the ravages of cancer. However, his unremitting fight to secure Federal funds and Federal action in the fight against all disease dates back to a time before he was himself stricken. And his own sufferings, his own pain, did not lessen his efforts or stop his dedicated work until the exhaustion of his personal fight against this disease brought to an end his public fight against it. If any man ever gave his life for his country, if any man ever died in the direct line of duty to his fellowman, that man was DICK NEUBERGER. If you would seek DICK NEUBERGER's memorial go to our hospitals, to our National Institutes of Health, and look at the hope in the faces of men, women, and children who would have no hope today had this man not freely thrown away the energies of his own life in order to help them and to help us all.

To Mrs. Neuberger and to his parents goes our most heartfelt sympathy.

I further ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be given 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks in regard to Senator NEUBERGER.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon in this word of tribute to the late great Senator from her State. Senator NEUBERGER was an outstanding American, a man of tremendous talents in many fields, a man who, though he had attained outstanding achievements in his life, was still in the prime of his life when he left us. For several months he struggled against the ravages of diseases that ultimately struck him down, but during that struggle he gave, I think, more to the matter of fighting for better health standards, as the gentlewoman had said, for all mankind, than he did to his own physical well-being. Our country has lost a distinguished statesman. I join the gentlewoman in this expression with respect to his life and his service, and in so doing I know I express the sentiments of all Members of the House.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of shock and grief that I learned this morning of the death of Senator NEUBERGER. His death is a great and irretrievable loss, a tragic loss, not only to the State of Oregon but to the Nation. He was one of the most able spokesmen, gifted as very few others in expressing the sentiments and the ideals of the country that he loved so much. Senator NEUBERGER's writings and also his legislative achievements constitute a lasting monument to his memory.

Having been stricken with cancer in 1958, he fought with great courage and was able to overcome this dread malady, returning here to continue with his legislative duties. He came back dedicated to wage a battle against cancer and disease, to fight against needless suffering of unfortunate people now and in the future.

Senator NEUBERGER was an outstanding conservationist. As a fellow member on the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, I want to say that his contributions in that body were great. He was the spokesman for millions of Americans who love the great outdoors.

Senator NEUBERGER's death is a great loss to all of America. To Mrs. Neuberger and to the family, I extend my deepest sympathy in this sad hour of bereavement.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] in expressing sincere regret over the sudden passing of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER. It was truly shocking to read in the morning paper of his being stricken and then on a newscast at breakfast time to hear that the attack had been fatal.

DICK NEUBERGER, prior to his being a Member of the U.S. Senate, was known as an author. But actually, although his fame was as a successful writer, I think most people viewed him as a crusader and I think his career as a legislator was the same. He had a burning desire to convert others to the several noble and high causes that filled his heart and mind.

Naturally, my State of Washington and the Senator's State of Oregon have a common interest in many legislative programs. Thus, DICK NEUBERGER and I often had the same interests and matters of concern and while I embrace a different political philosophy and I would not say our views on legislation were the same, nevertheless as I knew him better I increasingly came to respect the Senator's courage, integrity and unselfish motives. His energy and ability were boundless and certainly he deserved to become a national figure, which he was, and an outstanding man of our time.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the Northwest where DICK NEUBERGER was an extremely well-known political figure, a sort of legend. We, of Washington State, recognize that in his passing our sister State of Oregon has sustained a severe loss. The common cause of the Pacific Northwest will suffer in many ways. It has lost a strong advocate.

Civil rights and civil liberties, conservation, better ethics and better government, these were what the Oregon crusader unceasingly sought and the highest tribute I can pay our departed friend is that no word of mine or of anyone will so eloquently memorialize DICK NEUBERGER as will his own words and accomplishments in the records of our time.

In joining the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] in expressing sorrow, I would not want to close without extending to Mrs. Neuberger my deepest sympathy.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing our sorrow and regret at the passing of Senator NEUBERGER. The late Senator loved the

district in Montana that I represent. Together with the Senator, I have gone over the Lewis and Clark trail about which he wrote so much and about which he knew so much. He would sit on those high mountain peaks dividing the States of Montana and Idaho and tell of how he felt about Montana and the whole great Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, as it has been so eloquently said here before, his loss is not only a loss to the State of Oregon as a Senator representing that great State, but the Nation has lost a historian and a writer and an ardent conservationist, in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and George Norris.

He was an effective spokesman for the wilderness bill, for public power, for health and welfare programs, including increased funds for the National Institutes of Health and research into the cause and cure of cripples and killers such as cancer and heart disease. He sponsored legislation which established the medical insurance program for Federal employees. As chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee he was tireless on behalf of the first Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Neuberger and want to express the special regret of the State of Montana at the loss of one of our adopted sons.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today a man young in years, but truly mature in outlook and understanding, has left us. The untimely passing of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER is a personal loss for many of us.

His State and his Nation have lost one whose devotion to public duty and his overpowering and abiding faith transcended personal pain to the degree that he was able to overcome the scourge of cancer, only to be taken by a stroke.

DICK NEUBERGER's public record will proudly stand for all to see. But more important, I think, is the record of human and inspiring courage he displayed, a courage that has given hope and comfort to others afflicted with pain or disease.

Today we bow our heads with sadness, for we have lost a friend—we have lost a colleague. In expressing deep feelings of sympathy to Maurine Neuberger, I know every Member of Congress and her many friends wish her Godspeed in adjusting to the loss of a dear husband—a courageous man.

Mr. Speaker, DICK NEUBERGER loved life; he loved people. I can think of no better tribute to his memory than the fulfillment of his efforts to lick the problem of cancer so that in the days to come precious life will not be threatened by this vicious disease. Indeed, his death, caused by a cerebral hemorrhage, also reemphasizes the need for greater effort in all phases of medical research.

I am sure that the fulfillment of man's dream of life without disease and pain,

a dream which someday will become reality, will serve as a shining tribute to men such as DICK NEUBERGER.

No man could ask for a more lasting tribute. No man would deserve it more.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of the late Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon, who died today at the all too early age of 47 was an earnest, sincere, and diligent lawmaker of great courage in fighting for the principles in which he believed.

The Senator was a lifelong student of governmental and of social problems. His interests were wide and varied. No problem which seemed to him to affect the well-being of citizens was too little or too big for him to tackle. His years of writing experience gave him a clarity of expression that enabled him to win many a battle for programs and policies in which he believed.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the Nation lost an exceptionally, truly able, humble, and extremely hard working servant when RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the junior Senator from Oregon, died of a cerebral hemorrhage this morning in Oregon.

DICK NEUBERGER was that rare combination of keen observer and effective participant. He understood and he believed in our political processes. His knowledge on public issues was incredibly broad.

He was an acknowledged authority in the areas of conservation, public power, public health and research, and many others.

I leave now to attend his funeral in Oregon. His spirit and his intellectual contribution have left us all in his debt.

To his wife, Maurine, and to his parents, go our deepest sympathy. Oregon will long honor the works and memory of DICK NEUBERGER, a public servant whose dedication to his duties led to his death at the age of 47.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply saddened to learn of the sudden passing of one of the Nation's most able and distinguished leaders, the junior Senator from Oregon, RICHARD NEUBERGER.

DICK NEUBERGER came to the Senate of the United States 5 years ago. His training and experience had prepared him well for the arduous task of representing the people and the area he loved so well. With little regard for his own personal health and well-being he worked at his job and now leaves a proud heritage and an enviable record of public service.

DICK NEUBERGER's life and career was in the great tradition of American liberalism. His was not the doctrinaire, cut-and-dried liberal, but rather an independent, thoughtful human being who felt compassion for his fellow man and a sense of duty for the betterment of his country and the world.

His unflinching support of measures to conserve and protect the Nation's great natural resources places him with the Norrises, La Follettes, and other great Senate fighters and protectors of the public domain. Few men in public life had so sincere and deep a feeling for the outdoors and America's natural beauty and resources. He did not just talk about the subject, he knew it as well as any man living. His treks along the Lewis and Clark trail and other historic routes in the Pacific Northwest that he loved so much are legendary. He will be sorely missed by us all.

I want to take this opportunity to extend heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Neuberger in this hour of sorrow. We share her grief at the loss of a man of whom it can truly be said, "He walked in the midst of his people."

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my grief over the passing of Senator NEUBERGER.

I had known DICK NEUBERGER since we were students in college in the early 1930's and I have always considered him to be a good personal friend of mine. While we, of course, belonged to different political parties and, accordingly, our political thinking was dissimilar on many issues, nevertheless, we were able to work together very closely on many of the matters that came before the Congress in the last 6 years affecting the State of Oregon. On a number of occasions we conferred on matters involving our State, introduced legislation thereon, and succeeded in having it favorably enacted.

I want to particularly express my sympathy and sorrow to his widow, Maurine, who was a very devoted wife, and even more so in a true sense of the word a realistic helpmate during his campaign for the U.S. Senate and during the years he served here.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing my deep sorrow over the passing of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. NEUBERGER.

Seldom has any Senator made such a brilliant record of accomplishment during his first term. Senator DICK NEUBERGER was an outstanding writer and one of the foremost students of the history of the Northwest. An ardent conservationist and expert on hydroelectric power projects, he applied all of his many talents to the complex legislative tasks which confront every Senator. In so doing, he became an outstanding legislator and won the respect and admiration of his colleagues in both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Suddenly afflicted with cancer, Senator NEUBERGER endured extended treatment, and by the courage and persistence which characterized his life, fought his way back to health and again took his place on the floor of the Senate. His writings of his experience with the dread disease gave inspiration to others similarly stricken.

Upon his return to the Senate, Senator NEUBERGER renewed his efforts to step up Federal participation in cancer research activities of the National Institutes of

Health to hasten the day when a cure for the disease may be discovered.

He was a man dedicated to the preservation of our priceless resources and was always in the forefront in the fight for sound conservation measures. In every field of legislation in which he participated he was vigilant in his efforts to safeguard the public interest. DICK NEUBERGER will be sorely missed in the crucial days ahead. Mrs. Rhodes joins in extending our deepest sympathy to his devoted wife, Maurine, who so closely shared his political philosophy and his aspirations.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the sad and untimely death of my good friend, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, leaves me with a deep sense of personal loss. It is tragic indeed that one so young, with a past that was great but a future greater still, should be taken from us and that we should be so deprived of his leadership, his wisdom, and his shining courage. My wife, Martha, and I extend to his widow, Maurine, our heartfelt sympathy with awareness, however, that his qualities of greatness will continue to inspire her.

DICK NEUBERGER'S death does not bring a family sorrow alone—there is an unbridgeable void in our lives—our Nation has lost an outstanding statesman, one of her most dedicated sons; his own State of Oregon, a great Senator; the State of Alaska, a good friend; the people as a whole, a leading exponent of their causes, their hopes, their dreams; the literary world, a voice of conscience and great talent. His voice is silent, his pen is still, but to those of us left behind he bequeathed the inspiration of his high courage and integrity. He was a gentle and kind and tolerant man who believed unerringly in the democratic principles of our Government and unflinchingly in the fundamental rights of mankind. He was a true "liberal" in the full sense of the word.

From his early days at the University of Oregon, DICK NEUBERGER could always be found out in front fighting for good causes, regardless of their current unpopularity, or prevailing complacency. He was a man of basic wisdom with the courage of his convictions. He was a champion of the underprivileged, a passionate believer in democracy, a true American.

We in Alaska who have at long last found our place among the society of States will forever be grateful to him for his steadfast support of statehood. He was one of the early advocates of statehood for Alaska and likewise for Hawaii. He would, of course, be such an advocate for he lived by and worked for the ideals he so eloquently expressed. During the construction of the Alaska Highway by the military during World War II, he lived among us, worked with us, wrote about us, understood our endeavors, and left with us an even greater appreciation of our beautiful and bountiful State than we had had before—a richness that stretches before us in a never ending progression. To all of us he brought into sharp focus the problems of the Northwest in such perspective that we cannot but be blind to real-

ity if we do not continue his good fight to preserve for posterity some of that beauty of mountain and stream and forest that was so much a part of RICHARD NEUBERGER, the man; RICHARD NEUBERGER, the American.

While he sleeps peacefully in his beloved Northwest, I should like to think he is doing so beneath stately trees he loved so much, and in the shadow of towering mountains marked with all their splendor and natural beauty. He has left us poor with his passing, but indeed we are rich for having known him, having worked with him, and having been inspired by him. Our loss, but Heaven's gain.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues across the Nation in expressing my deep sorrow at the death of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, and my sympathy to Maurine Neuberger. The thoughts of Mrs. Reuss and I are truly with her.

DICK NEUBERGER was a remarkable man—a great Senator and statesman, a prolific writer, a man of deep human insight and compassion, a close friend and legislative partner.

It was my privilege to work often with Senator NEUBERGER. No one was more dedicated to the conservation of all our Nation's resources than he, and I was proud to be associated with him in this great cause. He fought wholeheartedly for the interests of the Klamath Indians of Oregon—and when we had some difficulty guarding the interests of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin, he helped us out, too. In fighting for adequate health and medical research programs, in enacting billboard regulation, in many other endeavors, it was a pleasure to be allied with DICK NEUBERGER.

Most recently, Senator NEUBERGER joined me in introducing a bill looking toward the establishment of a Point 4 Youth Corps, to enable young Americans to serve our country and help the peoples of other nations in technical assistance missions in far-off lands. DICK NEUBERGER'S sponsorship of this legislation was typical of his deep interest both in young people and in America, showing to the world our sincere dedication to peace and friendship.

We in the Congress have lost an inspiring friend, and the Nation has lost a brilliant son.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that others of our colleagues have previously obtained special orders to address the House today, I shall at the proper time, following the conclusion of such special orders, offer a privileged resolution that the House adjourn out of respect for the late and distinguished Senator from the State of Oregon, Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

H.R. 8601 CONSTITUTES A FEDERAL CONTROL ACT OVER STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8601, which bill will be brought up

tomorrow, if enacted, would constitute a Federal control act and would bring into question the ability, integrity, and official conduct of all State authority relating to education, elections, and law enforcement. This bill goes further in the direction of centralized Federal control of State affairs than any proposal which has been seriously considered by the Congress since reconstruction days.

H.R. 8601 has as its main purpose the promotion of integration through Federal supervision and control of State responsibilities, and contains six titles. Title I would impose fines of up to \$1,000 or imprisonment for up to 60 days, or both, for impeding rights or interfering with the performance of duties of courts of the United States in the admission of persons to public schools. Title II would impose fines of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, for travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for willfully attempting to damage by fire or explosive any public or private building or structure, or to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding relating to any such offense.

Section 301 of title III would require election officers to preserve primary and election records for 2 years where there are votes for President, Vice President, presidential elector, Senator, or Representative. This would include any application, registration, payment of poll tax or other requisite to voting. Officers and custodians could be fined up to \$1,000 or imprisoned, not more than 1 year, or both, under this section. Section 302 would impose the same fine and imprisonment upon an officer or custodian who alters, destroys, conceals, or steals any records. Sections 303 and 304 of title III would require that such records be made available to the Attorney General by officers or custodians for inspection or reproduction at their offices or at some distant office of the U.S. district attorney in the district where such records are located. Section 305 would permit the Attorney General to disclose such records to the Congress, congressional committees, governmental agencies and to courts and grand juries. This would apparently authorize the Attorney General to obtain such records from State and local officials for the benefit and use of the misguided Civil Rights Commission. Section 306 would authorize the United States to compel the production of records. Section 307 of the bill makes it clear that the term officer of election in the bill applies to any State, Commonwealth, or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, authority, custom, or usage performed in connection with any application, registration, payment of poll tax or other requisite to voting in any election or primary at which votes are cast for President, Vice President, presidential elector, Senator, or Representative.

Title IV would extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for a period of 2 additional years and provide for more reports of the type and variety which have previously served to promote preconceived social ideas and to create racial strife rather than to carry out factfind-

ing responsibilities. Title IV would authorize each member of the Civil Rights Commission to administer oaths or take statements of witnesses under affirmation. This title would also grant the Civil Rights Commission the unusual and exceptional authority to appoint personnel without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, rather than to make such appointments in accordance with civil service and classification laws.

Section 501 of title V would authorize the Federal Commissioner of Education to make arrangements for children of the Armed Forces on active duty, residing on or off of Federal property, where schools that usually provide free public education for them are made unavailable by official action of the State or local governmental authority and no local public educational agency is able to provide them with free public education suitable to the Federal Commissioner of Education—not including the acquisition of land, erection of facilities, interest or debt service. This determination would be left solely to the Federal Commissioner after going through the formality of consulting with the appropriate State educational agency. Section 501 would authorize arrangements for the new category of children with the head of the Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over the parents of some or all of the children.

Section 502 of the bill would authorize the Federal Commissioner of Education to acquire possession of any school building constructed with the aid of Federal funds when the local educational agency which owns the building is no longer using it for free public education and the Commissioner needs the building to provide education for children of military personnel or for other children who reside on Federal property. The Commissioner would decide what rental fee to pay for the non-Federal cost of constructing the building. Section 502 would require local educational agencies, in making application for Federal school construction funds, to assure that the facilities will be made available to the Federal Commissioner of Education in case the schools are not being used to provide free public education.

Section 502(b) would amend Public Law 815 which authorizes the Federal Commissioner of Education to make arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing school facilities for children of the Armed Forces on active duty. Section 502(b) of this bill would authorize the Federal Commissioner of Education to build school buildings or otherwise provide school facilities on a temporary basis, and these school buildings could apparently be constructed on Government installations or off of Government installations for children of members of the Armed Forces residing on Government installations or off of Government installations. The only requirements for embarking upon a vast Federal school construction program with the use of Government funds would be a determination by the Federal Commissioner of Education that free public

education is unavailable as a result of official State or local action after going through the formality of consulting with such agency as he considers to be the appropriate State educational agency. The Federal Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could presumably make use of this provision to force integrated schools into communities off of Government installations in furtherance of their preconceived ideas on the creation of a new society.

Section 502(c) of the bill would authorize the Federal Commissioner of Education to take possession of facilities constructed with the aid of Federal funds under Public Law 815 if not being used for public education as minimum facilities for children of Armed Forces personnel on active duty. The payment of rental would be within the judgment of the Commissioner, and could include only the non-Federal share of the cost of construction, adjusted to take into consideration depreciation and such other factors as the Commissioner deems relevant.

The proponents of so-called civil rights legislation repeatedly request new laws without stating their ultimate goals or objectives. Yet, such laws are not needed, are unworkable, and are opposed by the areas most directly concerned. The proposed mislabeled civil rights legislation is being directed at the South in an election year for political gain. Press reports indicate that as there has been accelerated activity relating to these proposals in the Congress, there has been a corresponding increase in racial tension. The Congress is the last remaining branch of the Government offering a possibility of substituting reason for the disorder and confusion which has resulted from the opinions of the Supreme Court and from actions to promote integration within the executive branch of the Government through the utilization of unlimited resources supplied by the taxpayers.

The Supreme Court invaded the legislative field by writing language into the Constitution which did not exist. The executive branch of the Government has engaged in activities which extend beyond their statutory authority and they have sought to enlarge on the language contained in the Supreme Court decisions. The courts have invaded the legislative field and the Congress is being asked to adjudicate.

Our State and local schools are very close to the hearts of our people. This bill would give to the Federal Commissioner of Education authority to constantly interfere in the orderly construction and operation of local schools. Yet, the Federal Commissioner of Education serves under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have previously pointed out that last year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare expressed the belief to the Judiciary Committee that if the Federal Government would make provision for assistance on integration, the States would increasingly turn to the Federal Government and ask for assistance. While acknowledging that his recommendations would

raise some constitutional issues, he stated that what he wants to do is to put the executive branch of the Government in a position to give affirmative help and assistance to school districts that have started to move in the direction of integration.

