The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o’clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 28, 1960, at 12 o’clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 24 (legislative day of March 23), 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Edward E. Mills, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954, vice John C. Doerfer, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1960

The House met at 12 o’clock noon. Rev. William F. Skinner, the Central Presbyterian Church, Downingtown, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who hast been our dwelling place in all generations; we come to Thee this day with praise of lips, thanksgiving of heart, and humility of spirit.

May we turn to Thee not only when there is none other; but in all things let us seek first Thy will, searching ever for new avenues of implementing love and brotherhood and peace and hope.

Unto our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress, Thou hast entrusted great and grave responsibilities; sustain us, O Lord, with the knowledge that Thou art the source of strength and energy, sufficient for every need. Descend Thou upon us; touch our eyes with a vision of Thy majesty and glory; touch our minds with Thy timeless truth; touch our hearts with understanding and love.

Grant that we may seize every opportunity of replacing error with truth, sorrow with joy, misery with happiness, enslavement with freedom, and despair with confidence.

Thou hast been our help in ages past, and we rest now in the assurance that Thou will be our hope for years to come. This we pray in the name of Christ, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill H.R. 8601, to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will read.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Without objection, a call of the House will be ordered.

There was no objection.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Anderson, Barry
Mont. Blatnik
Arenda
Pelly
Barden
Powell

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 422 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill H.R. 8601, to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Title I

Obstruction of court orders

SEC. 101. Chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1509. Obstruction of certain court orders (1) Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, willfully prevents, obstructs, impedes, or interferes with or willfully endeavors to prevent, obstruct, impede, or interfere with the due exercise of rights or the performance of duties under any order, judgment, or decree of a court of the United States which (1) directs that any person or class of persons shall be admitted to any public school, or (2) directs that any person or class of persons shall be denied admission to any public school because of race or color, or (3) approves any plan of any State or local agency the effect of which will be to prevent any person or class of persons to be admitted to any public school, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than thirty days, or both.

"No injunctive or other civil relief against the conduct made criminal by this section shall be denied on the ground that such conduct is a crime; provided that any such fine or imprisonment imposed for violation of such injunction shall be concurrent with and not consecutive or supplemental to any criminal penalty imposed hereunder.

"This section shall not apply to an act of a student in attempting to enter a public school.

"If such act is done pursuant to the direction of, or is subject to disciplinary action by, an officer of such school, such act shall not be deemed an offense within the meaning of this section.

"If a custodian to whom a custodian to whom a custodian shall be deposited, by the parties to any such action, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(c) Violations of this section may be prosecuted in the district in which the United States District Court in which the original crime was alleged to have been committed or in which the person was held in custody or confinement: Provided, however, That this section shall not be construed as extending an intent on the part of Congress to prevent any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States of any jurisdiction over any offense over which they would have jurisdiction in the absence of such section."

SEC. 102. The analysis of chapter 49 of such title is amended by adding thereto the following:

"1074. Flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or destroying any building or other real or personal property or to avoid prosecution for communicating any threat or false information with respect to any attempt to commit such an act."

Title III

Flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or destroying any building or other real or personal property or to avoid prosecution for communicating any threat or false information with respect to any attempt to commit such an act.

SEC. 103. A new section is added to chapter 49 of such title as follows:

"Flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or destroying any building or other real or personal property or to avoid prosecution for communicating any threat or false information with respect to any attempt to commit such an act."

Title III

Federal election records

SEC. 101. Every officer of election shall retain and preserve, for a period of two years from the date of any general, special, or primary election of which candidates for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elect, Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives, or Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico designates a custodian to retain and preserve these records and papers which come into his possession relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting in such election, and who is required by law, such records and papers may be delivered to another officer of election, and the custodian who is required by law, such records and papers may be deposited with such custodian, and the duty to retain and preserve any records and papers which come into his possession relating to any such offense shall be devolved upon such custodian. Any officer of election who willfully fails to comply
with this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 302. Any person, whether or not an officer of election or custodian, who willfully alters any record or paper shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 303. Any record or paper required by section 301 to be retained and preserved shall be destroyed not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 304. Any record or paper demanded pursuant to section 303 shall be produced for inspection, reproduction, and copying by the principal office of the person upon whom such demand is made or at an office of the United States attorney in the district in which such records or papers are located.

Sec. 305. Unless otherwise ordered by a court, the United States attorney, whether or not an employee of the Department of Justice, nor any other representative of the federal government, shall not reproduce any record or paper pursuant to this title, or any reproduction or copy, except to Congress and any committee thereof, government agencies, or the commission of any act proceeding before any court or grand jury.

Sec. 306. The United States district court for the district in which a demand is made pursuant to section 303, or in which a record or paper is demanded, shall determine by appropriate process to compel the production of such record or paper.

Sec. 307. As used in this title, the term "official of election" means any person, under color of any Federal, State, Commonwealth, or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, authority, custom, or usage, or is authorized to perform any function, duty, or task in connection with any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting in any general, special, or primary election at which votes are cast or in the office of a State, Commonwealth, or local governmental officer, and the answer of the applicant, if (1) the applicant is the holder of a驰licencia, (2) the applicant is the holder of a驰licencia, or (3) the applicant is the holder of a驰licencia, and after each party has been given notice and to each party to such proceeding and to the affected area shall, for one year and thereafter until the period within which such application would otherwise be enabled to vote.

Title IV

Civil Rights Commission, extended for two years

Sec. 401. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. Supp. V 1975d) (71 Stat. 635) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(a) Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, each member of the Commission shall have the authority to administer oaths or take statements of witnesses under affidavit.

Sec. 402. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. Supp. V 1975d)(a) (71 Stat. 635) is amended by striking out the word "special" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "without regard to the provisions of this section" and substituting the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Title V

Education of children of members of Armed Forces

Sec. 501. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 471, Eighthy-first Congress), as amended, relating to arrangements for the provision of free public education for children residing on Federal property where local educational agencies are unable to provide such education, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Such arrangements to provide free public education may also be made for children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty. If the scho~s in which free public education is usually provided for such children are made unavailable to them as a result of any local educational agency exercising its authority and it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children.

(b) (1) The first sentence of subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof: "or, in the case of children to whom the second sentence of subsection (a) applies, with the head of any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over the parents of some or all of such children".

(2) The second sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting in lieu thereof the words "Except where the Commissioner makes such arrangements pursuant to the second sentence of subsection (a), arrangements".

Sec. 502. (a) Section 10 of the Act of September 8, 1962 (83 Stat. 694, Eighty-sixth Congress), is amended relating to arrangements for facilities for the provision of free public education for children residing on Federal property where local educational agencies are unable to provide such education, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Such arrangements may also be made to provide, on a temporary basis, minimum school facilities for children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty, if such schools in which free public education is usually provided for such children are made unavailable to them as a result of official action by State or local governmental authority and it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children.

(b) Section 10 of such Act is further amended by inserting in lieu thereof the words "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner determines that:

"(1) any school facilities with respect to which payments were made under section 7 of this Act, pursuant to an application approved under section 6 after the enactment of this subsection, are not being used by a local educational agency for the provision of free public education, and if it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide such free public education, and, if such facilities are the property of the United States, such facilities shall be retained and preserved shall, for one year and thereafter until the period within which such applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote at an appropriate election shall constitute contempt of court.

"An application for an order pursuant to this subsection shall be heard within ten days, and the execution of any order disposing of such application shall not be stayed if the effect of such stay would be to delay the effectiveness of the order beyond the date of any election at which the applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote.

"Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of State or local law, any State officer or court, an applicant so declared qualified to vote shall be permitted to vote at any election that the court heretofore specified had no local educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide such free public education for such children.

"Such arrangements may also be made to provide, on a temporary basis, minimum school facilities for children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty, if such schools in which free public education is usually provided for such children are made unavailable to them as a result of official action by State or local governmental authority and it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide such free public education, and, if such facilities are the property of the United States, such facilities shall be retained and preserved shall, for one year and thereafter until the period within which such applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote at an appropriate election shall constitute contempt of court.

[section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637), is amended as follows:

"(a) Add the following as subsection (e) and designate the present subsection (e) as subsection (f):

"In any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) in the event the court finds that such deprivation was or is purposefully made or at an election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote at any election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote.

Upon receipt of such report, the court shall cause the Attorney General to transmit a copy thereof to the State attorney general or to the party to such report, together with an order to show cause within ten days, or such shorter time as the court determines is necessary.

"(b) Add the following as subsection (f) and designate the present subsection (f) as subsection (g):

"In any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) in the event the court finds that such deprivation was or is purposefully made or at an election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote at any election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote.

Upon receipt of such report, the court shall cause the Attorney General to transmit a copy thereof to the State attorney general or to the party to such report, together with an order to show cause within ten days, or such shorter time as the court determines is necessary.

"(c) Such proceedings shall be commenced at the request of the party to such report, and the person of such race or color resident within the affected area shall, for one year and thereafter until the period within which such applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote at an appropriate election shall constitute contempt of court.

"An application for an order pursuant to this subsection shall be heard within ten days, and the execution of any order disposing of such application shall not be stayed if the effect of such stay would be to delay the effectiveness of the order beyond the date of any election at which the applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote.

"Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of State or local law, any State officer or court, an applicant so declared qualified to vote shall be permitted to vote at any election at which the court heretofore specified that such deprivation was or is purposefully made or at an election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote at any election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote.

Upon receipt of such report, the court shall cause the Attorney General to transmit a copy thereof to the State attorney general or to the party to such report, together with an order to show cause within ten days, or such shorter time as the court determines is necessary.

"(d) Add the following as subsection (g) and designate the present subsection (g) as subsection (h):

"In any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) in the event the court finds that such deprivation was or is purposefully made or at an election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote at any election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote.

Upon receipt of such report, the court shall cause the Attorney General to transmit a copy thereof to the State attorney general or to the party to such report, together with an order to show cause within ten days, or such shorter time as the court determines is necessary.

"(e) Add the following as subsection (h) and designate the present subsection (h) as subsection (i):

"In any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) in the event the court finds that such deprivation was or is purposefully made or at an election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote at any election or any election at which the applicant was not entitled to vote.

Upon receipt of such report, the court shall cause the Attorney General to transmit a copy thereof to the State attorney general or to the party to such report, together with an order to show cause within ten days, or such shorter time as the court determines is necessary.
may fix, why an order of the court should not be entered in accordance with such report or for the declaration of any exception to such report. Exceptions to matters of fact shall be considered in accordance with any exception to a duly certified copy of a public record or by affidavit of persons having personal knowledge of such facts or by statements or matters contained in such record or the matters to which such record shall be supported by an appropriate memorandum of law. The issues of fact and law raised by such exceptions shall be determined by the court or, if the due and speedy administration of justice requires, they may be presented to the voting referee to determine in accordance with procedures prescribed by the court. A hearing as to an issue of fact shall be held only in the event that the proof in support of the exception discloses the existence of a genuine issue of material fact. The applicants' burden of proof and understanding of other subjects shall be determined solely on the basis of answers included in the report of the voting referee.

Any voting referee appointed by the court pursuant to this subsection shall to the extent not inconsistent herewith have all the powers, depositions and confessions upon a master-builder rule 53(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The compensation to be allowed to such referee shall be set by the court in accordance with the provisions of this subsection. Such compensation may be paid by the United States. The court, in its discretion, may make such order as it may deem necessary. In either case the order shall make appropriate provision for the impanelling of the applicant's ballot pending determination of the applicability of such order.

If any voting referee appointed by the court pursuant to this subsection shall to the extent not inconsistent herewith have all the powers, depositions and confessions upon a master-builder rule 53(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The compensation to be allowed to such referee shall be set by the court in accordance with the provisions of this subsection. Such compensation may be paid by the United States. The court, in its discretion, may make such order as it may deem necessary. In either case the order shall make appropriate provision for the impanelling of the applicant's ballot pending determination of the applicability of such order.

Mr. McCulloch, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the reading continue and at the proper time I shall again make my request.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. Celler (interrupting the reading), Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the engrossed copy of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the removal of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. Willis, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask up to what point the Clerk had read?

The SPEAKER. Page 2, line 30. Mr. McCulloch, Mr. Speaker, I ask further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Ohio amend his request to permit the reading of section 302 and then omit the balance of the reading?

Mr. McCulloch, Mr. Speaker, I suggested the reading continue and at the proper time I shall again make my request.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. Celler (interrupting the reading), Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the engrossed copy be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Pooff, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the motion?

Mr. Pooff, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pooff moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same forthwith back to the House with the following amendment: On page 1, line 11, and on page 2, line 15, strike out "Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force," strike out the words "or by any threatening letter or communication."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Colmer, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Colmer. Do I correctly understand that the motion to recommit contains the provision for the so-called Whitener amendment to section 1 of the bill?

The SPEAKER. That would hardly be a parliamentary inquiry. The Clerk has just read the motion.

Mr. Pooff. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 118, nays 304, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:
Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 311, nays 109, answered "present" 2, not voting 9, as follows:

Mr. Haggerty. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Chipfield]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Chipfield]. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I vote "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join today in voting for the passage of H.R. 8601, the so-called civil
rights bill. In my judgment passage of this legislation today represents a historic legislative milestone of which all Members of this House can be proud. Because of the parliamentary situation in my hands, it is entirely likely that the bill we are passing here today will go onto the statute books in virtually this same form.

Basically this bill does only one thing. Mr. Speaker, and that is to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens of our country regardless of their race, creed, or color. For the first time Congress is about to put upon the books legislation to give real meaning to the 15th amendment to our Constitution. As the distinguished Attorney General of the United States said the other day, either we must take steps now to enforce this amendment and make it a reality or else we should repeal it. Certainly no one, I am sure, would suggest that we ought to do anything more drastic and unfor- tumate than that. And after all, the shouting is over, I am sure that no Member would really want to stand up in this body and say that he wants to oppose legislation that would give people the right to vote regardless of their race, creed, or color.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that we are passing today is, in my judgment, moderate legislation. It represents the very essence of what American democracy should do and still hold up our heads in today’s world as the great exponent of human personal freedom. Personally, I would have preferred to see legislation which went farther in guaranteeing the rights of American citizens in other fields than this bill goes. But at least the right to vote is basic in our system, and in insuring the right to vote we are, in a very real sense, also laying the groundwork for further advances in other directions toward an America in which all citizens will have equal opportuni ty, and the blessings of happiness and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal in the many days in which the House has been debating this legislation about some of the dire effects that might occur if this legislation were adopted. Prankly, I do not believe anyone seri ously thinks that any of these gruesome predictions are likely to develop. In fact, it is my hope that this legislation will accomplish its basic purpose primarily as a preventive rather than a cure. For with this legislation on the books I am sure we will have created an incentive on the part of local officials to make sure that there does not develop the kind of pattern of discrimination that would require invoking the measures provided by this law. Any official who might disapprove of the machinery which is here can always forestall its application to his community simply by seeing to it that men and women are not discriminated against because of their race, creed, or color when it comes to voting.

May I say, finally, Mr. Speaker, that I want to commend all my colleagues, and especially those from the southern area of our country who have been so vigorously opposed to this legislation, for the wonderful job which they have conducted themselves during this debate. I also want to express my great admiration for the splendid job that has been done under the law and others they have conducted themselves during this debate. I also want to express my great admiration for the splendid job that has been done under the law and others they have conducted themselves during this debate. I also want to express my great admiration for the splendid job that has been done under the law and others they have conducted themselves during this debate. I also want to express my great admiration for the splendid job that has been done under the law and others they have conducted themselves during this debate. I also want to express my great admiration for the splendid job that has been done under the law and others they have conducted themselves during this debate.
had no choice but to vote against the measure.