Under this bill the local election officials, who receive little if any compensation, would be placed under the constant threat of fine and imprisonment and subjected to the humility of carting their records to the office of the U.S. district attorney upon orders of the Attorney General. If the Attorney General elected to do so, these records could be turned over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the misguided Civil Rights Commission to be used in furtherance of their preconceived ideas for a totally integrated social order. The bill would further ignore the past record of the Civil Rights Commission by authorizing the appointment of personnel without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949. The granting of such an exception to this Commission to the exclusion of other Government employees cannot be justified. The press has already reported that a staff member of the Civil Rights Commission recently attended a night strategy meeting with private organizations on the strategy to be followed in advancing Negro voting rights. Yet, the Commission was set up as a factfinding body.

There could be no better way of restoring a proper balance between the States and the Federal Government than to abolish the Civil Rights Commission rather than to extend its life under the provisions of the bill. This Commission has advocated radical proposals; failed to function as a factfinding body; operated beyond the scope of its authority; engaged in social experimentation; and based its determinations largely upon opinions, hearsay, professional polls, authors' views, and quoted statements. There can be no doubt that America has more to fear from the operations of the Commission than from the imagined ills the bill proposes to correct. The abolishment of the Civil Rights Commission would serve notice that increased emphasis is being placed on good will rather than the use of force. I know of no person in the 10th District of Georgia who has not been able to vote because of his race or color, and the entire testimony before the Judiciary Committee sets forth no justification for the drastic measures contained in this bill. There are now adequate laws and enforcement procedures to guarantee voting rights of all citizens.

The Federal Commissioner of Education should not be given authority to seize control of local school buildings for the use of any group. If the Federal Government wishes to lease or buy public school buildings or other property from a State or local government, the Federal Government has the opportunity of negotiating for such lease or purchase. This is the manner in which military procurement programs generally operate, and the States and localities should not be placed in a position which is inferior

to that of other parties contracting with the Federal Government.

In addition, the Federal Government should not be given the right to require that the States and localities turn over State or local school buildings to the Federal Government as a condition to obtaining a just and fair share of construction funds. Not only does such procedure constitute an unwarranted interference in local school matters, but this bill would set up the Federal Commissioner of Education as the sole judge and jury. It might be pertinent to inquire whether there are to be any similar restrictions on funds expended for construction under foreign aid. The Federal Government should never be permitted to dictate to local schools because of any use of Federal funds for school purposes, or to build integrated Federal schools in local communities.

All of us are interested in apprehending any individuals who participate in the bombing of churches, homes, business establishments, or other buildings. However, it is my understanding that there are close working arrangements between the FBI and State enforcement agencies. Law enforcement can be carried out to better advantage at the local level with the opportunity of requesting assistance when needed. This matter appears to be unrelated to other portions of the bill, provides the opportunity for unwarranted Federal interference in law enforcement, and there has not been an indication of a need for such provision from within the States.

The Congress should defeat this proposed legislation and thereby serve notice that the Congress will not pass special class legislation; that schools, voting, and law enforcement must operate at the local level without Federal interference; and that under our system of constitutional government there are certain basic rights which are reserved to the States. The defeat of this bill would further recognize that State and local officials are not less honest, are not less sensible, are not less just, and are not less concerned than Federal employees. It is with the deepest sincerity that I urge the defeat of this proposed legislation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Manpower of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit during general debate for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McSWEEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

H.R. 5—LEGISLATION TO EXPORT EMPLOYMENT—SOMETHING WE CAN EASILY DO WITHOUT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to learn from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] that the leadership of the House has decided to withdraw H.R. 5, the so-called Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1960, which was debated at some length in this Chamber on yesterday and to which so much substantial opposition has developed.

I believe that this is a most wise decision and one which will find favor with a majority of the Members of the House.

No one, of course, could quarrel with the objective of trying to replace our substantial overseas foreign aid commitments, made at the taxpayers expense, with private trading arrangements based on individual transactions rather than payments from the public treasury. But the fact of the matter is that in recent months men and women across the country who never concerned themselves with foreign trade or foreign investment have become increasingly aware of the one blunt fact that in encouraging American firms to invest abroad we are also quite frankly exporting employment.

Firms which only yesterday were producing goods in this country, not only for the American market but for the foreign market as well, in American factories and shops as a result of the labor of American employees, are today closing down, throwing American workers out onto the unemployment rolls, and moving abroad to produce the same goods with cheaper foreign labor at reduced foreign rates. Whatever such moves may do for the foreign countries involved or for the American companies who undertake them, they are only disastrous blows to the working men and women of America and they contribute substantially to our already staggering unemployment problem, and spell danger and disaster for our economy as a whole.

This is a problem with which the people of my district, Mr. Speaker, have been familiar and about which they have been complaining for many years. One glove factory after another in Fulton County, New York, in my district, has closed down and its operations have been transferred to Puerto Rico or to the Philippine Islands or to Hong Kong, where the same products are manufactured under substandard conditions and with substandard wages while men and women in Gloversville and Johnstown walk the streets out of work and the community is listed as the No. 1 chronic unemployment distressed area in the Empire State of New York. This situation, as I say, has gone on for many years in my district. But more recently other companies in other areas have begun to take similar action, and so the threat of low-wage, low-cost foreign competition has begun to be felt in sizable proportions in almost every corner of our land, as yesterday's debate clearly demonstrated.

How can anyone aware of these serious economic problems in our own borders support legislation whose pur-

pose is to make it easier for American firms to give up their responsibilities at home and shift their production base to low-wage areas abroad? And yet this, frankly and admittedly, is the purpose of this legislation, as its very title implies. Oh, of course, I have heard the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] tell us that the bill would not extend its tax privileges to firms exporting more than 10 percent of their produce back to the United States. But this stipulation does not prevent these firms from manufacturing their goods for the foreign market, goods which only a few short weeks before were being manufactured in American factories with American labor and under American wages and working conditions. Nor does it prevent these firms from selling the goods manufactured in their American-owned firms to some foreign subsidiary and then having that foreign subsidiary sell not 10 percent but all of its inventory in the American market. And the provision of the law to which the gentlemen so eloquently referred does not in fact prevent an American firm from continuing to set up as many additional foreign subsidiaries as it may desire to set up to get away from the 10-percent provision even if this legislation were enacted.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to face up to the serious problems which confront American communities as a result of differentials in wages and working conditions between our country and countries abroad. Surely legislation that would encourage American manufacturers to leave this country and leave behind them a growing wake of unemployment is not the kind of legislation that is needed in America or should be considered by Congress at this time.

I have joined vigorously in opposing H.R. 5 and I am delighted that the leadership has recognized the validity of our position and has withdrawn the bill.

NORTHERN CONGRESSMEN WANT CIVIL RIGHTS BUT THEIR CONSTITUENTS DO NOT WANT NEGROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the time of the year has come once again when the cause of politics must be served; the annual fiasco of trying to curry favor with minority-bloc voters is scheduled for later this week. Once again, the good people of the Southern States will be subjected to the usual barrage of vituperation, lies, slander, and other malicious outrages. They will be held up to the world as human beasts who bloodthirstily prey upon innocent Negroes because their skin happens to

be dark. The Negro will be praised for everything good ranging from the discovery of America to sending rockets around the sun. Radio commentators, newspapers, and television will resurrect the body of that old murderous fiend and crackpot, John Brown, for purposes of deification, and modern plagiarisms of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" will play to standing room only audiences throughout the Northern States. Southern Negro rapists will suddenly become the heroes of the hour. In all this, of course, the white people of the South will be cast in the role of arch villains serving the cause of evil, sin, and the Devil. We will be called the Bible belt and our religious beliefs will be held up to scorn.

"Civil rights" will be the battle cry, but civil wrongs will be the objective. Not a single so-called civil rights advocate will dare mention the words "civil responsibilities." Practically every politician from Maine to California will be weeping bitter tears over the plight of the "poor" southern Negro. With the help of the White House—through its spurious and trumped up Civil Rights Commission propaganda and the Attorney General's resurrected Reconstruction laws; with the help of a political Supreme Court reverently paying obeisance to its sociological messiah, Gunnar Myrdal; with the help of both major political parties selling their political virtue for Negro bloc votes, the South may expect nothing less than to be drawn, quartered, and cast as bait to the political wolves.

Because this bill, the so-called civil rights bill, is one of the most revolutionary pieces of legislation ever to confront the U.S. Congress, I think it well that Members of this body should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the provisions of this crime against the Constitution. Furthermore, the American people have a right to know what is going to happen to them following its enactment. In this, I am directing my remarks primarily to the people of the States outside the South, for it is they who will feel the real and disastrous effects of passage of this bill.

It is not my purpose here to discuss the provisions of the legislation itself; that will be done later when the bill is before us for debate. Rather, I want to discuss some of the chaos that will follow its enactment, not so much in the South, but in the other States of the Union who apparently believe themselves far removed from the problem.

Mr. Speaker, until 20—even 10—years ago white and Negro citizens lived together in the Southern States in complete harmony and understanding. Never during my lifetime had I heard of anything approaching mass racial friction, except for an occasional report of a race riot in some far-away northern city such as Cicero, Ill., or Detroit, Mich.

During the past 20 years a determined drive has been under way in the State of Mississippi and our sister Southern States, still feeling the economic pinch from reconstruction days, to give full meaning to the doctrine of "separate and equal" by providing Negro citizens with school and other public facilities equal to or better than

those enjoyed by our white citizens. The Southern States were steadily and surely accomplishing this objective, even though it meant tremendous sacrifices on the part of the white citizens who were saddled with a disproportionate share of the tax burden for its cost.

During this period of time, southern Negroes were happy and cooperative toward the end that the common interests of both races be served. The Negroes realized that the burden of going forward, of footing the bills, of planning for the future, rested entirely on the shoulders of their white neighbors, and they were secure in the knowledge that they were being given an opportunity to develop their own race. Their dignity as a race was recognized, and they were rapidly developing a pride in the accomplishments of their people.

Suddenly, on May 17, 1954, the sharp dagger of a politically inspired, irresponsible and illegal Supreme Court decision was thrust into the vitals of the South, undoing in the twinkling of an eyelash all the good that had been accomplished in the last 75 years in the field of race relations. Just as suddenly in its wake, out of the North swooped down the buzzards of a 20th century reconstruction, licking their beaks, and hoping to fill their political bellies on the flesh of a prostrate South. There came the Communists, the professional agitators of the NAACP and their cohorts, the political plunderers and opportunists, and every conceivable form of carpetbag racketeer, looking for a share in the spoils. Just as in the days of reconstruction nearly a century ago, they found ready and willing allies in a little handful of scalawag journalists already on the scene and willing to report any kind of poison propaganda against their neighboring southerners that could possibly be dreamed out of the whole cloth, with Pulitzer prizes dangling before them as a reward for their treachery.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 drove the dagger even deeper into the body of the South. It succeeded in severing the few lines of communication between the races that had been laboriously kept open since that black Monday in 1954.

Using the Court's decisions and the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as their chief arguing point, professional agitators are making an all-out, no-holds-barred campaign against the South. They are trying to convince the southern Negro that the southern white man is his natural enemy and therefore must be conquered. They try to convince the Negroes that their salvation lies in school and social integration and racial intermarriage, and when these are accomplished, they will suddenly become white and the Negro race will be no more.

It is significant that nearly all the actual violence resulting from these developments has occurred in the Northern States, with very little happening in the South. The blood of these incidents of violence is not on our hands; it is on the hands of the nine Justices who knowingly, willingly, and with malice aforethought, lit the fuse of this bomb which has shattered the peace of America. It

is on the hands of those who aid them in carrying out their devious aims: the politicians, the agitators, radio, television, and the press, and—oh yes, their scalawag Pulitzer Prize accomplices.

Passage of a new civil rights bill this year will further aggravate the strained relations between the races in the South, as it will in the North.

In the current idiotic wave of "student demonstrations" the evil intent of a large segment of our national news mediums is made manifest. Just last Saturday night, in Columbia, S.C., a group of Negro hoodlums, masquerading as "demonstrators," resorted to violence in wrecking a place of business and damaging several automobiles belonging to innocent and law-abiding citizens. In their usual manner of reporting such incidents, national news mediums referred to this as a "demonstration," while the same thing done by white hoodlums would have been called "mob" action.

The sly and clever hand of the NAACP and CORE behind these so-called student demonstrations—actually mobs—has already been exposed in the other body. Their actions are nothing more nor less than incitements to riot.

However, another influence has recently been admitted by the mob. It is the influence of African revolutionists in the United States under the student exchange program authorized by Congress and administered by the Department of State.

Hear what Lewis W. Jones, a Negro sociologist on the faculty of Tuskegee Institute, has to say on this subject:

The African students talk about the part they are playing in the independence movements of their continent, and frequently they reproach American Negro students for not being as aggressive as their counterparts in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of common sense and in the best interest of our Nation, the Secretary of State should take immediate steps to see that any African student involved in any way in these student mob actions be sent home. We have enough agitators and professional hoodlums without having to import Mau Mau to help stir up more trouble.

Mr. Speaker, passage of a civil rights bill this year will cause further grief to the good Negroes of the South. The white southerner, a member of the greatest minority group in America today, will become hesitant to continue a sympathetic interest and understanding in the problems of his Negro neighbor. White people will be hesitant to continue support of Negro education. They will be concerned over the U.S. Congress conferring superior rights on one group of Americans while restricting the rights of others. The results could mean economic disaster to southern Negroes.

It is no secret that since the Supreme Court's decision of May 17, 1954, there has been a steady exodus of Negroes from the Southern States into other areas of the country. Subsequent decisions of the Court, rubber-stamping the demands of the NAACP and similarly minded pressure groups, and actions by the White House and the Congress to curry

favor with these groups have greatly accelerated this movement of Negroes away from the Southern States. This is evident, for instance, in Chicago, where it is reported that Negro immigration from the South is so high that the population is changing from white to colored at the rate of several city blocks a week.

In Philadelphia recently, Harold Stassen, that great self-anointed liberal and friend of the downtrodden masses, that highly touted enemy of bigotry, intolerance, and other such evil things exclusively southern—according to most of the Nation's press—while running for mayor, suggested as part of his platform that he would, if elected, find a means of discouraging further Negro migration from the South into the beautiful and historic City of Brotherly Love. Negroes and Puerto Ricans continue to flood into New York City in ever-increasing swarms, though Harlem continues to be the largest completely segregated community in America. What has happened to our Nation's Capital never ceases to amaze everyone except those from the South, who predicted long ago that Washington would soon become a city more representative of Liberia than the United States.

This exodus of Negroes from the South, and their influx into the great metropolitan centers of other areas of the Nation, has been accompanied by a wave of crime, interracial and otherwise, unparalleled in the history of modern civilization. It has brought on housing problems of incalculable magnitude, and tremendous employment and other economic crises. Property values have plummeted downward in residential areas, and urban white people have been running over themselves in a wild and frantic escape to racially protected and segregated suburbs. Welfare rolls are swelling daily and illegitimacy rates are zooming upward. Schools are bursting at the seams with these newcomers, and municipalities are hard put to find the necessary revenue with which to carry out their corporate functions.

The chief of police of Los Angeles has stated that Negroes comprise only 12½ percent of the population of that city but committed 48.4 percent of the crime in 1958.

Nationwide, according to FBI reports, Negroes commit 61 percent of all murders, 54 percent of all robberies, 63 percent of aggravated assault, and 49 percent of forcible rapes. Bear in mind that only 10 percent of our population is Negro.

When these figures are computed on a per capita basis, it can be readily seen that Negroes commit serious offenses all out of proportion to their numbers. The following table indicates such to be a fact:

Arrests per 100,000

	White	Negro
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter.....	1.8	27.27
Robbery.....	14.29	153.52
Aggravated assault.....	19.26	311.1
Burglary.....	88.6	355.68
Forcible rape.....	3.87	34.34

These computations were made from statistics developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its 1958 report. The figures are from 1,586 cities over 2,500, total population 52,329,497. The per capita computation was made on the assumption that 10 percent of the total population is Negro; however, it is doubtful that the percentage is that high because so many live in southern rural areas.

The RECORD is replete with evidence that civil rights havens in northern and eastern metropolitan areas are just the opposite. A heavy influx of Negroes into a northern city brings also ordinances outlawing "discrimination in employment, education, housing" and what have you. It also brings unsafe neighborhoods, sanitary problems, high crime rate, deteriorating race relations, policemen in school corridors, heavily patrolled playgrounds, and locked doors day and night. What has civil rights accomplished for these areas? Only fear, confusion, hate, and community instability.

In its issue of May 4, 1958, the Philadelphia Bulletin, in a column headlined "City Stirred by Negro Crime Wave," stated:

Much of the trouble goes back to the younger generation of the Negro race. It would be nice to be able to pretend it isn't so and hide one's head in the sand, but statistics and facts can't be shrugged off. It is unpopular to discuss Negro crime and the Negroes have done little to help themselves.

Philadelphia, traditional City of Brotherly Love, opened its heart, its arms, and its purse to the less fortunate from the earliest days. Now the repayment is in crime, terrorism of schools and institutions, and a lessening of standards generally. Many of the less fortunate are unemployable and incapable of being educated.

Negro youth, boys and girls, almost monopolize many of the recreation centers, not only those in their own neighborhoods but in white areas, too. There have been running battles around high schools, in particular, covered up by police, the schools, and other authorities. They have frightened schoolteachers, and some refuse to work at schools in Negro areas.

Every one of the 11 who killed in-Ho Oh had a police record. One, in particular, had been placed on probation four times, including the latest for a long series of assault robberies.

A Philadelphia judge, speaking of Negroes and Puerto Ricans, stated that thousands of boys—and girls—between 16 and 18 now are coming before the juvenile courts, charged with crimes that are "the most reprehensible known to our society. Murder, rape, arson, burglary, robbery are common occurrences by these so-called juveniles."

The New York Journal American, in an editorial last May, stated:

IT MUST BE UNUSUAL

The Alexander Avenue stationhouse in the Bronx didn't bother notifying police headquarters about an unprovoked attack upon an innocent motorist by a teenage street gang because there was nothing unusual about it.

It was almost a week before news of the assault became public.

"This was a felonious assault and we have hundreds of them," was the explanation of the detective in charge of the stationhouse's

clerical work. "We don't send anything down to headquarters unless it is an unusual."

What constitutes "an unusual"? Must it be a murder?

Are we to assume that street assaults have become so commonplace and routine that the outlying precincts are no longer required to report them to headquarters by teletype?

And, in passing, how many attacks similar to the one in the Bronx have there been which have not been made public through the press?

Even the Washington Post editorially admitted on June 13, 1959:

The crimes of rape and assault with intent to rape, formerly rare in any well-policed society, are now almost commonplace, though arrests and convictions are relatively few because of the difficulties of positive identification.

The Post was commending the Washington Police Department for quick work in apprehending a Negro who brutally raped and knifed a woman after knocking on her apartment door about 7:30 a.m.

The lesson to be derived from this case? Listen to the yellow journalism of the Post:

The lesson is to make sure that all the doors are carefully locked.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was that the Washington Post?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was taken verbatim from the Washington Post of that date.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. Were you not surprised?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was certainly surprised.

The best answer I have seen to this editorial was a letter written by a lady in the Washington area to the Post editor, a copy of which was made available to me recently. Of course, the Post did not print it. It follows:

DEAR EDITOR: Your editorial "Fast Work—and Good" in the June 13 edition of the Washington Post stated that the horrible experience of Mrs. Joralemon should be a lesson to all careless women and girls who fail to lock their doors. The lesson derived from this episode should be to the careless courts and judges who free and pardon men of this sort to go forth once again to physically and mentally maim women and girls for the rest of their lives.

Your commendation of the metropolitan police was certainly richly deserved. However, the force is well recognized for always doing the best job possible, even though their efforts are nearly always undermined by the lenient courts, judges and psychiatrists. You also underestimate the police force when you call their method of solving this case rare as compared to detective fiction. The only rare aspect of this case in a comparison between reality and fiction (be it a novel, movie, television or Broadway play) is that the criminal was a Negro.

Your publication carries on daily about civil rights. I was not aware that civil rights pertained only to the voting rights of Negroes and desegregation. Does not the white American citizen have the right to live without fear of rape and assault stepping through his unlocked door? The home of a man (and even of careless women) is by

American standards his "castle." Perhaps we should revert to the customs of feudal times and have moats surrounding our abodes to discourage the commonplace rapist and assaulter in our society. This, however, would reject any idea of brotherly love; but then, brotherly love—achieved only through trust and respect, never through dictatorship—cannot exist where fear and mistrust prevails.