Mr. Speaker, for convenience I include at this point Congressional Record references to the amendments I offered and the remarks I made during the debate on H.R. 8601.

March 10, 1960, remarks on my bill, H.R. 11042, an alternative voting referee proposal, pages 5196 and 5221-5222.

March 14, 1960, my amendment to McCulloch substitute containing substance of H.R. 11042, page 5489.

March 15, 1960, remarks on my amendment to McCulloch substitute and remarks on Kastenmeier amendment, pages 5635-5641, 5655.

March 16, 1960, remarks on O’Hara amendment, pages 5755, 5762, 5779.

March 18, 1960, remarks on my amendment to make ex parte referee proceedings discretionary with the judge rather than mandatory, pages 6010-6011, 6014, 6016; remarks on Judge amendment, H.R. 10189, 6021-6023.

March 21, 1960, remarks on Johnson amendment, pages 6161-6162.

March 22, 1960, remarks on my amendment to alternate referee proposal, pages 6265-6269; remarks on my amendment to permissive ex parte proceedings, pages 6288-6295.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Friday, March 25, 1960, to file reports on general government matters appropriation bill for 1961, and the appropriation for health, education, and welfare.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bills.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the balance of this week there are several resolutions from the Committee on House Administration which will be acted upon right away.

Mr. HALLECK. May I inquire of the gentleman, I understood there were three to be called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand there were several, but I understood they were cleared with the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I had better discuss that with the gentleman later.

Mr. McCORMACK. I announced that there would be three resolutions called up today. I suggest that they wait until Tuesday next to call up any other resolutions.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that would be preferable.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not like matters to be brought up unless the House has had notice that they are coming up. Continuing with the program for next week:

Monday will be District Day, and there are seven bills on the District Calendar: H.R. 10964, to amend the Life Insurance Act of 1934, as amended.

H.R. 10761, indigents, representation in courts.

H.R. 10000, refunds, inheritance taxes.

S. 1159, Alley Dwelling Authority, acquisition of property.

H.R. 10183, amend Fire and Casualty Act.

H.R. 10683, automobile sales, finance charges.


House Concurrent Resolution 582, disposal of surplus stockpile.

S. 1705, Armed Forces promotion and retirement of certain officers.

If any of these other bills are not disposed of on Monday they will follow the appropriation bills.

Tuesday there will be the Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Department appropriation bill for 1961. There are also several privileged matters to be brought up on Tuesday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT’S DISTRIBUTION GUIDE SYSTEM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter under date of March 21, 1960, from the Postmaster General. This letter provides an explanation of the Post Office Department’s distribution guide system. I believe a copy of the letter has been received by every Member of Congress, or will be received, and I strongly recommend that each Member read it carefully and thoughtfully.

I am proud of those improvements in management and efficiency which have been brought about over the years by the continuing cooperation between the Postmaster General and the House. Indeed, the high quality of the great majority of employees in the postal service is an established tradition over many, many years under many administrations.

I know the Postmaster General is right in stating as he does in his letter of March 21, that “we are confident that
the overwhelming majority of post-office employees want to perform a fair day's work for a day's pay."

The distribution guide system deserves a fair trial. I am confident it will receive a fair trial from employees of the postal service. The Post Office Department is strongly on record in the hearings conducted by our subcommittee. The Postmaster General's letter of March 21, that the distribution guide system is eminently fair, that it is based on minimum standards, and that it has demonstrated very substantial savings in actual practice. Testimony received during the hearings disclosed that savings annually in one office would amount to $1 million, and we are told that the system will be installed in the 292 largest post offices.

The reductions recommended by the Appropriations Committee and sustained by the House appear modest indeed when viewed in the light of the approximately $1 million savings reported from just one post office. The saving is expected to be very large indeed. It is evident from the very beginning that the full benefits of such a change could not be realized immediately. We have chosen a moderate course which permits the Post Office Department the necessary latitude and freedom to operate effectively and to proceed in an orderly manner with the installation of the distribution guide system and other aspects of the program to modernize the postal system. These things can be accomplished only in an atmosphere of fairness and willingness to bring about improvements, so I support the Postmaster General in his plea for objectivity in regard to the distribution guide system.

The letter follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.


Hon. J. VAUGHN GARY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Members of Congress are receiving letters of employee organizations. None of those letters has been in your possession. I believe it will be helpful both to you and to the Department to give you a complete explanation of what is involved in that program.

The distribution guides are minimum rates of performance in terms of number of pieces of mail processed per minute and per hour provided for the information and guidance of individual employees. The rates are applicable only to the time during which the employee is actually engaged in processing the mail.

The distribution guides were first published in the Postal Bulletin of November 20, 1959. A copy of the Postal Bulletin notice is attached. The notice shows the rates of performance and clearly sets forth the Department's reasons for publishing these guides. Apparently, because no system was previously in existence, the changes could be implemented without loss of production. Publication of the performance guides had little or no effect in most offices. Some employees expressed surprise when they first heard of them. However, at Brooklyn, N.Y., after several weeks of intensive study and conferences with officials of employees' local organizations, the postmaster instituted a system of recording individual employee performance and notifying each employee every day of the production rate attained by him on the previous day. The program was placed in operation early in March 1959, immediately resulted in a phenomenal increase in production in the Brooklyn post office.

The guides do not purport to define performance but rather the minimum amount of work an employee should accomplish during the time he is actually engaged in performing the respective mail handling functions.

The guides system recognizes that employees are different in the particular mail handling operations. Among other duties, a certain amount of time is needed by the employee to obtain the mail for distribution and to deliver the mail which he has distributed. It is also necessary that the employee absent himself from his post of duty from time to time for personal reasons. The employee is not expected to itemize the reasons for lapses in actual distribution but he is required to record the period of such lapses under the general heading of "Non Distribution Time." We in the Department have been well aware from the beginning that if the guides program was to have a beneficial effect the rates of performance had to be entirely fair and reasonable. Before the guides were published, they were reviewed by a number of people who had long years of mail handling experience. The lowest acceptable performance rate for employees was established for the guide system. None of those who reviewed the guides expressed any opinion other than unanimously fair and reasonable, and some expressed the opinion that they were too low.

The employees' representatives generally have welcomed the distribution guides as published. They, however, have endorsed the guides as they are published.

The question has been raised as to whether there is any real need for the distribution guide system in the postal service. As a result of our investigation of the claims of the employees' local organizations, the Postmaster General has concluded that the system is needed.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of post-office employees want to perform a fair day's work for a day's pay. The distribution guide system merely defines in easily understood terms what the Department considers to be acceptable performance rates. The increases in the production rates of our employees have consistently exceeded the rates in their daily performance. Department statistics indicate that, however, in every post office where the system has been installed, a material increase in productivity has immediately become apparent.

The experience has been made at all levels of management of the postal service to allay any apprehensions which employees might feel relative to the installation of the distribution guide system.

The purpose here is to have the Department with national officers of the employees' organizations before original publication of the distribution guides. Similar conferences were held in advance of implementing the distribution guide system. In every post office where the system is installed, extensive preinstallation conferences are held by regional and departmental officials with the postmaster, supervisors, and employees.

Most careful consideration has been given to every employee complaint against the distribution guide system which has reached the Department. Following are statements of complaints most frequently voiced, followed by the Department's comment with respect to each:

1. The distribution guide system is a speedup system which is injurious to the physical and mental health of the employees. We are confident that the performance rates prescribed by the guides are readily attainable by all employees. However, postmasters and supervisors are instructed to see to it that under no circumstances are they to permit the system to operate to the detriment of any employee who performs his duties in a conscientious manner.

2. The system is especially burdensome on the aged and physically handicapped employees, including disabled veterans. We are confident that the performance rates prescribed by the guides are readily attainable by all employees. However, postmasters and supervisors are instructed to see to it that under no circumstances are they to permit the system to operate to the detriment of any employee who performs his duties in a conscientious manner.