You state that "the crimes of rape and assault with intent to rape, formerly rare in any well-policed society, are now almost commonplace." In my small, but well-populated hometown in Massachusetts (population 26,000 and more than double in the summer months), they has never been a rape or a murder. Locked doors are not the reason for this, as few doors are locked day or night. Could it not possibly be due to the zero number of Negro inhabitants?

It would seem that Washington's leading newspaper would cry out against this violence and call for measures to prevent men such as this with backgrounds such as his from lurking the streets of this country No—your only advice was directed to the careless women and girls of this great Nation's Capital to lock their doors—the only means, I gather, by which they can be saved from the savage animals lurking the streets of Washington.

P.S. If this should be printed, please use only my initials and Arlington, Va. My doors are rarely locked and I should like to continue this outmoded privilege.

In certain areas of Chicago, police are stationed at certain street intersections and stop all pedestrians and automobiles. If the person or the occupants do not live in the neighborhood, they are turned back. Racial friction and tension is the reason for this unusual infringement of civil rights.

Further legislation will only compound the fear, confusion, and hate. Segregation is the only answer as most Americans—not the politicians—have realized for hundreds of years.

Metropolitan areas of the North and East appear to have absorbed as many Negroes as possible without creating an explosion. It stands to reason, therefore, that the all-white suburban communities which ring these areas must begin to absorb their share of Negro immigrants. Already, an agency of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., has issued a pamphlet called "Your Next Move" urging Negroes to seek new homes in all-white neighborhoods. Under date of March 3, 1960, the following Associated Press item appeared in the Washington Star, reporting this move on the part of the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations:

PHILADELPHIA UNIT SEEKS NEGRO MOVE TO WHITE AREAS

Negroes were urged by the city's commission on human relations yesterday to seek new homes in all-white neighborhoods.

In a pamphlet called "Your Next Move," the commission advised Negro families to refuse to be steered into what it termed ghetto areas.

"Be willing to buy a home where other Negroes have not lived," the pamphlet states. "To break the stubborn pattern of segregated housing many Negro citizens must have the courage to live in new neighborhoods."

The commission has prepared what it calls a do-it-yourself educational kit which contains a number of pamphlets and reports, most of them describing proper procedures to be followed in buying a new home.

Some other suggestions listed:

"Look. Look. Look. Any neighborhood in Philadelphia may possibly have the house you want. Don't ignore an area because minority families may not live there now.

"Visit new developments and inquire about available houses. Builders say that Negroes do not inspect sample homes. * * * This may be only an alibi for discriminating against you.

"Don't be discouraged by brokers who give you the runaround or turn you down with a flat refusal."

With this in prospect, the municipal governing boards of these all-white suburban communities should prepare their constituencies for the orderly integration of southern Negro families into their social and economic life, which will most certainly become a reality if more and more civil rights bills are forced upon us. If they are not willing to accept their fair and proportionate share of the burden of integration, they are not the real friends of the Negro that they publicly proclaim themselves to be.

Surely the troubles at Levittown, Pa., resulting from a Negro family's forcing itself upon a white community a year or so ago are fresh in our memories. They seem to be having their troubles in another Levittown, too, this time in New Jersey. On February 23, 1960, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] placed in the RECORD a long apology for the people of Levittown, N.J., who refused to integrate their "publicly assisted housing" until forced to do so by an order of the New Jersey supreme court. In his praise of participants in the lawsuit on the side of integration, Mr. ADDONIZIO pointed out the following:

Instrumental in this splendid victory was Julius Wildstein, Newark attorney and chairman of the Commission of Law and Social Action of the New Jersey Region, American Jewish Congress, who sacrificed time and energy, without any material compensation to act as chief attorney for the defendants. He, together with attorneys from the American Jewish Congress, as well as lawyers from other agencies, are to be commended.

What Mr. ADDONIZIO did not tell the Congress about Mr. Wildstein was that, several months ago, according to reliable information that has come to me, this same Julius Wildstein sold his home at 356 Seymour Avenue, an integrated neighborhood, to Negroes, and moved over to 19 Lyons Avenue, a protected all-white community in Newark. For Mr. Wildstein, integration appears to be highly desirable; but desirable only to others. Apparently he does not choose to be integrated himself. This is but one example of the hypocrisy which characterizes this entire controversy, Mr. Speaker. We need but to look at the great number of pro-civil-rights Members of this body who choose to live in the segregated suburbs of Maryland and Virginia, rather than subject their families to the integrated hodgepodge of the District of Columbia.

Make no mistake about it: passage of a new civil rights bill will accelerate this movement of Negroes to the northern areas many times the present rate. Any Member from a Northern State who is disposed to vote for this bill because of

its "civil rights" label, and the hope of luring a few minority votes into his fold, should be open and frank with his constituency, and let them know, also, that his vote will attract Negroes to his district.

No public issue in history has been so marked by hypocrisy as this. Never in history have so many been so vocal in their exhortations in behalf of what they call a "persecuted and underprivileged" minority, nor so few willing to give more than lipservice to that cause when it affects them personally.

Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1960, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] in a speech before this body—page 1437—stated:

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.

On February 18, 1960, I dispatched a telegram to the mayor of Arnold, Pa., a town of 10,263 people, according to the 1950 census, and in the district represented by Congressman DENT. Incidentally, according to the 1950 census, the population of this particular congressional district is only 2 percent Negro, and by all standards, should be able to absorb a great number of Negro families. The wire sent to the mayor of Arnold is as follows:

DEAR MAYOR: Passage of a new civil rights bill now appears certain.

There is no question but that the passage of this legislation will aggravate racial frictions previously fomented by the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and a series of Supreme Court decisions. This means, of course, that the exodus of Negroes away from Southern States into the already integrated northern cities will be accelerated to a considerable degree.

While we in the South do not question the Negroes' right to migrate to other sections of the Nation, we are very much concerned over their future welfare.

Your help is urgently needed in setting up a citizens committee for the purpose of assisting these Negro citizens in their relocation problems, particularly with respect to finding suitable employment, adequate housing facilities, etc. Please advise by wire collect whether you would be willing to cooperate toward the end that 150 additional Negro families might be comfortably accommodated in your city of Arnold."

Finally, after having sent a followup wire on February 29, I received a reply from the mayor by letter dated March 2, 1960, as follows:

HONORABLE SIR: In reference to your telegram of February 18 and February 29, 1960, I wish to advise that the city of Arnold is entirely built up with only a very few vacant lots remaining and the homes that are built in Arnold are all occupied.

Under the above conditions, it will be utterly impossible to take care of any additional families within our city.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED COLAIANNI,
Mayor.

Alas, Mr. Speaker, we hear so much talk of helping the Negro, but so little is done by those who talk the loudest. Of course, the mayor is acting, I am sure, in the interests of his constituency and his city, and I certainly have no criticism for him. He is being honest in the position he takes. I do deplore, however, the obvious politics being played throughout the Nation at the expense of the Negro and the Southern States.

On February 18, 1960, I sent similar inquiries to the mayors of 10 other communities located in districts represented by Members of Congress who have given much vocal support to the cause of civil rights for Negroes. Except for Arnold, Pa., and one answer from Deerfield, Ill., merely acknowledging receipt of my wire—and no more—my inquiry was wholly ignored, indicating perhaps, that it was just too hot for them to handle; and indicating, also, that if an affirmative reply could not be sent, they preferred to duck the issue.

A similar inquiry was forwarded to the mayor of Windham, Conn., 1950 population 15,884. Now, Windham, Conn., happens to be in a congressional district which has but 1.2 percent Negroes in its population, and is represented by that great ultraliberal international super-statesman, the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, whose presidential lightning rod has recently been sent up by several news columnists of liberal hue. I felt sure that here my inquiry would get a warm reception, because the distinguished Honorable Mr. BOWLES had just stated previously on the floor of this body, on January 27—page 1445—as follows:

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.

Alas, the mayor of Windham apparently is not interested in moving Negroes into his city; he ignored my wires.

Then, I felt sure I would receive a reply from the mayor of Brentwood, Pa., which is one of the cities in which my good modern Republican friend, the Honorable JAMES G. FULTON, happens to publish a popular and widely read newspaper, the Brentwood News. Surely, I felt, the Brentwood News would already have the people receptive to my proposition and conditioned for the acceptance of Negroes into their community; for, after all, is not their publisher-Congressman one of the great leaders in the fight for improving the status of the Negro? Surely, his newspaper would pick up the ball and see to it that opportunities are provided for accepting their share of the responsibility for integrating Negroes into their community. Alas, here again, my inquiry fell on deaf ears. In fact, the mayor even refused to accept my followup wire of February 29, with the information on the Western Union return that "It was not for him."

If the Brentwood News has not already done so, here is a great opportunity for them to serve the real cause of the Negro, wholly in line with, and consistent with the public pronouncements of its distinguished publisher-Congressman.

Similar wires were sent to mayors of the following cities:

First. Deerfield, Ill., in the district represented by Congresswoman CHURCH, 1950 population 7,607; district population only 3 percent Negro.

Second. Islip, N.Y., in the district represented by Congressman WAINWRIGHT, 1950 population 4,251; district population 4.4 percent Negro.

Third. Wilmington, Ohio, in the district represented by Congressman BROWN, 1950 population 7,387; district population 5.9 percent Negro.

Fourth. Columbia Heights, Minn., in the district represented by Congressman WIER, 1950 population 8,175; district population nine-tenths of 1 percent Negro.

Fifth. Riverside, N.J., in the district represented by Congressman THOMPSON, 1950 population 7,199; district population 8.6 percent Negro.

Sixth. Bozeman, Mont., in the district represented by Congressman MERCALF, 1950 population 11,325; district population .2 percent Negro.

Seventh. Camden, Maine, in the district represented by Congressman COFFIN, 1950 population 3,670; district population .1 percent Negro.

Eighth. Newton, Mass., in the district represented by Congressman CURTIS, 1950 population 81,000; district population 4.5 percent Negro.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress representing these and other such districts who continually harp on the subject of "Civil Rights" could render the Negro a real and meaningful service by assisting in their becoming located in their communities. If their people don't want to receive these Negroes into their communities and give them first-class citizenship, then the time has come to stop criticizing the Southern States, who must live with the problem and endure its consequences.

What better way for these self-styled liberals to prove their real friendship for the Negro than to invite him into their society?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, those furthest removed from the problem appear to be the first to find solutions for it; but the solution of integration, now being proposed, is meant to be applied only to the South, and is excellent only so long as it is restricted to the South.

The Congress can pass laws from now until doomsday, but it cannot solve the problems caused by white people and Negroes living in the same society. These problems are incapable of legislative solution; nor do they lend themselves to any kind of solution by force.

The only solution is to permit each State to work out its own destiny. The people of Mississippi are the first to admit that they cannot solve the problems of Arnold, Pa. We are content to let them remain segregated, if they so desire.

By the same token, we hope that the people of Arnold, the people of these

other cities to which inquiries were sent, and the millions living in all-white towns in the North, West, and East, will impress upon their Representatives in Congress that we have the right to solve our problems in the South without interference.

In substance, we think it only fair that the philosophy President Eisenhower expressed last night in referring to South America should also be applied to the Southern States. He said:

"We believe in the right of people to choose their own form of government, to build their own institutions, and to abide by their own philosophy."

That is all we ask.

IMPORTATION OF CUBAN SUGAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. Sr. GEORGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I introduced the bill (H.R. 9376) to prohibit the importation of Cuban sugar for so long as the price which U.S. importers are required to pay for such sugar is above the world market price.

Mr. Speaker, I said very little about this bill and of course it attracted absolutely no notice, but in view of some of the things that have happened recently and some of the news that I have received directly from Cuba I thought I should like to call the attention of the House to what it purports to do.

First of all let me make it very clear that the United States can import all the sugar from Cuba that it desires under this bill. The only thing that cannot be done is that Cuba cannot be paid a bonus under this legislation.

Within the last week I received this bulletin sent out probably to every Member of the House of Representatives by the Embassy of the Republic of Cuba. Everything in this bulletin is slanted in favor of the U.S.S.R. and very much to the detriment of the United States. One portion of it is headed, "Cuba's Sugar Market," and it reads as follows:

Cuba has already sold 65 percent of its world market sugar quota of which 1,340,000 tons were sold before February 5. Reports from the Sugar Stabilization Institute show that 75 percent of the quota for sale or release, amounting to 995,143 tons, has also been sold. After the announcements that the U.S.S.R. has bought 575,000 tons, the United Arab Republics 76,000, and Poland and Socialist China 50,000 tons, the Ministry of Commerce, Dr. Cepero Bonilla, stated that "this year the sugar warehouses will be cleaned up."

Therefore, the Republic of Cuba is really in no need to send any more sugar to the United States. As we all know, the United States is well able to get the necessary sugar for its own use without paying any bonus to Cuba or any other country.

Mr. Speaker, we of course are always jealous of the rights of others, particularly if they are revolutionists or if they are more or less affiliated with the Soviet Republic. I should like to call your attention to a fact which is noted in many

newspapers, notably the Wall Street Journal, which on its front page carried this item:

Cubans are enslaved by the 3 million tons of sugar the United States buys annually from the island at prices well above the world market. Ernesto Guevara, Castro's chief economic adviser, made this charge in a television address at Havana. These purchases, he said, had made Cuba dependent on sugar and kept the country in a "semi-colonial" state until Castro's revolution. He made clear, however, the Castro regime is not ready to give up the \$150-million-a-year bonus the United States pays for Cuban sugar.

In other words, like so many others he wants to have it both ways. But, I submit to the Congress that I think we do not want to be a party to enslaving the Cubans. No, I think if there is any enslavement to be done in Cuba, we had better leave that to their friends in the U.S.S.R. Therefore, as I said before, I think it would be well if the great Committee on Agriculture, to whom this bill has been referred, would consider it with care and realize that they are in no way curtailing the rights of the Cuban Republic to sell their sugar to us in a world market, but that on the other hand they are simply preventing the enslavement of Cuba through the paying by the United States of this rather obnoxious bonus.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a great deal about rights on the floor of this House, and we are going to talk about them a great deal more. It is well that that should be so. But, sometimes I wonder if we ever consider the rights of the American taxpayer. That seems to be a right that either does not exist—or if it does exist, is much too unimportant to fight for.

Mr. Speaker, in this morning's newspaper, incidentally, the Washington Post, Mr. George Sokolsky has the most interesting facts and figures taken from the McCarthy sugar report. These figures again prove that what we have done is to hand the Cuban Republic this very handsome bonus of \$150 million, taken from the pockets of the American taxpayers. For that, we have received nothing but vituperation and we also have been informed that we are trying to enslave a free people, incidentally, people for whom we have done more than has ever been done by any nation in the world for any other people. The U.S.S.R. who now comes in cheerfully and happily and buys all the sugar it needs at the world market price, is praised over and over again. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have often said—what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If this method is so successful for the U.S.S.R., maybe it will prove to be equally successful for the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article follows:

CUBA AND SUGAR
(By George Sokolsky)

Castro is beginning to feel the pinch. Otherwise, he would not have tried to bind our hands prior to a conference on outstanding difficulties.

From the authoritative McCarthy sugar report, I take these figures which ought to make an American think:

"To Russia—1 million metric tons at \$3.10 per 100 pounds, \$68,342,000.

"To the United States—1 million metric tons at \$5.10 per 100 pounds, \$112,434,000.

"Thus Russia gets Cuban sugar cheaper than the United States by \$44,092,000.

("The top world spot price this week was \$3.10 per 100 pounds (f.o.b.) (Cuba), and United States spot on a comparable basis f.o.b. Cuba was \$5.10.)

"Actually, of the first 1 million tons, Russia bought 575,000 tons at a lower level than the indicated \$3.10 price above. She bought last September 230,000 tons at \$2.905 and on February 5 of this year 345,000 tons at \$2.78 per 100 pounds. These sugars will go into the deal as part of the 1960 one million tons since they were purchased for shipment this year.

"As a matter of record Russia always buys sugar from Cuba at a discount under the spot price. In fact, no other country in the world since Castro became Cuba's dictator has bought sugar for less than Russia. Russia is the fair-haired boy."

Obviously, it makes no sense for the United States to pay more for Cuban sugar than Russia pays, or than any other country pays. Why must we always be suckers?

But it is not only sugar that we buy from Cuba at a subsidy price that comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. We also give Cuba a direct military subsidy of \$543,000. This money is military assistance to Castro, for the training of jet fliers. He could use those fliers against the United States. Do we have to subsidize our enemies?

When we pay more for sugar than the world price, we are paying a subsidy.

Cuba is not Russia. It is a minor country with small economic strength or potential. Its blackmail prospects are excellent because of its proximity to the United States, but the only way to get rid of a blackmailer is to knock his teeth out so that he cannot put the bite on.

Certain figures in the McCarthy sugar report are worth quoting in this connection:

"On September 1, start of the new crop year, world stock was 12,541,000 metric tons. World production is estimated at 48,900,000 tons and consumption at 50,317,000. Thus world stock on August 31, 1960, will be 11 million. While the stock figure will be less than the 12,541,000 tons of the previous year it will be more than the 10,071,000 on hand September 1, 1958. A drought in Europe cut into estimated production.

"Of the total world production Russia will make an estimated 5,880,000 tons against 6,260,000 in the previous year. This is a postwar step-up in production from 2,500,000 tons in 1937-38 and is more than Cuba will produce * * *"

There is no shortage of sugar and the United States need take none at all from Cuba.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] for her very fine presentation on this very important issue of the day. I would like to associate myself with the gentlewoman's remarks. I would like also to ask her this question. Would it not be a good idea to help some of our friends such as the people of Costa Rica and the Philippines and Mexico who are trying to increase their quota of sugar exports and want to get more sugar into the U.S. market at the world price?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am in hearty agreement with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I thank him for his contribution. The gentleman is absolutely right. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we could also help our new State, the 50th State, the great State of Hawaii that would be most anxious to export more sugar to the other 49 States on the mainland.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentlewoman and to compliment her highly for having brought this matter to the attention of the Members of the House.

THE RECENT DECLINE IN MARKET YIELDS OF TREASURY SECURITIES BRINGS MANY ISSUES BELOW THE 4 1/4-PERCENT CEILING

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the yields on Treasury bonds with 5 or more years to maturity have continued to decline in recent weeks. They are now substantially below the levels which the Ways and Means Committee considered and had available when Report No. 1297 to accompany H.R. 10950 was prepared. Table 2 of that report gave the most recent closing bids for February 26, 1960, and commented that all but one of the bonds was, at that time, selling at yields over the 4 1/4-percent ceiling. The accompanying table shows the quotations as of yesterday, March 8, 1960:

Yields on Treasury bonds with 5 or more years to maturity, based on closing bid quotations for June 8, 1959, for Jan. 6, 1960 (the recent high), for Feb. 26, 1960, and for Mar. 8, 1960, the latest available date

Coupon rate	Date of maturity	June 8, 1959	Jan. 6, 1960	Feb. 26, 1960	Mar. 8, 1960
2 1/2 percent	Feb. 15, 1965	4.50	5.10	4.72	4.40 (4.37)
3 percent	Aug. 15, 1966	4.32	4.83	4.51	4.26 (4.24)
2 1/2 percent	June 15, 1962-67	4.33	4.98	4.69	4.30 (4.26)
2 1/2 percent	Dec. 15, 1963-68	4.34	4.97	4.68	4.33 (4.29)
2 1/2 percent	June 15, 1964-69	4.35	5.01	4.70	4.33 (4.32)
4 percent	Oct. 1, 1969	4.16	4.74	4.39	4.19 (4.16)
2 1/2 percent	Dec. 15, 1964-69	4.30	4.93	4.66	4.31 (4.27)
2 1/2 percent	June 15, 1965-70	4.38	4.98	4.65	4.32 (4.29)
2 1/2 percent	Mar. 15, 1966-71	4.29	4.84	4.50	4.18 (4.15)
2 1/2 percent	June 15, 1967-72	4.17	4.70	4.32	4.05 (4.01)
2 1/2 percent	Sept. 15, 1967-72	4.22	4.75	4.37	4.08 (4.05)

¹ Just under 5 years to maturity.