3. Although the existing guides are reasonable, the employees desire to set the requirements to the point where they will become intolerable.

There is no intention of increasing performance rates above the rates prescribed by the guides. For years letter carriers, rural carriers, and custodial employees have operated under definite individual performance criteria. These criteria have not been raised over the years, have been met and exceeded by thousands of employees without harmful effects.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of post-office employees want to perform a fair day's work for a day's pay. The distribution guide system merely defines in easily understood terms what the Department considers to be acceptable performance rates. The increases in the production rates of our employees have consistently exceeded the rates in their daily performance. Department statistics indicate that, however, in every post office where the system has been installed, a material increase in productivity has immediately become apparent.

Also, the very nature of the postal service requires that employees work constantly against time. If we are to provide adequate mail service, every employee engaged in processing the mail needs to have a sense of urgency about the performance of his job. The time available for processing outgoing mail is always very limited if we are to connect dispatches of value and the same is true with respect to incoming mails being processed in time to connect with carrier delivery schedules. Reports from the field show conclusively that under the distribution guide system the mail service is being materially improved.

Every effort has been made at all levels of management of the postal service to allay any apprehensions which employees might feel relative to the installation of the distribution guide system.

The purpose here is to have the Department with national officers of the employees' organizations before original publication of the distribution guides. Similar conferences were held in advance of implementing the distribution guide system. In every post office where the system is installed, extensive preinstallation conferences are held by regional and departmental officials with the postmaster, supervisors, and employees.

Most careful consideration has been given to every employee complaint against the distribution guide system which has reached the Department. Following are statements of complaints most frequently voiced, followed by the Department's comment with respect to each:

1. The distribution guide system is a speedup system which is injurious to the physical and mental health of the employees. We are confident that the performance rates prescribed by the guides are readily attainable by all employees. However, postmasters and supervisors are instructed to see to it that under no circumstances are they to permit the system to operate to the detriment of any employee who performs his duties in a conscientious manner.

2. The system is especially burdensome on the aged and physically handicapped employees, including disabled veterans. We are confident that the performance rates prescribed by the guides are readily attainable by all employees. However, postmasters and supervisors are instructed to see to it that under no circumstances are they to permit the system to operate to the detriment of any employee who performs his duties in a conscientious manner.

3. Although the existing guides are reasonable, the employees desire to set the requirements to the point where they will become intolerable.

There is no intention of increasing performance rates above the rates prescribed by the guides. For years letter carriers, rural carriers, and custodial employees have operated under definite individual performance criteria. These criteria have not been raised over the years, have been met and exceeded by thousands of employees without harmful effects.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of post-office employees want to perform a fair day's work for a day's pay. The distribution guide system merely defines in easily understood terms what the Department considers to be acceptable performance rates. The increases in the production rates of our employees have consistently exceeded the rates in their daily performance. Department statistics indicate that, however, in every post office where the system has been installed, a material increase in productivity has immediately become apparent.

Also, the very nature of the postal service requires that employees work constantly against time. If we are to provide adequate mail service, every employee engaged in processing the mail needs to have a sense of urgency about the performance of his job. The time available for processing outgoing mail is always very limited if we are to connect dispatches of value and the same is true with respect to incoming mails being processed in time to connect with carrier delivery schedules. Reports from the field show conclusively that under the distribution guide system the mail service is being materially improved.

Every effort has been made at all levels of management of the postal service to allay any apprehensions which employees might feel relative to the installation of the distribution guide system.

The purpose here is to have the Department with national officers of the employees' organizations before original publication of the distribution guides. Similar conferences were held in advance of implementing the distribution guide system. In every post office where the system is installed, extensive preinstallation conferences are held by regional and departmental officials with the postmaster, supervisors, and employees.

Most careful consideration has been given to every employee complaint against the distribution guide system which has reached the Department. Following are statements of complaints most frequently voiced, followed by the Department's comment with respect to each:

1. The distribution guide system is a speedup system which is injurious to the physical and mental health of the employees. We are confident that the performance rates prescribed by the guides are readily attainable by all employees. However, postmasters and supervisors are instructed to see to it that under no circumstances are they to permit the system to operate to the detriment of any employee who performs his duties in a conscientious manner.

2. The system is especially burdensome on the aged and physically handicapped employees, including disabled veterans. We are confident that the performance rates prescribed by the guides are readily attainable by all employees. However, postmasters and supervisors are instructed to see to it that under no circumstances are they to permit the system to operate to the detriment of any employee who performs his duties in a conscientious manner.

3. Although the existing guides are reasonable, the employees desire to set the requirements to the point where they will become intolerable.

There is no intention of increasing performance rates above the rates prescribed by the guides. For years letter carriers, rural carriers, and custodial employees have operated under definite individual performance criteria. These criteria have not been raised over the years, have been met and exceeded by thousands of employees without harmful effects.
Nothing could be further from the truth.

The content is ridiculous and is at complete variance with the accurate description of the Department's treatment of its employees. No disciplinary action has been taken and not a single specific employee grievance has arisen as a result of the program. On the other hand, the Department never has and will not in the future countenance improper conduct or deliberate malingering on the part of any employee.

5. The system of determining the number of pieces processed by an individual through linear measurement is unfair because the number of pieces in a linear foot of mail varies according to mix.

Standard rates of conversion of linear measurements of mail to pieces have been arrived at after exhaustive tests. The variation in number of pieces in the regular mix of mail is inconsequential. Whenever there are unusual mailings involved such as Treasury checks, utility bills, periodicals, and the like, provision is made in the guides system for special conversion rates to be applied.

6. The strain on the individual caused by having to meet the guides will cause good employees to leave the service, thus resulting in costly turnover.

There has been no evidence whatever that employees have suffered any ill effects from this program. It has been in effect in Brooklyn, N.Y., where the system has been operating longest, the rate of employee turnover has averaged lower under the guides program than during a comparable period prior to its installation.

7. The system is costly in terms of the manpower required to keep performance records.

Actually, the manpower required to maintain records of performance under the guides program is much less than is required for other work performance systems. We are now developing an integrated system of mail volume and manpower reporting based on the guides system which will result in a net reduction in the number of people who were engaged in such record-keeping before the guides system was installed.

I trust that this letter will serve to provide you with a full explanation of the Department's distribution guides program. I shall be very glad to see that you are supplied with any additional information which you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD
Postmaster General

[First- and second-class post offices, AMFs' and terminals]

GUIDES FOR EMPLOYEES PERFORMING BASIC MAIL HANDLING DUTIES

The chart below lists certain distribution rates to be used by clerks as guides in evaluating their own production and by managers and supervisors in evaluating the production effectiveness of individual employees engaged in these basic mail handling operations. It was prepared in response to numerous requests from the field service for a distribution rate guide.

These guides are not to be considered as substitute work performance standards system which has been installed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of groups of employees working in units or centers. In installations having the revised WP5 system those distribution rates shall be posted in the area of the supervisors and employees concerned.

While it is realized that there are variables in similar operations which affect the rates of production, the tables attached to this report represent the best judgment of the supervisors and employees concerned.

Any clerk who finds that he is not maintaining a satisfactory production rate should carefully examine his methods and procedures and make whatever adjustments are necessary to increase his productivity to an acceptable level.

If the reasonable guidance and counseling an employee demonstrates inability to process his work at a satisfactory rate, the clerk's terminal manager should give consideration to reassigning the employee to duties which he can perform in an acceptable manner. In such cases, if the employee, supervisors must consider not only the rate of production but also the constancy and accuracy of the employee's work. It is important that this be done over a sufficient period so that variations in mail mix, etc., will not lead to unfair conclusions.

(See pt. 715 of Postal Manual.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mail-handling operations</th>
<th>Number of pieces of mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing table:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With bridge</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without protection</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing distribution:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter primary</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter secondary</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat primary</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat secondary</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel post primary</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel post secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming distribution:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter primary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3,000 items</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat primary</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3,000 items</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat secondary</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel post primary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel post secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 144) as for introduction:

Resolved, That Charles A. Vanik, of Ohio, be and is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROMOTION AND INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. Thornberry), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 485, Rept. No. 1417) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 886) providing under section 1(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, the express approval of the Congress for the disposal from the national stockpile of approximately four hundred and seventy thousand long tons of natural rubber. After general debate which shall be confined to the resolution, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It is requested in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or Committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments that have been adopted without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS BY CONTRACTORS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. Marden), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 487, Rept. No. 1419) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10959) relating to the employment of retired commissioned officers by contractors of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces and for other purposes. After general debate which shall be confined to the resolution, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration...
of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House. 1
such amendments as may have been adopted, and the Committee shall be discharged as
considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without interve-
ning motion except one motion to recommit.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHESA-
PEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NA-
TIONAL HISTORICAL PARK
Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on
Rules, reported the following privileged
resolution (H. Res. 468, Rept. No. 1420),
which was referred to the House Calendar
and ordered to be printed:
Resolved, That upon the adoption of this
resolution it shall be in order to move that
the House resolve itself into the Committee
of the Whole House on the State of the
Union for the consideration of the bill
(H. R. 2891) to establish the Chesapeake and
Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and to
provide for the administration and mainte-
inance of a parkway, in the State of Mary-
land, in connection therewith.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker,
I ask unanimous consent to address the
House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my
remarks. I desire to make a few brief points
in connection with the request of the gentleman
from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as the
sponsor of H.R. 11211, a bill designed to
protect the American farmworker and the
family farmer against unfair competi-
tion from imported Mexican labor, I
offered testimony this morning before
the House Subcommittee on Agriculture
which has jurisdiction over this legisla-
tion. Under unanimous consent I in-
clude the text of my testimony at this
point in the record, with the 30-second
limit.

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN FAM-
ILY FARM AND FARMWORKER
Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent to address the House
for 1 minute, to revise and extend my
remarks, and include extraneous matter.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINIS-
TRATION
Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker,
I ask unanimous consent to address the
House for 1 minute and to revise and ex-
tend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speak-
er, the Southeastern Power Administra-
tion, with headquarters in my hometown of
Elberton, Ga., celebrated its 10th an-
iversary on March 21.

The agency has marketed 22 billion
kilowatt-hours and received total reve-
ues of $102,860,000 during the past 10
years as shown by a statement of Secre-
tary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton.

Southeastern Power Administration
sells electric power generated at 11 Corps
of Engineer projects to 134 utility cus-
tomers, most of whom are rural electric
cooperatives and cities which by law are
given preference in the sale of Federal
power.

The 11 operating projects have an in-
stalled capacity of 1,424,000 kilowatts.
In addition, the Corps of Engineers is
currently constructing three multipur-
pose water projects whose aggregate ca-
pacitv will be 590,000 kilowatts.

The operating projects, and those un-
der construction by the Corps of Engi-
neers, are located in Virginia, Georgia,
South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Ten-
nessee, and Kentucky.

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN FAM-
ILY FARM AND FARMWORKER
Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent to address the House
for 1 minute, to revise and extend my
remarks, and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as the
sponsor of H.R. 11211, a bill designed to
protect the American farmworker and the
family farmer against unfair competi-
tion from imported Mexican labor, I
offered testimony this morning before
the House Subcommittee on Agriculture
which has jurisdiction over this legisla-
tion. Under unanimous consent I in-
clude the text of my testimony at this
point in the record, with the 30-second
limit.
While the operation of Public Law 78 has served to weaken the economic position of the family farmer through indirect means, it has very directly depressed the wages and employment opportunities of American farm workers. There has been some public debate recently as to whether and in what manner the presence and number of foreign workers in the United States in such large numbers for every five American farm workers in the farm labor market would inevitably have some effect on job opportunities and wage levels. In the last several years we have watched wages rise in the United States on such a scale that it is self-evident. The presence of even a small number of foreign workers in such a market would potentially adversely affect American farm workers. To my mind it is self-evident. The presence of even a small number of foreign workers in such a market would potentially adversely affect American farm workers.

Recently the Secretary of Labor appointed four prominent consultants to review the administration of Public Law 78. These men were Edward J. Thye, former U.S. Senator from Minnesota, George G. Higgins, director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Rufus B. von Kleinsmid, chancellor of the University of Southern California; and Dr. Kurus B. von Kleinmichel, chancellor of the University of Arizona. In passing, the only one of these consultants from my general region, former Senator Thye, Republican of Minnesota, is not only an esteemed and respected public servant, he was also a leading member of the Senate subcommittee which, with broad and unwavering authority, modified the 1942 legislation and directed the administration of Public Law 78. He was intimately acquainted with its objectives and with its difficulties. His report represents the American labor program in such a way as to permit the Secretary of Labor additional authority to administer it, and to assure that the conditions of special privilege for a small number of foreign workers are in short supply and that the use of such labor when it is to be used as a solution of any skill shortage should be for the purpose of improving their economic condition and not in the best interests of the farmers and agricultural workers of the United States.

The less than 2 percent of our farmers who rely on this labor must be brought to recognize that the law was never intended to be permanent. The intention and philosophy behind it was to provide a temporary stopgap while normal adjustments of production, wages, labor supplies, and the labor force were brought into line. The American people will not tolerate a permanent system of foreign contract labor in agriculture any more than they would in the steel, coal, mining, automobile, transportation, or any other industry.

Recruitment of workers from Mexico began as an emergency measure during World War II. The fact that this program has mushroomed from some 60,000 in 1950-51 to 460,000 now and has become a serious threat to the institution of the family farm and to the institutions of the family farm. I would like to pause those who wish to extend it indefinitely.

My conviction is this: The interest of the family farm is served by elimination of the program much more than by improvement of the protection for domestic workers. Thus, a clear and definite date to terminate it should be established. Yet, complete termination on June 30, 1961, might be inequitable for those groups of Americans whose income is so low that they have permitted themselves to become dependent on Mexican workers; some phasing-out time, time for adjustment, is therefore the way of moderation.

H.R. 11211 establishes this period at 5 years. In my view, however, the precise duration and nature of the phasing-out period of much longer duration than that at least a clear-cut agreement on final termination at a specified time in the future.

The American people are becoming aroused over this system which is so alien to our traditions. This was expressed in a recent resolution of the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A., which read:

"The recent precedent of our Government in authorizing the importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural labor in the United States raises human and ethical issues of grave concern to the conscience of Christian people."

It is the sense of H.R. 11211 that the use of foreign contract labor when it must be permitted to become a substitute for a constructive program to provide decent standards of wages and working conditions for American farm labor and to protect the institutions of the family farm.

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

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

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the prolonged standing ovation given by the House to our colleague "Tad" Walter yesterday at the conclusion of his uniring presiding over our debates on the civil rights bill was certainly a most notable tribute.

The hearts of Pennsylvanians were, indeed, warmed when we witnessed this immigration act. The practice of using foreign contract labor when it is to our advantage, sending it home when it is no longer needed, or desired, denying it the freedom of wage and job choice while in the United States, is a fundamental exploitation and not in the best interests of the farmers and agricultural workers of the United States.

The less than 2 percent of our farmers who rely on this labor must be brought to recognize that the law was never intended to be permanent. The intention and philosophy behind it was to provide a temporary stopgap while normal adjustments of production, wages, labor markets, and the labor force were brought into line. The American people will not tolerate a permanent system of foreign contract labor in agriculture any more than they would in the steel, coal, mining, automobile, transportation, or any other industry.

Recruitment of workers from Mexico began as an emergency measure during World War II. The fact that this program has mushroomed from some 60,000 in 1950-51 to 460,000 now and has become a serious threat to the institution of the family farm and to the institutions of the family farm. I would like to pause those who wish to extend it indefinitely.