Yields on Treasury bonds with 5 or more years to maturity, based on closing bid quotations for June 8, 1959, for Jan. 6, 1960 (the recent high), for Feb. 26, 1960, and for Mar. 8, 1960, the latest available date—Continued

Coupon rate	Date of maturity	June 8, 1959	Jan. 6, 1960	Feb. 26, 1960	Mar. 8, 1960
2½ percent	Dec. 15, 1967-72	4.13	4.66	4.26	3.99 (3.95)
3½ percent	Nov. 15, 1974	4.19	4.61	4.40	4.21 (4.19)
4 percent	Feb. 15, 1980	4.19	4.51	4.33	4.17 (4.16)
3¾ percent	June 15, 1978-83	4.09	4.49	4.32	4.14 (4.11)
3¼ percent	May 15, 1985	4.06	4.44	4.33	4.17 (4.14)
3½ percent	Feb. 15, 1990	4.16	4.44	4.35	4.14 (4.14)
3 percent	Feb. 15, 1995	3.86	4.12	3.96	3.81 (3.80)

NOTE.—The figures in parentheses opposite the Mar. 8, 1960, figures, represent the quotations (over the counter) published in the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 9, 1960. There seems to be a substantial difference in the Treasury information and the report on the same securities in the Wall Street Journal and other publications. The Government securities market is unregulated.

The significant thing about this table is that in a few short weeks yields have declined so that it may now be said that 12 out of the 18 issues listed are selling on a basis below the present 4¼ percent ceiling. In a market which has been declining since a high on January 6, 1960, only six issues are now selling at yields a shade above the 4¼ percent ceiling.

These figures, incidentally, are based upon the official calculations of the Treasury Department itself which are in some cases slightly above the yields in the over-the-counter quotations as quoted in the morning papers as indicated in the footnote at the end of the tables. The differences between the official series and the newspaper series are not too material, however. The important thing is that as of today, less than 2 weeks after the report of the Ways and Means Committee there are 12 different maturities selling at rates below the statutory ceiling.

I was advised after the market closed Friday last by an expert who deals in Government securities that the present market indicates that a Treasury issue of 4¼ percent long-term securities would go at a premium at the present market. That is quite different from the situation as it existed when the Ways and Means Committee made its report.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS PAYING ITS SECURITIES MORE THAN ONCE IN SOME INSTANCES

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite your attention to one other matter that is closely related to this. Another move by the Federal Reserve to make money tighter and interest rates higher. The Federal Reserve Open Market Committee had in its portfolio as of January 1, 1960, about \$27,500 million in U.S. Government securities.

Decrease in Reserve bank holdings of U.S. Government securities, bought outright and under repurchase agreement

[In millions of dollars]

Week ended:	
1960:	
Jan. 6	177
Jan. 13	237
Jan. 20	773
Jan. 27	172
Feb. 3	3
Feb. 10	58
Feb. 18	34
Feb. 25	102
Mar. 3	41
Total	1,597

Since that time the Open Market Committee has sold \$1,597 million of these bonds.

That means—listen to this statement, if you please, this is astounding—here we are, Members of Congress looking after the people's welfare, yet we are permitting the Federal Government to pay its debts more than once. We are paying our bonds not only one time, but sometimes twice, and possibly several times more.

These bonds that the Federal Open Market Committee sold back into the market have already been paid for once.

One important result of the transfer of these securities will be that the interest on them will cease to go into the Treasury as it did when they were held by the Federal Reserve, but will go to the holders of the securities instead. In all probability commercial banks bought them by creating or manufacturing the money on their books to do so. In that case the interest will help the commercial banks instead of the taxpayers.

The purchase of Government securities by the Federal Reserve is like having a mortgage on your home for, we will say for the sake of discussion, an amount of \$10,000. It is not due. But you send your agent with your \$10,000 to the mortgagee with instructions to take the \$10,000 and pay to the mortgagee the \$10,000 in payment of the mortgage on your home. The agent takes the money there, delivers it to the mortgagee and then instead of the mortgagee canceling your mortgage and putting it of record, he transfers your mortgage to the agent of yours and that agent of yours every year when the interest becomes due wants you to pay the interest and when the mortgage becomes due he wants you to pay again, the mortgage in full. That is exactly what we are doing through the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve takes Uncle Sam's money and pays Uncle Sam's obligations with it. Then instead of canceling the obligations the Federal Reserve keeps these obligations and in this case they are actually transferring them back into the market and Uncle Sam will have to pay them again, just as in the illustration I gave where your agent would take your mortgage and sell it to someone, who calls on you when it is due to pay it again. This just does not make sense.

PRESIDENT'S INHERENT CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from

California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1960, I delivered a speech in the House of Representatives on "the President's proposal to transfer nuclear weapons." The gravity of this proposal was carefully considered in my prepared remarks and I was pleased to note it was given due notice by many of our nationally prominent newspapers and periodicals. I will ask permission to include, at the conclusion of these remarks, two articles from the Washington Post. The first article is a February 11, 1960, editorial and the second is a February 24, 1960, column by the eminent and highly respected newspaper columnist, Mr. Marquis Childs.

In my speech of February 9, I discussed the philosophy of transferring nuclear weapons and the requirements of present constitutional and legislative procedures, such as treaties, international agreements and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

I did not comment on the so-called inherent constitutional powers of the President, acting in his official capacity as the President or Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

The inherent constitutional powers of a President are shadowy and undefined. They have never been rigidly fixed and are subject to change, as the Constitution, by amendment, prescribes additional duties or nullifies former duties. The scope of these undefined "powers" is also subject to continuous change by legislation in specific areas—which may or may not have been subjects of prior legislation.

Legislation once enacted into law requires loyal obedience by the President, as well as by an ordinary citizen. Neither has the right to ignore or violate an established statute.

Congress has given the President special powers to use under certain conditions. I refer, in this instance, to powers granted under the War Powers Acts and during formally declared conditions of national emergency. These specific grants of power, under or during these special conditions of national peril, are separate and apart from the peacetime scope of Presidential power.

Therefore, we are not concerned with these specific wartime or emergency powers in this discussion. We are concerned with the exercise of Presidential power in peacetime which goes beyond those powers clearly defined in the Constitution and in the statutes.

The pertinence of this discussion arises as the result of numerous news stories and special articles which, by inference or direct statement, indicate the President might transfer nuclear weapons to one or more allies under a claim of "inherent" constitutional power.

This is an alarming possibility.

The President, in his news conference of February 4, 1960, certainly gave no hint of using such a procedure. His answers to the questions of Mrs. May Craig and Mr. Garner showed a complete awareness of the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

I trust the President will not be advised that it is unnecessary for him to comply with laws which he signed and approved. Any advice to the President that he should proceed to act under inherent constitutional powers in this field of nuclear weapons transfer would create the greatest debate of our generation. The impact and reverberations of such an act would be calamitous to our international relations. It would be used to sustain and prove the Communist charge of imperialistic warmonger.

It would destroy our prestige as a proponent of peace and disarmament.

It would make a complete farce of our long negotiations for the cessation of nuclear bomb tests at Geneva.

It would cut the ground from under our negotiators in the approaching international conference on disarmament in March.

It would give Khrushchey a propaganda platform of deadly effectiveness in the scheduled summit conference in April.

Because of the great importance of this matter, I have requested the counsel of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. David Toll, to research the legal facets of this problem. I realize, of course, that lawyers are prone to disagree, but in the interest of full discussion and debate on this vital matter, I am including, as part of my remarks, Mr. Toll's legal memorandum on the claim that the President might have inherent constitutional power to transfer nuclear weapons in peacetime, notwithstanding clear statutory provisions which require congressional approval.

LEGAL MEMORANDUM FOR MR. HOLIFIELD

Under the Constitution, the President is Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. On the other hand, the Congress also has constitutional responsibilities in the national defense field: to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, to make rules for the Government and regulation of land and naval forces, and to raise revenues and appropriations for the Armed Forces.

Two principal constitutional questions have been presented: First, can the President act under his inherent constitutional powers to follow one course of action when Congress has carefully considered the subject and by legislation has provided an alternative procedure to accomplish the same objective? Second, regardless of any legislative prohibitions or alternatives, can the President proceed under his inherent constitutional powers when a grave emergency develops?

Each of these questions will be discussed briefly below.

First. Can the President act under his inherent constitutional powers to follow one course of action when Congress has carefully considered the subject and by legislation has provided an alternative procedure to accomplish the same objective?

The Supreme Court of the United States considered in great detail all of the constitutional provisions here involved in the case of *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company against Sawyer*—343

U.S. 579 (1952). In that case, the President, during the Korean war, seized the steel mills in order to assure continued production for vital military and national defense purposes. He took this action under what he considered his inherent constitutional powers as Commander in Chief rather than under available statutes which were characterized as "much too cumbersome, involved, and time consuming for the crisis which was at hand." The Supreme Court, by a 6 to 3 decision, with 5 concurring opinions by the various Justices, declared the President did not have inherent constitutional powers to the extent claimed, primarily because Congress had carefully considered the questions and provided alternative procedures, which he chose not to follow.

Mr. Justice Black, in the Court's opinion, stated as follows:

Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of the several constitutional provisions that grant executive power to the President. In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States" (343 U.S. 579, 587-588).

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in a concurring opinion, analyzed the legislative history in great detail. He concluded that Congress had granted by statute special powers to the President to deal with this type of emergency, but in every case "it has qualified this grant of power with limitations and safeguards"—343 U.S. 579, 598.

Mr. Frankfurter pointed out that the Congress had made a "conscious choice of policy in a field full of perplexity." He stated that "Congress acted with full consciousness of what it was doing and in the light of much recent history," and that "Congress has expressed its will to withhold this power from the President as though it had said so in so many words"—343 U.S. 579, 602.

Mr. Justice Jackson, a former Attorney General, pointed out that the President's inherent powers vary according to the action of Congress in the field. He stated:

Presidential powers are not fixed but fluxuate, depending upon their disjunction or conjunction with those of Congress (343 U.S. 579, 635).

When the President proceeds under a statutory authorization, according to Justice Jackson, "his authority is at its maximum." When the President acts in absence of congressional action, he is in a "zone of twilight." But when the President proceeds on his own initiative and on his so-called inherent powers to follow a course of action different from that provided by Congress, his power "is at its lowest ebb." Mr. Justice Jackson put it this way:

When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied

will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter. Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting upon the subject. Presidential claim to a power at once so conclusive and preclusive must be scrutinized with caution, for what is at stake is the equilibrium established by our constitutional system (343 U.S. 579, 637-638).

Two other Justices, in separate concurring opinions, also relied heavily upon the fact that Congress had legislated in the field and the President had ignored the legislation and had attempted to follow an alternative course under his so-called inherent powers which the Court held that he did not possess. Mr. Justice Burton spoke as follows:

The foregoing circumstances distinguish this emergency from one in which Congress takes no action and outlines no governmental policy. In the case before us, Congress authorized a procedure which the President declined to follow. Instead, he followed another procedure which he hoped might eliminate the need for the first. Upon its failure, he issued an Executive order to seize the steel properties in the face of the reserved right of Congress to adopt or reject that course as a matter of legislative policy. Congress has reserved to itself the right to determine where and when to authorize the seizure of property in meeting such an emergency. Under these circumstances, the President's order of April 8 invaded the jurisdiction of Congress. It violated the essence of the principle of the separation of governmental powers. Accordingly, the injunction against its effectiveness should be sustained (343 U.S. 579, 659-660).

Similarly, Mr. Justice Clark emphasized the fact that Congress had laid down specific procedures, speaking as follows:

I conclude that where Congress has laid down specific procedures to deal with the type of crisis confronting the President, he must follow those procedures in meeting the crisis; but that in the absence of such action by Congress, the President's independent power to act depends upon the gravity of the situation confronting the Nation. I cannot sustain the seizure in question because here, as in *Little v. Barreme*, Congress had prescribed methods to be followed by the President in meeting the emergency at hand (343 U.S. 579, 622).

The Youngstown case represents the most recent and thorough discussion by the Supreme Court of the President's constitutional powers as contrasted with those of the Congress. It is true, of course, that the facts in that case were substantially different from those in the present case, since the facts will vary in every case. However, the constitutional provisions were the same and the case is identical in that the President was attempting to justify his actions not on the statutes, but on his inherent powers under the Constitution. The constitutional principles enunciated by the Court in the Youngstown case are believed to be strongly persuasive in the present case.

In cases where the President has pursued a practice long known by the Congress and never questioned, the Court has upheld his action, as in *U.S. v. Midwest Oil Company* (236 U.S. 459). This

case was distinguished from the Youngstown case because the Presidential practice had been one "long pursued to the knowledge of the Congress and never before questioned."

Prior to the Civil War, President Lincoln took a number of extraordinary actions which were not challenged by the Congress. Prior to World War I, President Wilson again took a number of executive actions, as did President Roosevelt before the outbreak of World War II. In each case, however, the President was not acting in the face of a statutory prohibition, nor challenged by the Congress.

These Executive actions by past Presidents "short of war" have been ably discussed by Prof. Edwin S. Corwin at pages 194-204 of his authoritative book entitled "The President—Office and Powers 1787-1957," New York University Press, 1957. For present day considerations, Mr. Corwin discussed the U.N. Participation Act approved by the President on December 20, 1945. He emphasizes the participation of Congress and the provisions in the statute concerning the right of Congress to be kept informed. He then continues as follows:

In brief, the controlling theory of the act is that American participation in United Nations shall rest on the principle of departmental collaboration, and not on an exclusive Presidential prerogative in the diplomatic field. Not only is this a sound constitutional principle in that it can claim a great deal of support from the history of the conduct of American foreign relations, especially in the period prior to the war with Mexico: It is the only practicable principle unless we wish to establish outright Presidential dictatorship. The point is that the sort of foreign policy that present-day conditions require can never be kept going by attributing to the President, as in the past, the simple power to order the Navy around without consulting Congress. Far otherwise; Congress must be constantly asked to exercise powers that no President has ever ventured to exercise on any scale—the power to tax, to pledge the credit of the United States, to raise armies, to regulate commerce, and so forth and so forth. If Congress cannot be persuaded to back Presidential policy by bringing these powers to its support, then—the idea of a Presidential coup d'état being dismissed—the policy fails, and that is all there is to it.

Even more than in the U.N. Act, the Congress has, in the atomic weapon field, insisted on the right to be kept informed and to participate in international sharing decisions. The 1958 amendments represented a "conscious choice of policy in a field full of perplexity."

From the above, it can be concluded that the President's so-called inherent constitutional powers are limited when the Congress has carefully considered an area and provided procedures for the Executive to follow. Although the statutory procedures might be perhaps more cumbersome, expensive, or time consuming, they represent legislative determinations which are binding upon the President until the law is amended or hostilities commence.

Second. Regardless of any statutory prohibitions, can the President proceed under his inherent constitutional powers when a grave emergency develops?

This question was also discussed in the Youngstown case, and the Supreme Court rejected the theory that the President's powers were expandable to fit any emergency. Mr. Justice Jackson, a former Attorney General, spoke as follows:

The appeal, however, that we declare the existence of inherent powers ex necessitate to meet an emergency asks us to do what many think would be wise, although it is something the forefathers omitted. They knew what emergencies were, knew the pressures they engender for authoritative action, knew, too, how they afford a ready pretext for usurpation. We may also suspect that they suspected that emergency powers would tend to kindle emergencies. Aside from suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus in time of rebellion or invasion, when the public safety may require it, they made no express provision for exercise of extraordinary authority because of a crisis. I do not think we rightfully may so amend their work, and, if we could, I am not convinced it would be wise to do so, although many modern nations have forthrightly recognized that war and economic crises may upset the normal balance between liberty and authority. Their experience with emergency powers may not be irrelevant to the argument here that we should say that the Executive, of his own volition, can invest himself with undefined emergency powers (343 U.S. 579, 650-651).

Later Justice Jackson stated:

In view of the ease, expedition, and safety with which Congress can grant and has granted large emergency powers, certainly ample to embrace this crisis, I am quite unimpressed with the argument that we should affirm possession of them without statute. Such power either has no beginning or it has no end. If it exists, it need submit to no legal restraint. I am not alarmed that it would plunge us straightway into dictatorship, but it is at least a step in that wrong direction (343 U.S. 579, 653).

Mr. Justice Douglas, in his concurring opinion, pointed out that speed in an emergency was not the sole consideration and that the separation of powers under the Constitution was more important. He pointed out that the President, with the armed services at his disposal, "can move with force as well as with speed," and that all Executive power "has the outward appearance of efficiency." Legislative power by contrast, he stated, is "slower to exercise." He concluded:

Legislative action may indeed often be cumbersome, time consuming, and apparently inefficient. But as Mr. Justice Brandeis stated in his dissent in *Myers v. United States* (272 U.S. 52, 293):

"The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy."

We therefore cannot decide this case by determining which branch of Government can deal most expeditiously with the present crisis. The answer must depend on the allocation of powers under the Constitution (343 U.S. 579, 629-630).

From the above, it is clear that the executive branch of our Government, because of the separation of powers in the Constitution, cannot escape the prohibitions of a statute merely by finding

that a grave emergency exists. The legislative history of the 1958 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act clearly indicates that the prohibitions of section 92 were intended by the Congress to be in full force and effect until the outbreak of hostilities or war. The executive branch cannot avoid the statutory prohibitions by the finding of a grave emergency, but only upon the outbreak of hostilities or war, unless an amendment to the law is requested by the executive branch and approved by the Congress.

I associate myself with the principles set forth in the preceding legal memorandum.

Matters of far less importance are considered annually under treaties or international agreements which require the cognizance and formal approval of one or both Houses of Congress.

It is unthinkable to me that a matter of such grave consequence as the transfer of mass destruction nuclear weapons to the independent sovereignty of other nations, could ever be accomplished by methods other than those prescribed in our Constitution and existing statutes.

The use of inherent power for this grave purpose, because of political expediency or fear of the people's verdict, after congressional debate and decision would, in my opinion, be so unjustified and unworthy of our faith in the democratic processes as to warrant impeachment proceedings.

The February 11, 1960, editorial from the Washington Post follows:

AMENDING THE ATOM

Repercussions continue at home and abroad from President Eisenhower's muddled comments last week about sharing nuclear weapons with America's allies. Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has been particularly sharp in telling the administration that if there is any such intention it must have the explicit approval of Congress.

As we understand the situation, the President confused the tentative and preliminary discussions between administrative and congressional officials about control of nuclear warheads abroad with his own long-held feeling that the allies ought to have access to all weapons that a potential enemy possesses. His egalitarian sentiments do him credit, but the problem is by no means that simple. Korea is an ally, but it would be perilous folly to endow the Rhee government with nuclear weapons. Germany also is an ally and a member of NATO, but is prohibited from having nuclear weapons. To undercut this prohibition would be to cause the gravest apprehensions, not merely in the Soviet Union, but also among Germany's Western neighbors.

The other point, which is only remotely related to the President's views on sharing, is the problem of making nuclear weapons already abroad more effective for air defense and retaliation. Under present arrangements American nuclear weapons stored in Britain under this country's control are physically separated from the missiles that would carry them in an emergency. They thus might not be quickly available for assembly with the carriers in the event of attack. What constitutes custody in such circumstances? Could the warheads be assembled with the missiles and still be kept under American control?

It is possible that the present law could be stretched to make feasible a more immediate response without relinquishing technical American control of nuclear weapons

abroad; but that would be poor procedure. This problem is less serious in scope, to be sure, than the broader sharing that the President seems to envisage. In any event, the confusion has served a useful purpose in emphasizing the vast ramifications of a change in American practices. Mr. HOLIFIELD seems to us right in insisting that amendment of the law be approached openly rather than by subterfuge, and that all of the implications, including the effect on the Soviet Union, be discussed fully and frankly with Congress. This the administration has yet to do.