My conviction is this: The interest of the family farm is served by elimination of the program much more than by improvement of the protection for domestic workers. Thus, a clear and definite date to terminate it should be established. Yet, complete termination on June 30, 1961, might be inequitable for those groups of Americans whose income is so low that they have permitted themselves to become dependent on Mexican workers; some phasing-out time, time for adjustment, is therefore the way of moderation.

H.R. 11211 establishes this period at 5 years. In my view, however, the precise duration and nature of the phasing-out period of much longer duration than that at least a clear-cut agreement on final termination at a specified time in the future.

The American people are becoming aroused over this system which is so alien to our traditions. This was expressed in a recent resolution of the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A., which read:

"The recent precedent of our Government in authorizing the importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural labor in the United States raises human and ethical issues of grave concern to the conscience of Christian people."

It is the sense of H.R. 11211 that the use of foreign contract labor when it must be permitted to become a substitute for a constructive program to provide decent standards of wages and working conditions for American farm labor and to protect the institutions of the family farm.
spontaneous and deserving appreciation of the sterling performance of our fellow Pennsylvanian, who has displayed not only his usual fairness and parliamentary skill, but permitted us to witness once more his alertness and his courage in meeting the long series of most difficult problems that face a presiding officer of this body. The pride and love with which we look upon "Ted" Walter have been once more augmented by the unanimous manifestation of the House.

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

Mr. Flood. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Willis. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood). The patience and the consideration to all Members and the skill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), who presided over the Committee of the Whole, as a parliamentarian, as well as all of his actions are something to be commended. I think he, above anyone else, deserves credit for keeping the debates and the proceedings of the Committee on an even keel.

Mr. Flood. I thank the gentleman, and the Pennsylvania delegation thanks him also.

STUART SYMINGTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Moulder. Mr. Speaker, our great country and the entire world needs a new era in the test cessation conference of the United Nations, and Senator Stuart Symington has announced his candidacy for this high office. Mr. Speaker, this great man has the ability, integrity, and strong sense of duty to give and provide the effective executive leadership the American people need and deserve to have in the White House. We are justly proud of this great American, Senator Stuart Symington, of Missouri, and his announcement, which I will read into the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON

I wish to announce that I am a candidate for President of the United States.

Our generation has a priceless opportunity to lead mankind to a new era of lasting peace and a better tomorrow.

If our children and our grandchildren are to continue to enjoy the American way of life, the United States must continue to maintain and upgrade the United Nations, and other international arrangements and organizations.

Only a First-rate, first-class, first-place America can reinforce the world's faith in freedom, and secure a just and lasting peace.

This great Nation has the capacity to be a stabilizer of the world and helps make the most of our freedom and unleash the full strength of our free enterprise system for the benefit of all.

In the months ahead I intend to emphasize four major policies:

1. A positive program for peace through negotiation, from a position of relative strength, including a world-wide "Good Trade—Good Neighbor" policy.

2. This program would involve a better foreign service, a realistic economic development both at home and abroad, and an effective campaign to tell the truth about America.

3. A sound public investment program in such fields as education, health, slum clearance, housing, and more efficient and more realistic benefits for the elderly and disabled.

4. A sound program to reverse the present trend through the elimination of the family size quota and help him attain a standard of living comparable to other Americans.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Van Zandt. Mr. Speaker, for over 16 months the British and United States representatives have argued the Soviet proposals at the Geneva conference on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons testing.

From the very beginning the Soviets have made clear their position and from this they have never budged:

First. They have insisted on a total and immediate ban on all testing.

Second. They have treated the inspection system as being something that can be worked out at leisure.

Third. They have tried to brush away the technical limitations of inspection.

Fourth. They would have us buy the test ban and worry about details of inspection afterward.

On March 19 the Soviets publicized and put forth what they claim as a new proposal. They have ballyhooed this as a great concession and one capable of breaking the deadlock. Yet it is obvious from a brief study of their proposition it represents no concession. It is one more attempt to force us into a total ban no matter the technical capability of detection, nor the degree of inspection they will allow in their country.

As you will remember the United States has for many months attempted to reach agreement on a treaty which would, as near as possible, subject only to the condition that all its aspects must be capable of adequate monitoring.

We have established that tests in the atmosphere can be inspected and identified by technical means, but there is a serious question as to latitude and with certain limitations.

We have established too, however, that the problem of monitoring underground tests, although it is possible, subject only to the condition that all its aspects must be capable of adequate monitoring.

The Soviets have responded by claiming to accept the threshold principle and even the threshold value we propose. Yet they have conditioned this acceptance with limitations which make it meaningless. They accept only if there is a simultaneous agreement to do away with all current and future tests of less than that threshold value.

As they will, however, by the limitations of detection and inspection, would not be forbidden initially by the treaty. Joint research would be undertaken to determine the possibility of lowering the threshold as seismic detectability improved.

The Soviets have responded by claiming to accept the threshold principle and even the threshold value we propose. Yet they have conditioned this acceptance with limitations which make it meaningless. They accept only if there is a simultaneous agreement to do away with all current and future tests of less than that threshold value. Along with this they continue to indicate they will accept only the most limited and inadequate onsite inspection for investigations of doubtful significance. They continue to insist on a total ban and inadequate inspection.

I was convinced on my trips to Geneva to observe the conference that the Soviets were interested in a ban but only if no real penetration of their country was involved. I was convinced also, that as long as we continue our moratorium while discussions proceed, they are achieving in major part our objective.

We are now entering into a new era in disarmament negotiations, one in which the power of the United States is considering many possible areas of agreement. The recent conduct of the Soviets in the test cessation conference was far from promising in regard to real progress in these negotiations. It would be tragic in my opinion for us to agree to a test moratorium treaty with the type of arrangements the Soviets want, and subject ourselves to limitations in this area which were inadequately controlled. Moreover, it would furnish precedent for similar agreements on trust in other, perhaps even more critical areas.
AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. 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 CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Commission is conducting hearings on limiting the imports of lamb and mutton. On the first day of the hearings, last Tuesday, March 22, 1960, I appeared before the Commission.

I wish to call my remarks to the attention of the House. I believe a reasonable trade policy offers a realistic solution to our agricultural problem on a sound economic basis. This is needed and would correct similar conditions in other industries now and would prevent such situations developing and getting out of hand in the future.

I hope the Tariff Commission has introduced general legislation which would accomplish this. I again urge that it be favorably considered.

Mr. Speaker, remarks to the Tariff Commission were as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, it is quite fitting that I should follow the representative of Senator Junnson. Wyoming is second only to Texas in production of sheep and wool. It is extremely important to our area, but it is also important to the nation at large.

May I, at the outset, express my thanks and, I am sure, the thanks of almost all of the people of the State of Wyoming, which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, to the Tariff Commission for having instituted, after application, this investigation under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, on its own motion to determine whether the imports of wool or sheep and lambs are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actually or potentially, or in such a manner, as to cause injury to the domestic industry producing like, or directly competitive, products.

Outstanding representatives from the producing and feeding industries are here to present you with the detailed facts and circumstances which I am sure will fully justify your finding that such is the case and recommending appropriate action under the same section 7. I would like to cover this in a general fashion.

May I first of all suggest to the Commission that there can be no doubt that anything which would even tend to lessen the production of the wool and feeding industry would do serious injury. Congress has many times, particularly since World War II, recognized the importance of the industry. The last two of these were in the passing of the National Wool Act of 1954 and its extension to the Agricultural Act of 1958 that had to do with wool, but wool, of course, comes only from sheep. The market for wool is relatively small, and inextricably tied to the market for and the production of lamb and mutton.

By declaration in both the Congress, the Tariff Commission has declared that the annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds of wool, grown in Wyoming and in the national security and the promotion of the general economic welfare of the country. This goal has never been achieved.

Under the National Wool Act, incentive payments are made to the producers from the duty on wool. Under section 706 of the act, the producers may, by vote, authorize a deduction from these payments for the purpose of developing and maintaining the necessary numbers for wool, mohair, sheep or goats, or the products thereof. This they have done, and a large portion of the money has been used to promote the sale of lamb and mutton, so as to thereby increase the market at a favorable price and to the accomplishment of the purposes of the act.

In spite of their efforts, they are now faced with huge increases in imports. They have also been facing large increases in imports. They have also been facing large increases in ranching and feedlots, and there are no indications that this trend will be reversed.

In that regard, I sincerely hope that this investigation will be completed and that the Commission will recommend the appropriate action in a favorable manner.

May I, at the conclusion of the House, express my thanks and those of the people of my State to the Commission for their action in looking into this important matter. I believe a realistic solution to this problem is necessary to the survival of the domestic industry and for the economic welfare of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the imports of wool and mutton reduced to a reasonable level. I believe that the imports of wool and mutton should be limited to the amount that can be handled by the domestic industry with the wool and cattle figures to be presented to you by Mr. Thomson show conclusively that the imports of wool and mutton have increased to the point where they are becoming the largest, even importing mutton of the world's second largest agricultural producer.

This is particularly true in the case of the United States, where the imports of mutton and lamb of over 4 million pounds have been increased from 3.5 million pounds of lamb and mutton to 56.5 million pounds. Since 1917, imports of live sheep have increased from 17,532 head to 75,073 head in 1959. This simply means that in 2 years, the imports of packaged lamb have increased from over 1,600,000 to 5,000,000, and the live imports of mutton have increased by 225 million pounds.

This is grounds for relief under section 7(b) of the act.

Figures to be presented to you by producers and feeders will show conclusively that this has adversely affected both prices and profits, as to both the producer and the feeder.

A fact sheet of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Services, published in January 1960, showed that the United States, second largest agricultural importer, and threatens to become the largest, even importing more than the United Kingdom. This same fact sheet further shows that the import of supplemental or, competitive, commodities have jumped from two-thirds of total agricultural imports to one-half. I quote from the publication:

"In the past 2 years, supplementary imports have increased to one-half of total agricultural imports due to expanded purchases of cattle and mutton."

May I, at this point, refer to the consideration being given by the cattle industry in seeking similar relief to that requested in this proceeding. In that regard, I sincerely hope that this investigation will be completed and, after hearing, proper relief granted.

Rising imports of mutton and mutton of cattle cannot be divorced. The two coupled together make the situation even worse.

Unless something is done about this, there is every reason to believe, the equipping of ships on down, that it will continue to the point that it completely breaks the market for wool, and the producing mutton of our American producers and feeders at the same time, thus making an already bad agricultural situation in this country could be very well break the American economy.

The statement of some supposedly intelligent people that this will take care of itself, because as prices are driven down and the attractiveness of our markets removed, the imports will naturally decline, is an astute mistake. The American wool and mutton producer and the beef producers and feeding industries knows that prices have an elasticity, and that even on the basis of the most basic index, with the indices of a fair profit on investment has generally not been possible.

The importation of mutton and mutton does not exist in a vacuum. It is a part of our overall agricultural picture. Yourselves and everyone in this country who are threatened by the economic conditions and problems that face us in this regard. According to the figures furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, the imports of mutton and lamb commencing June 30, 1959, were the equivalent of 1,075,000 head of sheep. Figuring 4 acres of western grazing land required to run one sheep, which is a most conservative figure, that represents the replacement of over 4,300,000 acres of grazing land in the United States.

It is suggested that producers of sheep are being driven down into pasture on dry farm land, irrigated farm land or top farm land. All would be substantial. In addition, land is required for pasture, and both for sheep and goats. It is suggested that producers of stocks all over the Nation are threatened. Your investigators will confirm this.

On the basis of increased imports for the past 6 months of calendar year 1959, it appears that the Western States and the range lands would jump to almost 6 million acres. This, of course, is greatly further aggravates the existing situation, and the rising imports of beef and cattle.

We have only so many acres in the United States that can be used to produce food and fiber. The American farmer is already in overproduction. It cannot be denied that imports of foreign agricultural products, either directly or indirectly, are endangering the production of acres in this country. We will be aggravating it instead of solving it. If we permit these imports to increase, we cannot survive the unfair competition from abroad based on lower wages and prices.

Total imports of agricultural products for 1959 exceeded $4.1 billion. Total exports amounted to $3.7 billion, but of this, $1.3 billion were shipped away by other countries, and about $2 billion were shipped away by one device or another, so that the amount sold for dollars amounted to only $2.4 billion. Of this, $700 million of dollars of this was sold mostly from CCC stocks at less than domestic market price. Therefore, our agricultural exports on a sound economic basis totaled only $1.6 billion, whereas the imports of foreign goods were over $3 billion.

Various schemes, all at the taxpayers' expense, have been tried to meet our agricultural problem from high price supports to federal insurance to the purchase of surpluses and utilization of soil bank. The soil bank and the acreage restrictions are direct recognition of the inter-relationship of agricultural products and the fact that it is an acreage problem.

Other schemes, all at the taxpayers' expense, have been tried, from direct cash payments up and down to the belief that if the federal government would or would place the American farmer in a straitjacket of poverty, but be extremely valuable. It has been found that by trying to do something about this on a sound economic basis, the Federal Government could do far more to alleviate the economic situation of the agricultural economy of this country from being destroyed by increased foreign imports produced under conditions of foreign competition.

March 24
Let us look at the other side of the coin. The American taxpayer is paying for foreign aid to raise the standard of living of the underdeveloped and undernourished countries. Included in this is Public Law 480. At the same time, when we allow food which would go to help, to be imported into this country, we are taking away from the very people we are trying to help. A large portion of our agricultural products disposed of under the foreign aid program goes to the market and enters the American economy. It is true that the American taxpayer was given some consideration. It is true that the right hand starts paying attention to this situation. We cannot continue to take away the American farmers' and ranchers' production by export and give away American agricultural products to those from whose mouths we have taken the food that should have gone to them, and hope to ever solve the agricultural problem on a sound economic basis, or for that matter, hope for this country to survive economically.

Amending House Resolution 148
Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 457 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:
Resolved, That H. Res. 148, Eighty-sixth Congress, first enacted on February 24, 1959, is hereby amended by striking out $800,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $750,000.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Committee on Education and Labor
Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 441 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:
Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1959, the further expenses of the studies and investigations pursuant to H. Res. 147 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittees, not to exceed $168,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses incurred for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:
Page 1, line 1, strike out "1959" and insert "1960".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Committee on Government Operations
Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:
Resolved, That the further expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(9) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $400,000 including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, which shall be charged against the appropriations of the Committee on Government Operations, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committee may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will tell us how much this makes the total amount available to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is $1,040,000, about $353,000 less than the committee received in the 85th Congress.

Mr. SCHENCK. It has been brought to my attention that there will be a hearing held in California on some subject under its jurisdiction by the Committee on Government Operations, and that for some reason the minority and the majority were not to be bidden.

Does the gentleman have any information on that? They certainly would seem to have a sufficient amount of money to take care of that.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations to answer that question.

Mr. DAWSON. May I say to the gentleman that it has not been customary for a minority or any member of the committee and it was not done in this case. Usually we permit a staff member to go with the committee when the minority leader is going, because of his illness. We have always done that. Otherwise we do not. That is the way the committee has always been run. We have saved the Government lots of money. I think that the advantage of this is that every Member of the House is not permitted to send a minority or any member of the committee.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I say that certainly no one is indicating that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations is anything but fair in his relationship with the committee. The point that was raised was that this is a rather important hearing and that it may develop some very important information. The minority felt they should have a minority counsel accompany that committee. This resolution allows the majority or any member of the committee. I wonder if there was any lack of money and if that is the reason for not sending the counsel on this occasion.