Following is Mr. Marquis Childs' article of February 24, 1959, from the Washington Post:

PRESIDENT MUDDLES HIS WEAPON PLAN

Nothing more extraordinary for confusion, uncertainty, and a heavy air of mystery has occurred in this administration than the mixup over sharing nuclear weapons with America's NATO allies. It was a fine example of marching up the hill, under a cloak of strictest secrecy, and then retreating in embarrassed disorder.

If President Eisenhower was aware of this sudden foray into a new area of policy and its objectives, he showed no sign of it. In fact, to the discomfiture of high officials in the Pentagon who had initiated it, whether knowingly or unknowingly, he signaled the retreat.

A top secret paper was submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with the sanction of high officials in the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission. It proposed that the United States share the custody of nuclear weapons with the British. This was in relation to the intermediate-range ballistic missile bases and also for an airborne alert.

The contention was that only in this way could the greatest speed and efficiency be achieved in the event of the need for a retaliatory strike. Under the law as currently interpreted, a U.S. agent must keep custody of nuclear weapons at oversea bases.

Committee members were startled at the proposal itself, since its implications were so far reaching. But what was more startling was the view that the President had the authority to do this under his inherent powers despite the law.

The whole question of the sharing of nuclear weapons and nuclear information was thoroughly threshed out when the basic atomic energy law was amended in 1958. At the request of the administration, closer cooperation with America's allies was approved. But on the insistence of committee members fearful that the "nuclear club" would be expanded, the provision that weapons must be retained in American custody was kept in the law.

Questioning of administration witnesses following the unveiling of the secret proposal seemed to confirm one of the deepest doubts of committee members. If nuclear weapons could be put in the hands of the British, they could hardly be withheld from other allies. Having furnished Britain with a squadron of Thor intermediate-range missiles, manned by the Royal Air Force, this country is in process of installing similar missile squadrons in Turkey and Italy.

The deepest misgivings were, however, with respect to West Germany. Several committee members feel that to give custody of nuclear weapons to the Germans would be an irrevocable act with such wide repercussions as to doom attempts at disarmament.

Shortly after a hint of what had been proposed to the Joint Committee appeared, President Eisenhower was asked about sharing atomic weapons with allies. To the chagrin of those who had carefully thought

out and worked up the inherent powers theory, the President replied:

"As far as giving away bombs, this cannot be done under existing law."

Since then it has been made clear that the administration will not ask for a change in the law, realizing it would precipitate a long controversy. But Joint Committee members are not sure that this really ends the effort to give weapons to the British.

The law requires that custody of atomic weapons be vested in a civilian, and a representative of the Atomic Energy Commission is designated by the President. But since the President also has the power to turn weapons over to the Defense Department, it has been determined that the captain of an American ship or submarine can be the AEC representative by White House order.

Why, it is being asked, could not a Royal Air Force lieutenant be given the same designation? This would make it possible to keep British fighter bombers in the air on a ready alert.

If that should be done under the inherent powers of the Presidency, it would be with the tightest secrecy restrictions. The Joint Committee would not be informed and presumably America's other allies would have no knowledge of this step. They would not be in a position, therefore, to claim the same privilege. But nothing could illustrate more dramatically how decisions taken in total secrecy enlarge the area of nuclear-weapons control. And at the same time, the risk of accidental war is inevitably increased.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 85-470, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. KYL, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

MARKETING PROGRAM FOR WHEAT

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in associating myself with the bipartisan group of Members of the House who today are introducing a new marketing program for wheat, I wish to commend the many farm organizations and individuals who met together over sustained periods of time during the past several months, and who were able to agree on a basic plan to help solve the many problems involved in the current wheat situation. I believe it is significant that, when I toured my district between sessions of the 86th Congress, I found that farmers in the wheat-producing areas of the State of Washington, were generally favorable toward a marketing approach to the problem of controlling surplus by preventing overproduction.

As you so well know, several of the farm organizations were unable to reach general agreement on the various proposals heard before the House Commit-

tee on Agriculture last year. But now, agreement has been reached among them, and therefore, I feel that this proposed legislation should be given careful study and consideration. It provides, I believe, a workable solution, in that it is designed to stabilize, at reasonable levels, the income of producers, and would substantially reduce the unreasonable cost of the wheat program which has brought so much criticism upon the American farmer in recent years.

I feel that this legislation is an expression from the farmers themselves, and therefore deserves careful consideration by all Members of Congress.

BARGAINS IN OLD-AGE INSURANCE: WHO GETS THEM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call attention to an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of March 14, 1960. This is an excellent and carefully prepared article. I would add only one basic comment. There has been built into the social security system the seed of the philosophy of the graduated income tax which is contrary to the expressed philosophy of insurance as it is applied to the OASI. Let me illustrate: The tax paid upon the first \$1,000 of base wage gives a larger dollar benefit than the same tax paid upon the succeeding \$1,000 of base wage up to the \$4,800 wage ceiling upon which social security tax is paid.

In other words, beneficiaries do not entirely receive their benefits based upon the amount they and their employers pay in taxes. The benefits are weighted to favor the lower income groups. Each time the wage ceiling is raised we move a little bit further away from the philosophy of insurance to the philosophy of taxing those who can afford to pay for the benefit of those who cannot so well afford to pay.

The article follows:

BARGAINS IN OLD-AGE INSURANCE—WHO GETS THEM?

Workers nearing retirement can count on getting back in old-age pensions far more than the taxes on their pay.

That's based on present law, which Congress is bent on liberalizing. This article shows where the bargains are, and why.

People are going to get still more for their payroll-tax dollars before this year is out. Congress and the White House seem agreed on that.

Disability pensions, now available only to workers over age 50 who are totally and permanently disabled, will be extended to all persons in the system of old-age and survivors insurance, regardless of age. Rules for qualifying for old-age pensions are to be relaxed. There is a good chance, as well, that the size of many pension checks will be raised a little.

Probably not this year, but before long, health insurance is likely to be provided for those who are retired under the social security system.

Since January 1, individual workers have been paying a maximum premium of \$144 a year for the protection they get from social security. Employers match that amount, making the total premium—or payroll tax—now 6 percent on income up to \$4,800 a year.

This tax, as now projected in the law, will rise gradually to a total of 9 percent—or 4.5 percent each on employer and employee. Actually, the law is almost certain to be changed over the years to impose a still higher rate of tax on a larger amount of income.

People often ask two things about this whole system: First, whether or not they are getting a bargain for their money; second, whether there will be money enough in the system to pay them or their survivors the promised benefits upon retirement, death, or disability.

BARGAINS FOR MANY

The accompanying examples help to provide an answer to the first question. They show that almost everybody now covered by the social security system will draw benefits much larger than tax payments into the Federal trust fund, provided they live an average lifespan after retirement. Or, if the person paying dies first, his dependents very often will draw benefits greater than his payments into the security system.

How is that possible? In part it is due to the interest earned on the OASI trust fund. In part it is due to the fact that many individuals will die before drawing benefits from the fund and will not have survivors entitled to benefits. For the most part, however, the scale of benefits being paid will be made possible by the much higher taxload to be borne for a much longer period by the workers who will enter the labor force in the future.

Older people of today, in other words, are getting a windfall at the expense of younger workers and future workers. In years to come, youngsters and their employers will start out by paying a total of 9 percent on employee earnings up to \$4,800 for social security benefits.

SOMETHING TO COUNT ON?

That leaves the question of whether the fund itself will always be solvent.

An answer to that question can only be based on experience to date. Thus far, Congress has insisted upon raising taxes as benefit payments were increased and as the program of benefits was enlarged. In the pension trust fund at present is \$21.3 billion. The plan calls for the fund to grow to \$199 billion by the year 2000.

Thus, the official picture shows a solvent trust fund, which people can count on to provide the promised benefits.

What the long-term future holds will be related closely to the size and scope of new benefits that Congress provides in the future, and the level of taxes imposed to support those benefits. Under the Railroad Retirement Act, each individual worker today contributes 6½ percent of his income up to \$4,800 to pay for benefits, and that contribution is matched by his employer for a total of 13½ percent.

Actually, great bargains are being enjoyed by older individuals under the social security system.

A PENSION WORTH \$30,938

A man and wife, if he retires today at 65 after contributing the maximum amount of tax into the fund for 23 years, are entitled to a pension of \$178.50 per month or \$2,142 per year. This worker has contributed \$1,146, and his employer has matched that amount for a total tax of \$2,292. If they have average life spans for people reaching

65, they will draw out \$30,938. Average life is about 78 for men and about 80 for women in this age group.

In the meantime, if the retired worker should die, his widow will draw a pension of \$89.30 per month, \$1,072 per year. At the time of his death she would get a lump sum of \$255 to help cover burial expenses. In addition, the couple would have received nearly \$160 a month if the man had become disabled since 1957 when disability payments first were made available and assuming the wife was then at least 62.

That shows you why the social-insurance program is popular.

FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Many professional people, businessmen, and farmers who have paid tax only a very few years are in a position today to retire on pensions slightly larger than received by the couple described above. Congress has made special concessions to these groups.

Farmers were first brought into the program in 1955 and 1956. Along with the other self-employed, they now pay 1½ times the tax on the individual, or 4½ percent.

A farmer who was 60 years old in 1956 will be eligible to retire next year. After having paid \$806 in taxes, he and his wife will be entitled to \$180 per month, \$2,160 a year or a total of \$31,198, if they have the average number of years in retirement.

A lawyer who was 45 in 1951, when a number of self-employed groups were blanketed into social security, will reach retirement age in 1971. In 20 years of paying tax, he will have contributed \$3,983. A pension for him and his wife will provide, in return, \$187.50 a month, \$2,250 a year or a total of \$32,498 in a normal life span.

In weighing these big bargains, there are several factors you should also take into account.

SAME TAX, LESS PENSION

If you are single, or if your wife dies before you retire, then you will get a much smaller pension, though you will have paid the same amount of tax as the married worker next door.

A single man retiring this year after 23 years of tax at the maximum rate is in line for a pension of \$119 per month. This is worth \$18,207 in the typical case, compared with \$30,938 for the married couple.

A second thing to bear in mind is this: Younger workers will be paying tax for as long as 47 years in many instances, compared with 23 years or less for those retiring in 1960. They'll pay at higher rates, and their payments, added to the payments of their employers, will come much closer to covering their pensions.

Finally, there's an indirect cost to be considered, which is of greatest importance to the younger group. This cost is represented by the interest these people could earn if they had all of the tax money to invest for themselves; that is, if the money now being paid in tax were put into their pay envelopes and invested regularly by them. It turns out that younger people could build up a retirement kitty that exceeds the value of the pensions they are to receive from the Government.

HOW YOUNG PEOPLE FARE

A worker who got his first job at the age of 18 in 1956 will be in line for a pension for himself and his wife of \$190.50 per month, worth \$33,017, starting in the year 2003. But social security taxes from himself and his employer will total \$18,498, which, over the working years, could grow to \$42,142, if invested at 3½ percent a year. A higher rate of return is available on U.S. savings bonds and on insured savings in many institutions.

The future worker, who starts paying the maximum tax in 1969, will contribute \$10,152. With his employer's payment, that will mean

a total contribution of \$20,304 during his working life. But the same money regularly invested at 3½ percent would grow by his retirement age in 2012 to \$49,832.

That worker's prospective pension, if he is married and has the average length of retirement, will total \$33,017, as the law now stands.

However, if the future is like the past, Congress will take care of the future worker's problem by voting him increased pensions and other benefits and, in doing so, give him a windfall, just as it has given windfalls to the older generation of today.

In short, there are big bargains in old-age insurance, but they are not the same for all workers. As the law stands, older workers get a much better deal than younger workers. Married workers do better than single workers. Workers who live to a ripe old age do better than those who die sooner. Also, low-income workers, who pay much less than the maximum amount of tax, get larger pensions relative to their contributions. Such inequalities reflect the social purposes of the law and the fact that pensions are officially classed as welfare in Federal planning and budgeting.

WHAT YOU GET FOR YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

(In each example, worker pays the maximum social security tax. Figures assume average life span after worker reaches 65, and no future changes in social security law. Payroll tax includes employer's contribution.)

Example No. 1

Mr. A, salaried worker, has been covered by social security since 1937. He plans to retire this year. Both he and Mrs. A will be 65.

Monthly pension, Mr. and Mrs. A, \$178.50.
Expected total pension, remainder of life, \$30,938.

Total cost of pension, 23 years of payroll taxes, \$2,292.

Example No. 2

Mr. B, salaried, covered by social security since 1937. Will retire at 65 in 1980. Mrs. B also will be 65.

Monthly pension, Mr. and Mrs. B, \$187.50.
Expected total pension, remainder of life, \$32,498.

Total cost of pension, 43 years of payroll taxes, \$10,068.

Example No. 3

Mr. C, practicing lawyer, unmarried. Covered by social security as self-employed person since 1951. Will retire at 65 in 1971.

Monthly pension: \$125.
Expected total pension, remainder of life, \$19,125.

Total cost of pension, 20 years of payroll tax (self-employed), \$3,983.

Example No. 4

Mr. D, who first came under social security in 1956 at 60. Expects to retire at 65 next year. Mrs. D also will be 65.

Monthly pension, Mr. and Mrs. D, \$180.
Expected total pension, remainder of life, \$31,198.

Total cost of pension, 5 years of payroll taxes, \$1,074.

A PENSION SYSTEM HEADING FOR TROUBLE?

For an example of what can happen to a pension plan when times get tough, look at the railroad retirement program.

This is a special system of "social security" set up for railroad employees in 1937. It is run by the Government, and supported by payroll taxes on railroads and their employees.

As long as rail employment was high and pensioners few, there were no particular problems. But note what has happened since World War II.

Railroad employees have dropped in number by 40 percent, to 815,000.

DOUBLED AND REDOUBLED

People drawing benefits—retired workers, dependents and survivors—have quadrupled in number, reaching 770,000 at latest report.

Today, in other words, there are almost as many people drawing benefits as people paying taxes to support those benefits. Before long, the way things are going, there will be more drawing benefits than working.

So far, the retirement system is safely solvent, with a reserve fund of nearly \$4 billion. This fund is increasing, even though benefits have been raised repeatedly.

A look at the payroll tax shows why. Already, this tax has mounted to 13½ percent—6¼ each on the railroad and the worker—applied to the first \$4,800 of the worker's annual pay. By comparison, the social security tax is 3 percent each on employer and employee.

By 1969, the railroad tax is to rise to 18 percent, divided half and half by employer and employee. That is already set by law.

Railroad officials now question whether even 18 percent will be enough to keep the program going in the future—if recent trends continue: bigger pensions, more pensioners, fewer rail workers.

These officials assert that railroads, already hard put, simply can't take another boost in the tax as now scheduled by law. Many think Congress some day will be forced to subsidize the program or else turn it over to social security.

TWENTY-ONE-BILLION-DOLLAR RESERVE

This question is raised: Could the same kind of trouble overtake the social security program? The prevailing answer seems to be this: In a major depression, general employment would drop sharply. Payroll tax receipts would diminish. More people would retire. A prolonged depression could raise problems for the system.

Few, however, expect any debacle for social security, even if business troubles do develop. The reserve fund for old-age, survivors' and disability benefits is more than \$21 billion and is expected to keep rising for many years.

If it were to become necessary, Congress almost surely would vote money to keep pensions going. Both railroad retirement and social security, though self-supporting, are accepted as official, and both are shown in the Government's "cash" budget as "welfare" programs. Today's workers have received repeated assurances that their pensions are safe.

MARKETING PROGRAM FOR WHEAT

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this present session of Congress, I informed the House that while in my congressional district I had the honor of attending the annual convention of the Washington State Association of Wheatgrowers. I pointed out that the results of this convention, the resolutions agreed upon by the wheat producers attending the conference, proved that if anyone is interested in solving the farm problem, it is the farmers themselves. I am confident that most of us agree that one of the main reasons why a wheat program has not been adopted is that the farmers have not been able to agree on such a program.

The farmers realize this and they also realize that before the Congress can help them solve their problems, the Congress should be presented with one proposal which meets with the overall approval of the producers.

For the last several months, our farmers, working through the National Grange, the National Association of Wheatgrowers, and the Farmers Union and other agricultural organizations, have agreed on such a program. I am proud to join with my colleagues in presenting this program to the Congress today. I believe this bill is the most constructive and sound approach to come before the Congress in years.

In my speech last January, I suggested that Congress follow the example set by the farmers and cooperate on a non-partisan basis to enact some constructive and sound farm legislation. I believe this bill submitted today is the best vehicle to carry us to a solution of the farm problem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. FLOOD), for an indefinite period, answering subpoena to appear in a trial in Indiana which involves a contempt of Congress.

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. THOMSON of Wyoming, for 30 minutes, today, and for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. HECHLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. STRATTON and to include an article. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. RODINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. MINSHALL.

THE LATE HONORABLE RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 471

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a Senator of the United States from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following members on the part of the House: Mrs. GREEN, Mr. NORBLAD, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. ULLMAN.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10761. A bill to provide for the representation of indigents in judicial proceedings in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KASEM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1519. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Peter Callas, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KASEM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church; without amendment (Rept. No. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6400. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Young; without amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8457. A bill for the relief of Richard

Schoenfelder and Lidwina S. Wagner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9043. A bill for the relief of Mock Fook Leong; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Idelle Helen Hinman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10564. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. James F. Richie; without amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 10990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special deduction from gross income for the depreciation of automobiles owned and used by retired individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 10991. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 10992. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10993. 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. INOUE:

H.R. 10994. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make financial assistance available under such acts to persons holding leasehold interests in lands in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 10995. 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.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 10996. A bill to authorize the use of certified mail for the transmission or service of matter required by certain Federal laws to be transmitted or served by registered mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 10997. A bill to grant to the government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 10998. A bill to provide for the establishment of experimental food stamp allotment programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10999. A bill to grant a deduction, for income tax purposes, to handicapped individuals, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer supporting dependents who are so handicapped as to be unable to care for

themselves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 11000. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 11001. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 11002. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 11003. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11004. A bill to provide authority for the Secretary of State to conclude an agreement with the Government of Mexico and the city of San Diego for collection, treatment, and disposal of sewage originating in Tijuana, Mexico, with a proviso that the agreement contain provisions for payment by the Government of Mexico in an amount and under such terms and conditions as deemed appropriate by the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H.R. 11005. A bill to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11006. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by providing for court appointment of U.S. voting referees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 11007. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11008. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of \$100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11009. 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.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 11010. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 11011. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 11012. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 11013. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 11014. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 11015. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended,

to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 11016. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11017. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCGINLEY:

H.R. 11018. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11019. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11020. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 11021. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 11022. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a marketing program for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARY:

H.J. Res. 647. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.J. Res. 648. Joint resolution to provide for a conference consisting of Federal, State, and local officials, and members of public and private groups or organizations to consider and propose methods of, and to coordinate action for, combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 616. 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. MOELLER:

H. Con. Res. 617. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons secrets to other nations; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 11023. A bill for the relief of Marco Piazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11024. A bill for the relief of Antonia Terrasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 11025. A bill for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE:

H.R. 11026. A bill for the relief of Akiko Hayashida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENSKO:

H.R. 11027. A bill for the relief of Miss Clare O'Halloran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

358. By Mr. BREEDING: Resolution adopted by the American National Cat-

tlemen's Association at its 63d annual convention held January 27-30 in Dallas, Tex., endorsing House Joint Resolution 619, to further reduce the incidence of brucellosis by providing Federal support to complete nationwide certification and proceed toward the eradication of brucellosis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

359. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of a group of residents of the 32d Congressional District of the State of New York, county of Schenectady, urging passage of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, as a minimum first step to-

ward providing decent medical care (hospitalization, surgical services, and nursing home care) for those persons eligible (retired or not) for social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

360. By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of F. S. Higdon, Hazlehurst, Miss.; W. H. Magee, Crystal Springs, Miss.; J. M. Griffith, Gallman, Miss.; and others in favor of a pension to be paid veterans of World War I as stipulated in H.R. 9336; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Amerigo Vespucci, the Italian Explorer Yesterday, and Amerigo Vespucci, the Italian Training Ship Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting story in the American student's history of colonial America is that of Amerigo Vespucci, Italian navigator, from whom the American Continents received their name. Vespucci left accounts of his voyages the first of which, in June of 1497, seemed to have reached the South American Continent before Columbus or Cabot. A German map-maker, Martin Waldseemüller, who translated the narratives of Vespucci, suggested in 1507 that because he was the first to make known his explorations in the New World that it might be proper to name the new continent America. At first the name was applied to only the southern continent but gradually it came to include the northern also.

Another story relating to Vespucci is of current interest. This is the account of the naval training ship, the *Amerigo Vespucci*, named in honor of the Italian explorer. This ship is now in use in the Italian Navy to train sailors participating in NATO for the common defense of the West.

Both the stories, although over 4½ centuries apart, are illustrative of the Italian's relationship toward America. The first shows how a skilled and courageous Italian seafarer was one of the first to explore our shores. The second is symbolic of the Italian people's determination to align their efforts with America and other NATO nations for the defense of the free world.

Americans, also, have always felt a close relationship to the Italian people. For generations they have admired sunny Italy with her priceless monuments of the past. Moreover, they have always been grateful for the Italian immigrants' contributions to the political, economic, social, and cultural growth of America.

At times, however, Americans have been concerned about the fate of Italy. Her predicament under fascism troubled us profoundly. But since the war, this

fear has been dissipated because Italy has shown decisively that she is glad to have reacquired her freedom and has shown this by her desire to be aligned with the West. This has been the will of the great majority of the Italian people. Italy has once more resumed her place of responsibility and cooperation in the family of free nations.

Ever since the inception of NATO, Italy has given her unstinted support to this Organization. Despite the numerous political, economic, and social problems that faced Italy at home after the war, she still has managed to do her share in this alliance of the nations of the free world. In the joint military exercises by NATO during the past few years, Italy has shown that she is an important and integral part of the Western defense system.

The progress of Italy since the war has been made possible by the generous and laborious character of her people as well as by the assistance granted by her allies, especially the United States. Nevertheless, Italy is the first to be aware that economic and political problems still have to be faced. Consequently, she is ever vigilant in the fight against poverty, fear, and aggression.

It is well that on this March 9, the birthday of Vespucci, we stress the close relationship that exists between the United States and Italy which goes beyond the military pacts and agreements that they have signed. Friendship between these two nations stems from an identity of democratic ideals and ties of affection and blood which existed long before these diplomatic pacts and which have tended to keep the two nations close in spite of the geographic distance that separates them.

The Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the years since the end of World War II, American air transportation companies have rapidly been losing their position as leaders in the field of international airline operations. Companies which a

dozen years ago transported some 75 percent of all transatlantic air passengers, for example, carry less than 40 percent today. A foreign airline, which calls itself the largest in the world, serves more American cities than one of our own international carriers. Another foreign airline is permitted to transport passengers across the United States while such authority is denied an American international carrier. This trend has resulted from concessions to foreign airlines at the expense of our own carriers.

Fortunately, the Department of State, upon recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has recently issued a decision reversing the pattern. KLM of the Netherlands, was denied permission for a route to our west coast. I commend the decision and hope it is indicative of the future direction of our decisions in similar cases in the future.

American carriers should certainly share in international air traffic generated by American business and travel abroad. While it may be necessary to make concessions to foreign airlines to maintain our international services by obtaining foreign operating rights, it appears that there have been too many concessions.

Correspondence with airline pilots who live in my district makes it fully clear that the detrimental effect of the current trend in international air travel is borne by American airline employees to an increasing degree. Let us hope that improvement is on the way.

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birth of the man whose name was given to the two great continents of the Western Hemisphere—Amerigo Vespucci.

We owe a great deal to this courageous Italian navigator, as well as to those other early explorers who accepted the challenge of the high seas and who ventured out into the unknown to make their great discovery. Their fearless spirit can well serve as an inspiration

to us as we chart other unknown seas in the turbulent world of the 20th century.

Amerigo Vespucci was born in Florence in 1451. He spent his early years as a clerk; subsequently he outfitted several expeditions to the New World; and, finally, determined to see for himself, he set forth on several voyages of his own.

On his third voyage—in 1501-2—he is reported to have reached the Canaries and Cape Canaveral, Fla.; then he sailed south and reached the coast of Brazil, which he called "The New World." The terms "The New World" and "America" came to signify the two continents along whose coasts Vespucci courageously sailed.

It is particularly timely that we note the strong historical tie which binds together the two Americas. In a very real sense both we and the Southern Hemisphere have common ancestors. And, as the President has stressed on his tour, we have reinforced those bonds by centuries of mutual good will and friendship. It is certainly of vital importance that people of both hemispheres work toward a still firmer relationship of trust and understanding.

Representative Curtis Proud To Be on Hoffa's Purge List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the *Globe-Democrat*, March 6, 1960:

REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS PROUD TO BE ON HOFFA'S PURGE LIST—WARNS OF RUGGED FIGHT AHEAD

(The author, a Member of the House of Representatives for 10 years, is one of 56 Congressmen whom Jimmy Hoffa has pledged to defeat. His congressional district is one of the strongholds of the Teamsters Union.)

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS)

WASHINGTON.—Fifty-six Congressmen have been marked for political purge by James Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

I am one of those Congressmen, representing St. Louis County and South St. Louis, home of Harold Gibbons, Teamster executive vice president, and Sidney Zagri, director of Hoffa's purge campaign.

Most of us on the Hoffa purge list will run in the November 8, 1960, elections. Forty of us have banded together in the Committee To Reelect Hoffa-Threatened Congressmen to offer a solid front to the threats of Hoffa and to delineate a choice for our citizens:

Shall Hoffa or the American voters have the final voice in choosing a Congress?

To "qualify" for the Hoffa purge list a Congressman had to have voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill, did so to curb Act and have won an election victory in 1958 by less than a 5 percent majority.

AYRES ON LIST

Fifty-three Republicans and two Democrats made the list in this way. The fifty-

sixth, Representative WILLIAM AYRES, of Akron, Ohio, despite his convincing 36,000-vote victory in 1958, was marked for purge because of his membership on the House-Senate conference committee which drafted the final version of the law.

The purge campaign is based on the fallacy that the act is "union-busting" and that those who supported it are antilabor.

This is patently untrue. The 56 named, plus 173 other House Members who supported the Landrum-Griffin bill, did so to curb abuses in the labor-management field, revealed to the Congress and to the public. As its name plainly states, the law aims at the unscrupulous employer as well as the unscrupulous labor leader.

Since most of the abuses exposed were perpetrated by Hoffa and his close associates, it is clear why they were angry at the Congress for protecting the public interest and the rights of workmen and women.

Propaganda opposed to the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reform Act characterizes those who voted for it as either blind in their disregard of labor or servile in yielding to the pressures of big business. I object to this attack on the motives and integrity of Congress.

VOTED OTHERWISE

Had I any reason to feel that this law was a vindictive assault on the labor movement, as it has been called by its opponents, I would have voted, worked and spoken against it, just as I have from 1954 to the present against the "right to work" proposals that have been presented in Missouri during that time.

There is nothing in this law requiring the overwhelming majority of properly run unions to do anything which they were not previously doing nor to prevent them from doing anything that they were.

Response to the creation of the Committee To Reelect Hoffa-Threatened Congressman has been spontaneous, widespread and encouraging. Civic leaders, editors and commentators have commended the committee's formation.

Many people throughout the Nation have responded. Letters are flowing into the House Office Building offices of the temporary committee cochairmen, Representatives AYRES and CARROLL KEARNS of Pennsylvania. These letters offer voluntary services and money to offset Hoffa's huge slush fund, his main weapon for waging political war.

The public response has highlighted the Hoffa purge list as an honor roll on which my colleagues and I are all proud to be named.

Surely no one wishes to deny Mr. Hoffa his right to engage in political activity. To flourish, our system of government requires a maximum of political activity and our committee would not strip anyone—an individual, union or corporation—of his legitimate right of political advocacy.

We do not condemn Hoffa for his exercise of this right; rather we commend him. We urge, however, that our citizens also exercise their rights in this field and prevent a special interest from usurping the powers of the public at large.

ONLY WAY

This is the only way to counter the Hoffa purge. The hundreds of thousands of interested, thinking citizens who refuse to let their rights be snatched away by a special interest group must act.

Those who cared enough to demand the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reform Act by an unprecedented deluge of mail, those who resent the threats of a bully can help. To show this interest they must support those Congressmen Hoffa would purge.

We honestly believe we are right. We were right to work for a law curbing a small but dangerous element in labor leadership that has perverted the movement for personal power. We are right in banding together

against the purge of a well-heeled special interest. We are opening the way for popular participation in a drive that will show it is not Hoffa, but the voters, the American people, who will name their Members of Congress next November 8.

This is the crux: Do the voters indorse our action or do they not?

If those who agree with us do not register their convictions at the polls, then we are doomed to the purge Hoffa has decreed.

Have no doubts, Hoffa with his huge slush fund for this purge will succeed unless the people rise and prove that they are the true rulers under our form of government.

**Last Commanding Officer of the Scotia Naval Supply Depot, Scotia, N.Y.—
Capt. Harold E. Cole, Supply Corps,
U.S. Navy, a Great Sailor Dies in the
Service of His Country**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow high on a hill in Arlington Cemetery there will be laid to rest the last mortal remains of one of the finest naval officers I have ever had the privilege of knowing and one of my close and warm friends, Capt. Harold E. Cole, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy.

Captain Cole passed away suddenly last Saturday while attending classes at the Albany Teachers College in Albany, N.Y. At the time of his death he was site administrator of the Navy machine tool program being conducted at the General Services Administration Depot in Scotia, N.Y. Until last December 31, Captain Cole was the commanding officer of the U.S. Naval Supply Depot at Scotia, a post in which he had served with great distinction since July of 1956. Prior to coming to Scotia, Captain Cole had graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the Naval and Finance Supply School at Philadelphia, and the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration in Cambridge. He served with distinction with the Asiatic Fleet prior to World War II and occupied a number of major staff assignments both at sea and ashore during World War II. Immediately before coming to Scotia he was comptroller for the Military Sea Transportation Service in Washington.

To Captain Cole fell the difficult and unhappy assignment of presiding over the Navy's major installation in the Schenectady area during its disestablishment. During the time of his tenure the Navy gradually reduced its complement at Scotia, and from time to time rumors of even greater reductions circulated prominently throughout the area. During this whole trying period, Captain Cole not only represented the Navy in the Scotia-Schenectady area with great distinction and ability but was tireless in his efforts to see that those in charge of arrangements in Washington were fully apprised of the situation in Schenectady

before making their decisions involving base disestablishment. Like every good commander, he had the welfare of his subordinates close to his heart.

In spite of all his tireless efforts in defense of the interests of our area and of the hundreds of loyal civilian personnel who were privileged to serve under him in Scotia in one of the finest activities which it has been my privilege to see in any Government department, Captain Cole had to watch the Navy go ahead with its decision and in December of 1959 he officially brought the Scotia Navy Depot to a close.

This action was not only a tragedy for the community and a blow to Captain Cole in his professional capacity, it also represented a serious personal blow as well. His ship sunk from under him, Captain Cole was obliged to look forward at the end of the current fiscal year to retirement from active naval service at the age of 49, with two young children left to educate. However, the personal blow which Captain Cole sustained was something he never spoke about, even to his closest friends. Having fought hard and courageously in the highest traditions of the Navy to preserve the jobs of the men and women under him, he went to work quietly without complaint to prepare for the difficult adjustment to civilian life which faced him and his family. In fact, with characteristic vigor and determination, he was at school early on a Saturday working, taking a special course of training in preparation for the impending return to civilian life when he passed away. He hadn't given up the ship. He had only just begun to fight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay my deep respects to Capt. Harold E. Cole for the outstanding job which he did for the Navy and for our community. I have never known a naval officer who did more for a community or for the men and women under his command than was done by Captain Cole.

Our Navy exists to fight, of course, and this is her first responsibility. But no military force can ever be effective in a democracy unless it has the understanding and sympathetic support of men and women in villages and cities and communities all across our land. For this reason the individual who embodies the Navy or any of our armed services in a particular community bears a very heavy responsibility. I am frank to say that I believe Captain Cole discharged this responsibility with a distinction and with a spirit of dedication that were far above and beyond the call of duty.

His sudden and untimely passing from our local scene also raises in my mind, Mr. Speaker, another matter. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I find it increasingly difficult to understand why our military services cannot make the fullest possible use of the abilities of the able officers who have selected the Navy as their career while they are still vigorously capable of serving and still possess their full capabilities. Why should it be that our military services can tell a man who has devoted the best years of his life to his country that his professional career is

at an end and require that he should go out and start another one from scratch at an age when his family responsibilities are heaviest, as were Captain Cole's, and when men of his own age group are only just beginning to establish themselves in greater positions of leadership and responsibility in other professional fields instead of taking down their shingles. Surely this is one of the greatest challenges which our military services face today. I for one believe they must meet this challenge promptly if we are to continue to attract to the career military service, men of the ability and devotion of Harold E. Cole.

I know the people of Scotia and Schenectady and the whole 32d district will join with me in expressing to Mrs. Cole and to her two fine sons our deepest sympathy in the loss of a wonderful husband and a devoted father.

Home is the hunter
Home from the hill
And the sailor home from the sea.

Just What's Going on in the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, another cavity is becoming visible in the hound's tooth.

The revelation over the weekend that the Federal Power Commission has reversed its position and may give a \$15,660,000 plum to a gas transmission firm after personal calls from an attorney who was not even the lawyer of record in the case is shocking indeed.

I believe that the events and disclosures of the past few days are the strongest possible arguments for the passage of my resolution, House Resolution 474, which directs the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to conduct immediate inquiry into the affairs, procedures, and policies of the FPC.

Or, if the Commerce Committee is already too overburdened with investigatory hearings to schedule the needed investigation at once, may I suggest that it be directed to the Government Operations Committee, and that this committee be empowered to conduct a full-dress investigation.

An investigation is needed, and it is needed now.

We cannot help but be disturbed by the facts that the Federal Power Commission has, in effect, set the stage for a whopping 7-percent return for the firm represented by these visits from this lawyer, and that the same attorney's connection with the firm is so nebulous that the FPC itself could not allow his employer to pass his \$60,000 fee in another case on to the consumer.

I hardly need point out that utility stockholders are singularly free of the

risks which characterize the operations of other, more competitive corporations. In view of this fact, it is really incredible that a 7-percent return could be justified by a Federal regulatory agency.

But this is just what the FPC—after secret visits from a lawyer mysteriously associated with the case—appears to be agreeing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to tell you who winds up the ultimate loser in this hopeless confusion of overlapping, temporary—and often unjust—rate increases. It is the public.

The public deserves protection from 7-percent earnings by any public utility. The public deserves absolute assurance that regulatory bodies are not being influenced by cloak-and-dagger phone calls and visits.

Most of all the public deserves a Federal Power Commission whose primary purpose is to protect and defend their interests, not the interests of the gas producers and transmission companies.

Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the captive peoples of Byelorussia, who commemorate the 42d anniversary of independence on March 25.

On that day, in the year 1918, the Byelorussian people took advantage of the chaotic situation in Russia to proclaim the establishment of the Byelorussian National Republic. Despite years of czarist attempts at assimilation, the Byelorussians refused to forget their status as a distinct ethnic group. At the first opportunity they proclaimed their national independence.

Their freedom was, of course, short-lived, and they were soon overcome by another Russian oppressor.

The new oppressor tried to do what czarist Russia had failed to accomplish for centuries: the forcible Russification of the Byelorussian people. For the past 40 years they have embarked upon a brutal campaign of extermination, dispersion, and exploitation. Byelorussians are today in colonial status; they are ruled by Russian officials; their schools use Russian books; and the major part of their production is exported for Russian consumption. Byelorussian youth are deported to obscure outposts, and are subjected to intense Russian indoctrination. The population as a whole has been subjected to such pressures that it has suffered the heaviest losses in Russian history.

Despite this brutal suppression the Byelorussian people have accepted the rule of the Soviet no more than history shows they accepted the rule of the czar. They continue to cherish the hope for freedom and independence in the face of permanent political terror and tyranny.

Let us join the people of Byelorussia today, and the people of Byelorussian descent everywhere in the free world, in the hope that one day their noble hope may come to fruition.

More About Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the following exchange of correspondence will prove of interest to our colleagues. Following is a letter I received from the Northeastern Retail Lumbermen's Association and my answer thereto. If I receive any answers to my letter I will be happy to share the contents thereof with our colleagues.

The letters follow:

NORTHEASTERN RETAIL
LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,

Rochester, N.Y., February 24, 1960.

Re interest rate on Treasury obligations.

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: On behalf of more than 1,200 retail lumber and building material dealers who are in New York and New England States, we wish to call your attention to action taken by these men on the important subject of interest rates on Treasury obligations.

This action has been taken after careful study and clearly reflects the attitude of these dealers on this matter which is of vital consequence to them and the home-buying public.

We feel that this is of particular interest to you because it reflects the considered judgment of a substantial number of your constituents.

We invite your attention to the enclosed statement of position pertaining to this resolution on interest rates.

We hope that you will give this subject your personal attention and careful consideration and that you will take such action as is warranted by further developments.

We shall be glad to have your reaction to our views on this subject.

Sincerely,

HORACE G. PIERCE,
Managing Director.

A STATEMENT OF POSITION—INTEREST RATES
ADOPTED AT THE 66TH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE NORTHEASTERN RETAIL LUMBERMEN'S
ASSOCIATION IN NEW YORK, JANUARY 26,
1960

Whereas Congress failed in the 1st session of the 86th Congress to remove the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling which was imposed many years ago and is long outdated because of worldwide financial trends on long-term Federal bonds. If the ceiling had been removed the Treasury's efforts to achieve non-inflationary debt management would have been strengthened; and

Whereas short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest level in several decades, and the ability of the Treasury to manage the debt in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustaining economic growth has been seriously undermined; and

Whereas the vital interest of all Americans is at stake because excessive reliance on short-term financing probably will have

grave consequences by reducing the purchasing power of the dollar; and

Whereas this trend has affected the available mortgage funds for house construction because the consequent withdrawal of funds from traditional savings institutions such as the mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations and channeled into short-term paper which has seriously threatened their liquidity, and thereby their ability to furnish the mortgage funds necessary to build the new homes America needs:

Resolved, That we the members of the Northeastern Retail Lumbermen's Association commend the administration for its position in the management of the public debt; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to remove the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling to give the administration more freedom in management of the public debt; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be brought to the attention of the congressional Members in the northeastern area urging their favorable action on President Eisenhower's proposal.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1960.

Mr. HORACE G. PIERCE,
Managing Director, Northeastern Retail Lumbermen's Association, Rochester, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. PIERCE: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of February 24, 1960, with reference to interest rates on Treasury obligations.

I regret to advise that it is my opinion that you are merely mouthing the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, which statements are fallacious and have not yet been sustained by the facts. On the contrary, every fact of economic and banking life indicates that they are wrong.

It is almost silly for anyone to argue that you will lower the interest rate in the marketplace by increasing the maximum interest that may be paid. Every time that we have increased the interest rate on FHA and VA mortgages, the rate immediately went to the maximum and stayed there. Furthermore, the interest paid on Government bonds fixes the interest rate on everything.

It stands to reason that the interest charged on risk loans, whether they be mortgage loans or otherwise, should be higher and they always are higher than the interest rates paid by the U.S. Government on its riskless securities. Our Government has never defaulted on any of its obligations and never will.

The finest security is U.S. Government obligations, requiring no effort on the part of the saver or investor but to sit back and to either clip coupons or receive the interest checks.

The pretense that short-term securities are inflationary is utter nonsense. They are no more inflationary than the E- and F-bonds that are readily cashable at any bank by the owner thereof. The mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations of the country have upward of 25 percent of their resources invested in U.S. Government obligations, most of them long-term. They are selling now way under par. If we increase the interest rate on new issues of long-term Government securities by as little as one-half percent the value of those outstanding bonds will fall another 5 points, and if we increase the interest rate on the new long-term issues by 1 percent those outstanding long-term bonds will drop 10 points. None of those institutions can stand it.

If you think that mortgage money is now tight, just try to imagine what will happen to it when the Government issues long-term bonds at 5 percent. Commercial banks are paying a maximum of 3 percent on their savings accounts, savings banks are paying 4

and 4½ percent, and some savings and loan associations are paying as high as 4½ percent.

You can be sure that the run which was experienced a short time ago when our citizens rushed to buy the last high interest rate Government bonds will look like a crawl if we give this administration its way and let them issue long-term bonds at more than 4½ percent interest.

There is no better way to dry up the mortgage market than to have the Government issue long-term bonds at an interest rate close to that being paid in the mortgage market. Why maintain and pay for the cost of real estate appraisers and employees to service mortgages when you can get better than the equivalent net return on riskless Government securities at the expense of employing a coupon clipper?

Can you think of anything more inflationary than increasing the cost of Government? The interest on Government obligations is the first charge on the cost of Government. The national debt now stands at \$290 billion. The President says he is going to reduce that by \$4 billion. I doubt whether he can but let us assume he does. That will bring the debt down to \$286 billion. An increase in the cost of carrying that debt of only 1 percent a year is \$2,860 million each and every year of the term of the debt. And you urge the Congress to let the President do that so he can issue long-term bonds that will run from 25 to 30 years? Multiply the \$2,860 million by the number of years he wants the debt to run and you will have the total increased cost of carrying that debt. What could possibly be more inflationary?

Do not overlook the fact that this is not new or additional money that the Federal Government must borrow in order to carry on. This is all refinancing or refunding of existing debt. The only new money that must be generated for this refinancing will be the increased interest, if any.

There isn't an economist or financier in the country worthy of the name who can justify advising a client to refinance with long-term obligations an outstanding debt during a high interest rate market. The only sensible, businesslike thing to do is to finance short-term in the high interest rate market and when the interest rate drops, finance long-term. That has been traditional with our Government as well as with business and no one can give any valid reason to do the contrary.

Incidentally, did you know that in the bill reported by the committee there is a provision permitting the Treasury Department to engage in what is known as "advance refunding." That means that a Government bond that has 12 years to run until maturity, bearing a 2½ percent interest rate, can be exchanged by the Treasury for a new 20-year bond with a 5 percent interest rate. Justify that if you can. I cannot.

I will appreciate your circulating a copy of this letter among your members with the suggestion that they send me their comments with reference thereto.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Amerigo Vespucci (1451-1512)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Italy has been the home of the arts in all ages,

but in the 15th century she gave birth to two famous sons who became great explorers. One of them discovered the New World while the other, Amerigo Vespucci, baptized it with his name.

Little is known of this adventurous son of a notary public in Florence whose sole ambition seems to have been to sail away from home to places barely known, and explore new lands. In about 1500 we find him entering the services of Don Manuel, of Portugal, and organizing several expeditions. It is now known that in about 1502, or 1503, he arrived at a Florida shore, and then sailed south to the shores of Brazil. Then the two continents of the New World were named after him, Amerigo, America. Glory to the memory of this great explorer.

Statement of Congressman Lane on Cotton Export Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission on March 9, 1960:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE, DEMOCRAT, MASSACHUSETTS, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION IN RE SECTION 22 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED, ON THE UNDUE INTERFERENCE WITH THE COTTON EXPORT PROGRAM OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OF IMPORTED COTTON, TEXTILES, AND TEXTILE PRODUCTS, MARCH 9, 1960

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Tariff Commission, the cotton export subsidy program of the U.S. Government for the benefit of domestic growers, is indirectly hurting the domestic manufacturers who process this raw material into cloth and clothing. This contradiction may be described as a double standard in textile economics.

We are paying out a subsidy rate of 8 cents a pound in cotton and the cotton content of cotton products in order to reduce the surplus of this commodity in the United States. Foreign manufacturers are buying and using this cotton to make textiles that are then exported to the United States where they undersell American-made textiles.

The same Government program which is helping the American cotton grower, is damaging the American cotton manufacturer. Even though we produce more cotton than we can use, American textile manufacturers have to pay \$350 million more a year for cotton than they would at the world price.

We want to dispose of our surplus cotton abroad, but we don't want to see it come back to the United States in the form of cotton cloth or clothing that undersells American cotton textiles on the raw material differential.

This is only one competitive disadvantage that our manufacturers must contend with. The wages and other labor costs of foreign manufacturers are one-tenth of one-half of American costs. The surge of Japanese imports through 1955-56 has been held to that level by a voluntary quota arrangement with the Japanese Government.

But imports continue to pour in from other countries, and especially from India, Korea, Formosa, and Pakistan. In 1959, 170 million square yards of cotton goods were imported from Hong Kong; an increase of 170 percent over 1958.

New England textile mills have suffered from the constant erosion of unfair competition and Government indifference to their problems for many, many years.

Now that the problem of the textile industry has become national, affecting all mills irrespective of the States in which they are located, it is expected that the Federal Government will not only recognize the danger, but take effective action to protect our textile industry from the double-barreled attack of foreign competition.

The President has asked the Tariff Commission to determine if the establishment of an import fee equivalent to the export subsidy on raw cotton to foreign mills, is necessary to prevent interference with the Department of Agriculture's cotton export program. This is a roundabout and inadequate way to help American textile manufacturers in their predicament. A countervailing duty to offset "two-price cotton" is a beginning. To be effective, it must be implemented by overall quotas broken down by categories of goods, and comprehensive quotas.

The whole problem will not be solved unless the Government also applies a formula that will protect our manufacturers from the low-wage competitive advantage of foreign producers who are undermining our domestic market.

The Tariff Commission must face up to the fact that the American textile industry needs protection from the destructive effects of mounting imports. As it considers the convincing testimony presented by management and labor working together in their appeal for a solution to the ruinous competition of imports, I am confident that it will make the necessary recommendations to save the American textile economy.

Amerigo Vespucci (1451-1512)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Americans owe many things to many peoples, for we are indebted to innumerable countries and peoples for what they have contributed to our civilization. We are especially indebted to Italy for giving birth to two great Italians whose deeds and names are indissolubly connected with America. Christopher Columbus, one of the great explorers in his days, discovered the New World, and his contemporary, Amerigo Vespucci, gave his name to the New World.

This enterprising son of a notary public in Florence was born on March 9, 1451. From his early youth he was an adventurer, anxious to go far and away from home. His parents placed him in the great commercial and banking house of the Medici, and that connection offered him opportunities to travel and sail to all parts of the then known world. In about 1500 he entered the service of Don Manuel, of Portugal, and made several expeditions to the New World. It is believed that some time in 1504 he came

here and gave his name America to our continent. Today, on the 509th anniversary of his birthday, let us remember this great explorer, his great son of Florence.

Let's Terminate the "Temporary" Luxury Tax on Telephone Users

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in this month of March the people of this Nation paused to honor the memory of Alexander Graham Bell who was born March 3, 1847, and who, 29 years later on March 10, 1876, gave to the world that vitally essential and indispensable servant of mankind called the telephone.

Things were different then. To quote a contemporary writer of historical prose:

The old enemy of distance prowled everywhere. And people were separated by the bigness of this land.

That was what started young Alec Bell thinking. He knew well what it meant to be shut off from the sounds of familiar voices. You see, he was a teacher of the deaf.

It wasn't easy—explaining sound to those who knew only silence. He had to take hold of sound and pry loose her secrets. He had to find out what she looks like. What she's made of. And then he learned that sound was willing to learn from him.

So he taught sound to change herself into a new form—electricity that wiggled up and down along a wire and carried with it all the laughter and sadness and anger and love of men's everyday conversation. Wherever they strung Alec's wire, distance just shriveled away. The plain, friendly speech of the western farmer could be heard, clear and distinct, in Boston. A man in New York could find out how things were going in California without even raising his voice. Alexander Graham Bell's telephone was talking their language.

Some inventions change the way people live all over the world. If so many of them have happened in America, it's because in this country there's always a dream of doing things better. And part of that dream is that each of us can make it come true.

And so we have seen how the telephone, in a little more than half a century, has grown from a laboratory curiosity to a necessity numbered by the millions. The manifold uses it has today scarcely need be told. Electronic engineers tell us the time is coming when a person anywhere in the world will be able to dial anyone else on the face of the globe without the intervention of an operator and in a few seconds have his party on the line. A vast, new field is opening up in communications. When the whole world can talk over telephones, the benefits will be multiplied. Perhaps, then, nations will understand each other a little better. Perhaps—and who can tell—the telephone may be one of the avenues which will help establish permanent peace in the bright new world we are still hoping and praying for.

We scarcely need be told that the people of this country and our own Government rely heavily on communications facilities and services not only in pursuance of our peacetime activities but in defense of our Nation. I point up all these things to remind us that the telephone is not a luxury but an everyday necessity. Yet, it is one of the most heavily taxed of any necessary service. Water, gas, electricity, heating fuel and other utilities are not taxed. Why then should we continue to single out and penalize the telephone user with a 10-percent levy every time he calls the corner grocery and every time he calls a sick relative in some far-distant State?

Actually, the Federal excise tax on communications services is unfair and discriminatory. It is a luxury sales tax on an essential service. The same kind of a tax that we assess against jewelry, furs, and liquor. Why should the telephone be put in the luxury class? When a housewife telephones for groceries or when she needs to call the family doctor about her baby's illness, she does not regard the telephone as a luxury. Nor does the businessman when he picks up the transmitter to order more merchandise for his customers. When farmers and others resident in rural areas need to summon a doctor or a veterinarian or to call the fire department, they do not feel that telephone service is a luxury. Yet, Congress has continued to impose this luxury tax upon one of the most essential services we have. I repeat, to continue this tax is unfair and discriminatory.

This tax was imposed as a temporary wartime measure to restrict civilian use of the telephone and to save materials in the interest of defense. Telephone users have been paying this temporary tax for more than 18 long and heavily burdened years.

Last year this Congress voted to drop the excise tax on local telephone service on June 30, 1960. We decided that the tax—the only such tax on a household utility—was an inequitable levy. The discontinuance of this tax would mean a 10 percent cut on local telephone bills for everybody. But now President Eisenhower has asked us to rescind the repeal action of last year and to continue the tax on both local and long distance service. In bringing these facts before the House I want my colleagues to understand I am as fully aware as they are of the problems involved in obtaining tax revenue for the country's needs. We know these needs must be met and that the money must come from somewhere. But telephone companies and their customers already are paying more than their fair share. I wonder how many of you realize that approximately one-third of every dollar spent for telephone usage goes for Federal, State, and local taxes. I am reliably informed that this is the amount of the tax against telephone companies and telephone users in most localities.

The millions of people who depend upon the telephone and the telephone companies themselves are seriously concerned should there be a continuance of

this Federal excise tax on telephone service. I share that concern. They fear that the longer this tax on communications service is continued the greater is the danger that it will become a permanent part of the tax structure. Telephone users long have complained, newspapers the country over have demanded repeal of this tax, and the entire communications industry long has urged elimination of the tax. Are we going to continue to ignore their pleas? Telephone users and telephone companies are not alone in seeking repeal of this tax. State and Federal agencies which regulate the rates and charges for telephone service are fully aware of the impact of these excise taxes on the cost of service. These regulatory authorities repeatedly have advocated repeal of taxes on telephone service. The regulatory commissions know that the cost of providing telephone service has been constantly increasing due to the inflationary trends that have raised the cost of nearly every product and service. Commissions have found it necessary to allow a net increase of \$2.08 in gross revenues to allow an increase of \$1 in the net income of a telephone company. This comes about as a result of the Federal income tax. But, in addition, the customer must pay another 21 cents to cover the 10 percent excise tax on the increased rate. Thus, in order to increase a telephone company's net income by \$1, the customer must bear a total increase of \$2.29. Regulatory commissions are opposed to this added cost because they regard it as unsound, unjust, and inequitable to the maintenance of a reasonably priced communications service.

In view of these things I ask the Congress when the proper time comes to allow the tax on local telephone service to terminate on June 30, 1960, as scheduled. The wish to keep Federal tax revenues at present high levels should not blind us to the need of eliminating this discriminatory and unfair assessment upon our vital communications services. It would be a practical way of providing a general tax reduction which would stimulate our economy and which would benefit everybody.

In the language of St. Paul, I urge you to think upon these things.

Minshall Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, each year I send out a questionnaire to the home of every registered voter in Ohio's 23d District. The questions are based on some of the vital issues coming before the Congress. The response has always been excellent, and helps me sound out the sentiment of the voters on these important questions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the Minshall

poll for the 2d session of the 86th Congress be included in the RECORD:

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

DEAR FRIENDS: On previous occasions, I have sent out questionnaires seeking expression on pending issues before the Congress. Your response has been excellent. Again I am requesting your opinions on these vital issues. Having the benefit of your views will better enable me to represent you in Congress.

Please place this card inside an envelope marked "Minshall poll" and mail to me at Post Office Box B-221, House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C. Your views will be held in strict confidence.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

1. Do you consider the proposed \$41 billion defense budget adequate? No opinion No Yes
2. Do you favor Federal aid for local school construction? No opinion No Yes
3. Do you favor Federal aid to raise teachers' salaries? No opinion No Yes
4. Do you believe we should continue our foreign aid program? No opinion No Yes
5. Do you favor the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits? No opinion No Yes
6. Do you believe the Federal budget should be kept in balance? No opinion No Yes
7. Who is your choice for the next President of the United States? _____

Granting Atomic Weapons Information to France and Other Allies in Best U.S. Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to revise its policy of withholding atomic energy information from its own allies. This was recognized by the President in a recent press conference when he said:

When the Soviets have the information and the know-how to do things, it's pretty hard for me to understand why we don't do something with our allies.

Under the Atomic Energy Act, however, the President cannot transfer restricted material and data for use in atomic weapons unless a nation "has made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons." Only Great Britain has achieved eligibility under this standard. Even the recent explosion by France of an atomic device in the Sahara has not qualified it to receive the American know-how and materials which would facilitate its attaining an atomic capability.

I believe that in view of the fact that the Soviet Union already has atomic weapons as powerful as those of the

United States, it serves no useful purpose to continue this prohibition in effect. The law under which nuclear weapons and information are kept from our allies is out of date, especially since General de Gaulle exploded the French bomb in the Sahara.

Furthermore, the effect of withholding data and material on atomic weapons from allies such as France has become self-defeating. First, it requires our allies to spend millions and millions of dollars in duplicating work which we have already done—money better spent for raising their standard of living and for defense purposes.

Second, it makes it necessary for our allies to conduct nuclear tests explosions, either to develop their own weapons independently or to achieve the substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons which is a prerequisite to American atomic weapons aid.

Third, either we pool weapons and expertise or nations will act independently. France will go on testing until it has the hydrogen bomb or we offer nuclear cooperation. We dare not stand pat any longer. Such action can result only in a considerable number of independent capabilities—a situation in which it would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to impose effective weapons control.

To remedy this situation, on February 29, 1960, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10748, eliminating as a condition for obtaining atomic weapons assistance from the United States the current requirement that a nation already have achieved substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons. The President will thus be enabled to make atomic weapons assistance available whenever he determines that this will promote the defense and security of the United States. The proposed agreement for the exchange of information or material will, of course, still be subject to the provision of the Atomic Energy Act which retains in Congress the right to make any such agreement ineffective by a simple concurrent resolution.

I have also provided in my bill that in return for receiving aid from the United States in developing its own atomic weapons, any nation receiving such assistance must guarantee to refrain from conducting nuclear tests explosions to the same extent that the United States refrains from conducting her tests.

The passage of this legislation will not only assist such staunch and proven allies as General de Gaulle in his quest to restore France to her greatness, but it will also prevent the proliferation of nuclear tests by aspiring atomic powers which now appears inevitable.

We must help France in this manner for then France helps us in the defense of Europe. Remember also, France is our time-tested ally. We have since our beginnings been forced into conflict with every major nation in Western Europe, but France has always been with us.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 10748

A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of Amer-

ica in Congress assembled, That section 91c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. The President may authorize the Commission or the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the other, to cooperate with another nation and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 57, 62, or 81, to transfer by sale, lease, or loan to that nation, in accordance with terms and conditions of a program approved by the President—

"(1) nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons and nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems involving Restricted Data;

"(2) utilization facilities for military applications;

"(3) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in utilization facilities for military applications; and

"(4) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, or use in atomic weapons: *Provided, however,* That the transfer of such material to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability, whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and each proposed transfer arrangement for the nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons and atomic weapon system, utilization facilities or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123: *And provided further,* That if an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to this subsection provides for transfer of utilization facilities for military applications the Commission, or the Department of Defense with respect to cooperation it has been authorized to undertake, may authorize any person to transfer such utilization facilities for military applications in accordance with the terms and conditions of this subsection and of the agreement for cooperation."

Sec. 2. Subsection 123a of the Atomic Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) A guaranty by the cooperating party that it will refrain from nuclear test explosions to the extent that the United States refrains from nuclear test explosions;"

Sec. 3. Subsection 144c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. In addition to the cooperation authorized in subsections 144a and 144b, the President may authorize the Commission, with the assistance of the Department of Defense, to cooperate with another nation and—

"(1) to exchange with that nation Restricted Data concerning atomic weapons: *Provided,* That communication of such Restricted Data to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability; and

"(2) to communicate or exchange with that nation Restricted Data concerning research, development, or design, of military reactors, whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed Restricted Data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

Civil Defense Workers, H.R. 856

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced my bill H.R. 856 to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extent coverage to persons engaged in civil defense.

On February 24, 1960, it was my privilege to appear before the House Education and Labor Committee in support of the measure.

My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WIER. This is H.R. 856?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIER. Identify yourself, and the number of the bill.

Mr. MULTER. I am ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Representative of the 13th District of New York.

I appreciate the opportunity this committee gives me to appear here in support of my bill, H.R. 856.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, in order to save some time, I offer my prepared statement for the record, if you will take it that way, and I will give you a brief summary.

Mr. WIER. No objection? So ordered. We all have a copy of your report now.

(The information follows:)

"STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I first express my thanks to you and to the other members of this subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to appear here today in support of my bill, H.R. 856.

"This legislation is designed to extend the coverage of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to include certain persons engaged in civil defense. Specifically, in the language of the bill, it would cover 'part-time and full-time, paid and unpaid volunteers, auxiliaries, and civil defense workers subject to the order and control of State government or any political subdivision thereof engaged in, training for, or traveling to or from, activities relating to "civil defense" * * *'

"I have introduced this bill because I sincerely believe that there are good reasons why the Federal Government should assume some responsibility for the welfare of these people if they are killed or injured while on duty.

"As you probably know, the protection provided to many of the people working either full time or part time in civil defense is in many cases woefully inadequate. This has been the case ever since the Federal Civil Defense Act was approved in 1950, and I think it is high time that we take the necessary steps to rectify this situation.

"In past years legislation has been introduced to authorize the Federal Government to make contributions to assist the States in awarding death or injury compensation in these cases. However, no action beyond hearings has ever been taken by Congress on any of this legislation. Over the years, apparently, the idea has prevailed that any compensation to be paid to people injured in the performance of civil defense duties should be paid solely by the respective States.

"This plan may be satisfactory in theory, but in actual practice it has been demonstrated to have serious shortcomings.

"Although it is true that many States have passed legislation to protect civil defense workers, it is also true that most of them have not done so. Even among the States which have acted, the coverage is not uniform. This in itself is unfortunate.

"Of greater importance, perhaps, than the inequity of uneven coverage among the States that have done something is the fact these workers in far too many States have no protection at all. These States have had 10 years to enact at least minimal legislation, but they have not done so.

"This situation is grossly unjust. Protection must be given to these people, and I think the Federal Government has a clear and compelling responsibility to provide it.

"I know that I do not have to make a case for what might happen to all of the American people if we should become involved in another shooting war. The consequences of such horrors are beyond our capacity to imagine. We must, if we are to be realistic, recognize the possibility of such a conflict.

"In the event of an enemy attack, the civil defense workers would be the most vulnerable group in our civilian population. They would be confronted with what, to say the very least, would be hazardous, demanding, and highly important duties.

"It is unthinkable that so many of them should be expected to serve under these circumstances without the benefits of adequate death or injury compensation. Yet, this is exactly the situation that has existed for 20 years, exists today, and will continue to exist unless and until Congress takes the necessary action to remedy it.

"By the very nature of civil defense work, if the program is to have any value at all, a great many people are required to participate in it. You cannot accept just anybody for these jobs. The work requires people with intelligence, a deep sense of responsibility, and a profound concern for the welfare and safety of the United States.

"The recruitment of persons of this caliber has always been a serious problem. And no wonder. We make heavy demands upon their time and upon their physical and mental energy, but, at the same time, offer them little or nothing in return.

"The inadequacy or complete absence of any death or injury compensation is a most serious barrier to recruitment of civil defense volunteers. As long ago as 1953 the head of the Federal Civil Defense Administration wrote: 'The Federal Civil Defense Administration continues to be seriously concerned over the representations by many State and local civil defense directors that the absence of compensation coverage for volunteer workers seriously hampers the development of a strong U.S. Civil Defense Corps.'

"There is every reason to think today that the assurance of compensation insurance would be of great assistance in this recruitment. The strongest argument for it is that it could correct a palpably unjust condition that can be measured in dollars and cents. But there are other arguments as well. As a moral factor, the knowledge that they were backed up by a program of Federal compensation insurance would demonstrate to the civil defense workers the genuine concern of the National Government in civil defense and in the welfare of all persons associated directly with it.

"The recruitment and training of personnel and other aspects of civil defense is the prime responsibility of the Federal Government. It has been delegated in part to the States and local governments.

"All of these levels of government have failed to deal adequately with this question of injury and death compensation for civil defense workers. I do think, furthermore, that under the circumstances, the Federal

Government has a duty and an obligation to do something about this. It was for this reason that I introduced H.R. 856.

"Let me, in conclusion, point out that this bill offers nothing in the way of compensation for unpaid volunteers or in the way of additional compensation for paid workers in the performance of their regular duties.

"The cost of this measure, if enacted into law, is important, of course, but it should by no means be controlling. It is far more important that the few payments that might be made under its terms would be money well and justly made. The very least we can do for anyone who meets some accident or injury in connection with his civil defense work is to guarantee to him that he will receive some compensation as a result of his misfortune.

"It is my sincere hope that the committee will see fit to report favorably a bill. In my opinion it deserves prompt consideration by Congress.

"Again I thank the members of this subcommittee for the courtesy they have shown me in giving me this chance to appear in support of H.R. 856."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the committee, most of the bills that you have before you, and Mrs. St. GEORGE's bill is one exception, are retroactive in effect in that they try to cover situations of persons already injured or families of those who have been killed or died as a result of injuries under various and differing circumstances.

I think the St. George bill, like my bill, is prospective in effect in that it attempts to remedy a defect in the law as to all and sundry who may come within the terms of the law if it should be amended.

I have been offering this bill since 1951, and I am very happy that the committee has seen fit to set it for hearing as it reviews the entire act to determine how it can be brought up to date and made more effective.

Mr. WIER. I may say to you we have two or three other bills on the so-called civil defense noneligibility.

Mr. MULTER. I am glad that other members have also seen the need for this.

Mr. WIER. Congressman FINO has one in here.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. I think Mr. FINO's bill applies to persons who have heretofore been injured or the next of kin of persons who died as a result of injuries sustained in civil defense activities.

I do not think his is prospective in effect where mine would cover everyone and anyone who may be injured or die as a result of injuries while working in civil defense.

The primary issue that the committee must determine is whether or not civil defense is a Federal obligation. My view is that it is. The defense of the country is the Nation's obligation.

While that portion of it which is referred to as civil defense has been delegated in part to the States and the municipalities, it is an unconstitutional delegation of power. I say that the U.S. Government cannot delegate its responsibility. While it can ask the municipalities and the States to assist in the program, it cannot pass on to them its responsibility to defend the country in time of peace and in time of war.

While we talk of war in the old sense of the shooting war, the cold war is just as much a war as the hot war or the shooting war. While we prepare for the time that we hope will never come of a shooting war, it is that portion of that responsibility of the Federal Government that we address ourselves to with a bill such as mine.

The training of persons in the Armed Forces is training for defense and national security. The training of volunteers and others in the civil defense of the country is the same kind of preparation. We will not need them unless there is a shooting war or unless the country is attacked. We do

not need our Armed Forces except to the extent they are a deterring effect upon an aggressor or potential aggressor. We will need them when the time comes to defend our country and its people and its property.

This bill has been prompted, in part, by my actual experience during the 1940's when I helped set up in the city and State of New York the air raid warden service and the police and firemen's volunteer auxiliary services.

Every time someone was in training in any of those programs and was hurt or the learned of somebody being hurt while going to and from a training center or in the training center, or while actually performing those duties, and they found that there was no way of their family being protected in the event of the death of the volunteer, and there was no way of even getting his medical expenses paid, if the volunteer was hurt, we lost hundreds of volunteers. The services almost disintegrated every time there was an injury or death, the reports of which were carried in the newspapers. We have the same thing today.

The New York State Civil Defense Commission as early as 1951 said the question of insurance protection for civil defense volunteers had arisen in every one of our 104 local offices of civil defense. The lack of proper coverage has definitely impeded our efforts to build up a strong civil defense volunteer force. The same thing occurs even today. You cannot get these people interested to do the job when you are not going to give them some protection.

It is true that we pay our members of the Armed Forces. But historically it is the duty, not the privilege; it is the duty of every American citizen, every able-bodied American citizen to serve his country in its defense.

The U.S. Government as the sovereign has the right to call up these men and these boys and require their services without compensating them. We do it because it is the right thing to do, not because it is the legal thing. So with these civil defense volunteers. There is no obligation to pay them but it is our duty to at least compensate them for their injuries and give their families some compensation in the event of a death while performing this very necessary volunteer service.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. MULTER, I do not mean to interrupt you but you referred to civil defense volunteers. As I understand it, your bill would specifically include a full-time paid civil defense worker and presumably paid by the State government, or perhaps a municipality.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. What would be the justification for including in this protection that type of individual?

Mr. MULTER. I include part-time and full-time, and paid and unpaid volunteers.

The justification is this: We should have one system uniform throughout the entire country to cover all of these people.

There is one defect in this bill which you call attention to. There should not be double compensation or double payment to these people. If a paid employee, part-time or full-time employee, gets any compensation as a volunteer or otherwise gets any compensation on the local level, I do not intend that it be supplemented. But he should get it. He should get it to the same extent throughout the country. If he is getting \$25 a week payment under a local statute, and this will provide for as much as \$500 a month or \$100 a week, he should get the difference. But these people who are serving the country should be on the same basis and compensated on the same basis. If some locality thinks they cannot pay as much as the Federal Government does, give them the difference. If they are paying more, he gets nothing from the Federal Government.

To that extent my bill needs amending. I do not want double compensation. I do not want supplemental compensation. I do think they all should be compensated, or their families in the event they are compensated, on the same basis from one end of the country to the other.

That, I think, presents the problem to you gentlemen for your consideration.

I am sure all of these bills that are before you are entitled to your sympathetic consideration and you will give them the deserving attention they need. You have a tremendous task before you to try to fill up the loopholes that exist in the law and correct inequities in the law.

I am sure you will bring out an overall bill that will encompass all of these situations.

I have no pride of authorship. I do not urge you must bring out my bill, or my bill is the only way to do this. I think you can bring out one comprehensive bill and include the provisions of mine to the extent they appeal to your sympathetic consideration and do the real job that has needed doing since 1940.

Mr. WIER. Mr. MULTER, if I could think of anything that could be said about this bill or the need for it or lack of need, I will say that the State administrator in my State is a very, very good friend of mine, and he comes down here quite frequently to the Civil Defense National Committee meeting, that is, the representatives of every State come here for an assembly. Yet the only place that I learned of or have been approached for this is New York.

My administrator in Minnesota has never approached me and I would presume that there must be some accidents out there because the civil defense in the major cities, like Minneapolis, St. Paul, work at the football games where they are called out for traffic duty. When there is a big fire they respond for so-called policing. They have so-called police uniforms. That is limited. They are continually doing these things. They are not just waiting for somebody to shoot and start a war. They are doing State work. On the Fourth of July they are spread around the State as something to warn people that they are watching them.

But my friend has never approached me on this question of compensation for these men that serve in his department.

Mr. MULTER. I think, because your State has been much more forward looking than mine, your State has assumed the monetary obligation involved and enacted a statute that covers these men, so that they get compensation in the event of injury and the families are protected in the event of death.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. MULTER, the chairman pointed out that to some extent the functions of civil defense work are certainly not national in flavor. Supervising traffic at a football game would not necessarily create a Federal responsibility if the individual were injured I would think this could be used as a disastrous argument against your point of view.

Do you happen to know how many people would be included as possible beneficiaries under your bill?

Mr. MULTER. It is impossible to foretell how many might be injured.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How many people are engaged in civil defense activities, broadly?

Mr. MULTER. I do not have that number.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Many millions, I would assume.

Mr. MULTER. The Civil Defense Administration certainly could supply that information to you.

You will find that as of today it is comparatively few because you cannot get the volunteers on the local level to take up this national defense problem.

I have another bill which requires the U.S. Government to take over and do this

job. I do not prohibit them from decentralizing. But you are never going to get a good national civil defense organization on the local level. It is a national problem and you cannot stir these people except in time of war.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If you define it as a national problem and if you say in the discharge of their Federal responsibilities and spell them out, you might have, I think, sounder ground for arguing that they should be compensated by the Federal Government.

If a man were injured directing traffic at a football game and you said the Federal Government is responsible for his total disability payments, you would get into trouble.

Mr. MULTER. You are certainly right.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. So I would think if we were going to extend coverage to potentially hundreds of thousands of people that might be injured, millions perhaps—

Mr. MULTER. Under my bill—you see, I know how these men work and what they are doing—those—who have volunteered. Therefore, my bill says "while engaged in"—this is on page 1, line 10—"engaged in training for or traveling to or from activities relating to civil defense as such term is defined in section 3(b) of the Federal Defense Act of 1950."

That excludes the policing for traffic and the policing at football games. It refers, specifically, and covers them only while engaged in true civil defense as defined by our national statute.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Unfortunately, I did not have that statute with me. Presumably they are called out for traffic because they are members of the civil defense organization.

Mr. MULTER. On the local level. They have been enlarged to take in strictly local problems.

Mr. WIER. That is the only training they get.

Mr. MULTER. It is not the training called for by the Federal Civil Defense Act.

Mr. WIER. When we have a big parade—the Shriners, and the Legion, let us say—all of them are called out for policing the parade. We do not have enough policemen for that kind of a job.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would not a policing function such as that be included within an appropriate definition of training for civil defense work?

Mr. MULTER. I think it is stretching it awfully far.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We do not have the definition. It is difficult to say.

Mr. MULTER. I never intended to cover that kind of function. It is necessary to keep these volunteers to give them something to do to keep their interest. In many communities they get additional policing duties. It gives him a feeling he is doing something for his community, while at the same time they keep up the defense organization. They must be in a state of readiness in the event the holocaust might come that we all fear but hope will never come.

Truly, it is not a part of civil defense duty to be policing a parade or football game or playing the part of a traffic officer.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the case of a disaster, a sweeping disaster that might well be useful background to have had to be able to direct traffic out of the disaster areas.

Mr. MULTER. You now get into that basic problem about which there has been such tremendous difference of opinion. When you train a soldier—take, rather, a man in the Navy—what good is that training of showing him how to march and right face, left face, and about face? Yet it is part of basic training. There is the argument: Should we not stop wasting time training an artilleryman to march? Should we not stop wasting time training a pilot of an airplane to march?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. What would a civil defense worker in peacetime be engaged in officially unless it were something like the duties which the chairman indicated they do as a practical matter?

Mr. MULTER. The only actual training for work he has to do is that which includes first aid, fire protection, police protection—yes, and traffic control would undoubtedly come within that. I suppose you could stretch it far enough to say that this training at the parade and at the football game is training him in traffic control.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think you might get into an administrative nightmare to try to say that it was not direct training or reasonably a direct connection between the actual disaster and training.

Mr. MULTER. You put your finger on something that probably requires definition in the statute.

Mr. WIER. Let me point out also in connection with the Federal relationship that last year all of the administrators of civil defense were down here making a sincere effort to get some heavy equipment; and when my friend came up to see me, I said, "What are you going to do with heavy equipment?"

He said, "Roy, we have a job. When we have a forest fire either on State or Federal property, most all of the Western States pull these people out and use that heavy equipment for firebreaks."

So they were having an awful time getting some of the military surplus—that is, big tractors and equipment like that. I was wondering what they were training for. That is what they wanted it for. It was for protection of the forests up in the northern part of the State.

Mr. MULTER. Let me indicate this to you: As early as 1951, when the bill was first introduced, the Secretary of Labor said:

"It is the opinion of this Department that the Federal Government should assume responsibility for the payment of benefits only with respect to civil defense workers killed or injured as a result of enemy action as distinguished from injuries or death incurred in training or duty in advance of enemy attack."

I am sure you gentlemen would not agree with that kind of differentiation between injuries received while training to protect the country in event of attack.

Mr. ZELENKO. Under the present rules of war there would not be anybody left to administer this act if it were during a holocaust.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let us change it to instead of rules of war, philosophy of war.

Mr. WIER. When did you get that letter?

Mr. MULTER. This letter is a copy of the letter from the Department of Labor of August 1, 1951, sent to Chairman BARDEN of the Committee on Education and Labor with reference to my bill, H.R. 3468, which was the identical counterpart of the bill now before you.

Mr. WIER. You heard the statement I made a minute ago.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I did.

Mr. WIER. That we are getting reports on all these bills from the Department.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I did. The reason I read that, that was the only objection he raised at that time, that we should assume the responsibility and pay them if hurt during attack or hurt during war, that we should not pay them while being trained to prepare to do the right thing.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. MULTER, I think you agree that the difficulty of determining what constitutes training constitutes a problem as far as we are concerned; because of the necessity of being liberal in that definition, it makes it difficult not to get a tremendous number of beneficiaries even though it may be a very fringe kind of training for an actual disaster.

Mr. MULTER. As I said in my main statement, while the cost of this program is important, it should not be controlling. When we get into talking about numbers who may be covered, I think it is important to consider how many will have to be covered, but whether there are few or many, the principle is the same. If we should give them this compensation, I do not think it should matter whether there is 1 or 1 million that will have to be compensated. This is our obligation. If this is the Federal Government's obligation, we should meet it.

Mr. GOODELL. That is true, but you still have the problem of getting the Federal Government into covering them in all sorts of situations where they are doing nothing at all that is connected with the national purpose so-called.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I agree.

Mr. GOODELL. This is particularly true because your section 2 would eliminate the present provision.

Mr. ZELENKO. Would the gentleman yield for one moment, please?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. ZELENKO. I have to leave to attend another meeting. I want to interrupt to commend my distinguished colleague from New York for bringing this problem to our attention and continuing to bring it to our attention.

I am most sympathetic with it. Something should be done. I think we almost all agree that the difficulty is how. I know if you continue to press this problem we will come to a solution.

These people are entitled to some kind of help, as I pointed out in the case of Mrs. St. George's bill. I am with you on the general theory. I hope we can work something out.

Mr. MULTER. That is all I ask of you.

Mr. ZELENKO. I commend you again for continuing to properly press this. You have been one of the leaders in pressing this and pointing out to the attention of the country this subject.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ZELENKO. If you will excuse me.

Mr. GOODELL. Your section 2 provides that the civil defense employees will be considered employees of the Federal Government for purposes of compensation.

This would raise all of these problems we are talking about if we change that classification and make them Federal employees for purposes of Federal compensation. Then what forest fires they are fighting or when

there is a snowstorm or whatever it may be presumably the Federal Government would be responsible every time they are called out.

Mr. MULTER. That is so. But the main purpose, of course, of section 2 is to bring them into that so they can use that same machinery. You do not have to set up new machinery. There is no new department called for by my bill. They will file their claims just as though they had been employees. They will go through the same process that any other Federal employee's claim would have to go through. It is an expeditious way of handling it. It is a fair way. It never gives them complete compensation but it does put them on the same basis.

But as you both pointed out, the bill is by no means perfect. It probably needs clarification so as not to bring into it those that should not be covered.

Mr. GOODELL. I have one more question here.

Was there any particular reason that you put in this provision for maximum benefits provided under the act? It is my understanding that would provide for something like \$525 a month for these people.

Mr. MULTER. I think that would probably come to about \$525 a month and the reason I did that was that my experience in New York City and New York State is that most of these volunteers are businessmen and the higher paid type of employee. You do not get the man who is earning \$50 or \$75 or \$100 a week ordinarily into this program. You get the man who has gotten to the point in life where he has the time and the feeling that he owes a duty to his community. There is an obligation to his community and to the country to do something in times of need and stress and disaster.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. There may be such competition for positions under this provision that you will lose those higher paid types for the lower paid who would like to receive such compensation if they should be injured, I should think.

Mr. MULTER. I would have no objection to this provision reading that you take his base pay on the outside as the measure of his damages, not to exceed the maximum, so that if you got the man who is in the \$200-a-week category he is going to be limited to the maximum. I have no objection to it being handled that way.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Then you will get the \$200,000 a year man crowding for the consideration.

Mr. WIER. Let me assure you, Mr. MULTER, since there are 20 amendments, it would be

much easier if we already had a good bill. Some of the things I learn here in these hearings about the present Compensation Act, which it is a very good act for those that are covered, but there are a lot of problems.

Now, Mr. McCauley told us as an example that when somebody asked him about who is covered an example would be this:

If the Government or some agency of Government assigns two or three professional people in University of Minnesota, for example, to do some research work, by Government assignment and under the jurisdiction of the Government, even though they draw their pay out there, their university pay, as long as they have that assignment they are covered by compensation.

There are so many inequities in this bill. I am talking about maximums and minimums.

Some of the military is covered. Some of the military is not covered. Some chose not to be covered and preferred the Veterans' Administration compensation.

So this is not a simple bill.

Mr. MULTER. No. I think the task of your committee and the task of every congressional committee would be made a tremendously lot easier if we had some overall requirement in the law that every agency having jurisdiction under a particular bill or act would have to review at least every 10 years and submit to the Congress or the congressional committee involved in recodification bringing it up to date and indicating to the Congress what difficulties they have run across, what problems they have had in the administration of the act, and bring in a proposed overall bill so as to modernize the law.

If they did that once every 10 years, your problem would be a lot easier. I know ours would be in my standing committee. But they do not do it.

Mr. WIER. It is 11 years now since this bill was amended, so we have these problems that have come to light in those 11 years.

We want to extend our appreciation, Mr. MULTER, to you for pointing out some of the problems. It is a very controversial bill.

You gave us a job here and Mrs. St. George gave us a job in trying to define what the civil employee is.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if I might add, that as might be expected, Mr. MULTER has been both an interesting and provocative witness.

I congratulate him on the handling of this subject.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1960

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 8, 1960)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Eternal Spirit, who art revealed to us in the order of the world in which we live, in the emancipating truths our minds discover, and, above all, in the life of the spirit as we see it exemplified in the noblest sons of men, we beseech Thee that in this hour of destiny for us and for a world in wild commotion, Thy servants in this temple of democracy may

be worthy of their sacred commission as the keepers of freedom's holy light.

Give us to know that the deepest revelation of Thyself is hidden in our own hearts and in the hearts of our fellows on this strange earthly pilgrimage. Make room in our sympathy for the vast multitudes of the disinherited who have been stirred by a radiant hope and, as sheep without a shepherd, are turning from despair to promise.

And so may we find our true selves in the need of others, and, thus, beyond ourselves, find Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 9, 1960, was dispensed with.

LEASING OF PORTION OF FORT CROWDER, MO.—CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8315) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield to any Senator who desires to speak at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for the transaction of morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yesterday we announced that due to the limited time, we would have a morning hour immediately after the vote regarding which consent was given. We have divided the time, and it will begin to run at 9:30.

We can have a quorum call, if Senators wish to use that much time to call Mem-