Mr. DAWSON. No, it is not the lack of money, because the amount asked for the committee is based on the operations of the committee. This is just the customary operation of the committee. We extend every courtesy to every man on that committee regardless of party.
Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Maryland will yield further, when we took this matter of the various committee appropriations up in our Committee on House Administration, there was a very splendid résumé of the savings that had been achieved through the operations of the Committee on Government Operations. I wonder if the chairman will feel it is proper to place that list in the Record with such additional information as he may feel is warranted.

Mr. FRIEDEL. In reply to the gentleman's question, and your request that this information be placed in the Record, I talked to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Dawson) and this I believe was inserted in the Record of March 17 on St. Patrick's Day, and it is to be found on page 5917. There is a complete breakdown in the Record of the savings of the Committee on Government Operations that had previously been filed with the Committee on House Administration.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations just a moment ago about this matter of minority counsel at this particular subcommittee hearing. I would just like to say for the record, I agree with the gentleman that he has been fair and I find no quarrel with that. As a matter of getting the record, I understand it. I am one of many of us that what is proposed out there is a sort of replay of the hearing at which there was developed some very substantial political overtones and the only way to build up the worth of minority counsel is because if that is what is to be done again, then I think the minority is entitled to have somebody on there besides a minority Member of the House.

Mr. DAWSON. I assure my distinguished friend of many years that we do not go into matters because of political implications. We go into matters because we feel expenditures may have been made in an unfair way. If the gentleman will permit me to say so, certainly, we would never conduct the committee in such a purpose, putting into things from the standpoint of politics. The Republican member on that subcommittee was the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Huffman). He would not go and he asked me to permit the minority counsel of the full committee to go. I said if it was all right with his side, for him to go instead of sending another Member of the Congress, that would be all right. He said the Congressmen were busy and I consented to that. Then, later they changed their minds again and decided to send a member of the committee instead of the counsel. Of course, that is all right. That has been the normal procedure, and what we are doing here is strictly in accordance with the procedure that we have always adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, just to conclude my part in this colloquy, I want to call this to the attention of the House. After that hearing several years ago, the minority said the following:

'The hearing was a forum provided at the taxpaying citizens' expense for a campaign oratory during the closing weeks of a political campaign, and its chief result was the unwarranted abuse of a constitutional witness for the Department of the Interior.'

Mr. Speaker, that minority report was signed by 13 very fair and able Members of the House of Representatives. And that is the only reason I raised the question at this time.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yield.

Mr. NELSON. I would like to make inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Dawson) relative to this committee. Is this the same type of investigation as the so-called Chudoff committee? Is this the same type of investigation as the so-called Chudoff committee?

Mr. DAWSON. No, it is not the same committee.

Mr. NELSON. Was the Chudoff committee a regular committee?

Mr. DAWSON. The Chudoff committee was a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Of course, as the gentleman knows, Mr. Chudoff was no longer with us, he is a judge in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, I understand. But I am making this inquiry because it has been suggested that there have been political overtones here. I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when I was Administrator of theREA I was investigated by this same committee; and, if ever I was involved in a political circus and the only way to build up the worth of minority counsel is because if that is what is to be done again, then I think the minority is entitled to have somebody on. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. With reference to the hearing contemplated for the west coast, would the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Dawson) intend to send out?

Mr. DAWSON. We expect to send enough people to do a good job.

Mr. HOEVEN. How many staff members?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know. Perhaps two. Sometimes we send a man to a certain place and we will have him go into another job. Certainly you have to have men to do the job. You have to use capable men to have them do a good job and they have to be on the job. I submit to you we have always under­taken to do a good job.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the minority report that has been referred to, after the meeting held in 1956, that certainly the minority should be represented on the staff?

Mr. DAWSON. The minority is represented on the staff. Not only the minority, a person in that staff have been given them extra ones to help them. They have more than is allowed by law. We have given them a staff. Of course they are charging it up to one of the subcommittees, but I have assigned them to the minority side to work with them regularly. They are at their service.
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I am sorry this is brought up in this way because it was not intended to be. We have not had that kind of feeling at any time.

Mr. HOEVEN. The thing that disturbs me is the report that was made by the minority.

Mr. DAWSON. Is that the Chudoff report?

Mr. HOEVEN. It indicates that there were political overtones.

Mr. DAWSON. I could likewise charge the minority.

The Speaker. The Chair calls for the regular order. The regular order is, is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $400,000 including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittee within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee or subcommittee by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committee may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF MAHONEY AGAINST SMITH

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration and pursuant to clause 20 of rule XI, I call up House Resolution 482, relative to the contested election case of Mahoney against Smith, Sixth Congressional District of the State of Kansas, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Wint Smith was duly elected as Representative from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Kansas in the Eighty-sixth Congress and is entitled to his seat.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"UNCLE SAM"

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to halt what might prove to be a grave injustice to one of America's most illustrious citizens, I rise in protest against an impending legislative proposal. As your Honor is aware, there are steps under consideration which would honor Troy, N.Y., with a shrine as a mark of respect for a man that community claims as the first "Uncle Sam."

In Indiana, and particularly in the district I represent, our people know that buried in a quaint and interesting little cemetery at Merriam, rest the mortal remains of the Nation's original

"Uncle Sam." It is the body of Samuel Wilson who died on March 7, 1878, at the age of 100 years and 3 days.

Here in this body lay the claim that this Samuel Wilson was the original "Uncle Sam" whose interesting life and individuality became the patriotic caricature of the tall figure in the top hat and red and white, and blue stars that became known throughout the world, depicting freedom and liberty.

A little crossroads country store at Merriam still bears the legend of his individuality and carries the message of his existence for all to see. The people of northern Indiana grew up to honor and respect the historical significance and tradition created by "Uncle Sam" Wilson, of Merriam.

To prove our contention, we had definite records and information about him and how he achieved the recognition as "Uncle Sam." To begin with, Samuel Wilson, one of triplets, two boys and a girl, was born in Wilmington, Del., March 4, 1778. When he grew to manhood, as a boy, he and his brother joined the Lewis and Clark Northwest expedition which he accompanied to a point in North Dakota. Afterward, they returned to their family in N. Y. at Elberton.

Samuel went to work for a Mr. Eiber Anderson.

During the War of 1812, Anderson's store served as a Government agency furnishing supplies to the Army. The marking and examining these Government supplies, Samuel Wilson used to write the initials "E.A.-U.S." on them; the initials were for Anderson's store and the "U.S." for Uncle Sam as he had been nicknamed by that time. Through the shipment of these goods, when the initials were identified all, Samuel Wilson became the popular "Uncle Sam." His tall, spare figure and whiskered face, of the Lincoln type, was then marked for posterity, and it became the subject of artists and was discussed in print and by word of mouth.

After the war, "Uncle Sam" Wilson migrated west. He married a Pennsylvania girl and then drifted on to Indiana. He died March 7, 1878, in Indiana and was buried in the Merriam cemetery.

The people of the United States, I believe, owe a debt of gratitude to this "Uncle Sam" for the outstanding contribution he made to our history and patriotism. Furthermore, I urge that we pay proper respect to him and his survivors by recognizing that he is the original "Uncle Sam" and that he deserves this honor.

I include herewith some accounts of "Uncle Sam" taken from Indiana newspapers:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Feb. 20, 1928]

Grave of Original Uncle Sam Found in Noble County, Ind.—KENDALLVILLE NEWS-PAPERVERMAN Visits 95-Year-Old Hoosier, Who Will Tell How Father's Nickname Came To Represent the United States

KENDALLVILLE, Ind., February 28.—A woman's intuition and her love of patriotic history has made it a matter of the last resting place of the original "Uncle Sam," whom admiring millions of Americans have held in worshipful esteem.

Our histories and encyclopedias have given us a more or less mythical account of the origin of this character in our Nation's history, but no authentic record has hitherto been disclosed of the identity of the man, where he lived and died and how it was about.

A chance remark came to the ears of Mrs. Louise B. Young, of Kendallville, associated with the Noble Farmer, an agricultural publication. Her nose for news scented a story, and, having her camera set up for the facts and obtained a picture of the tombstone erected at the grave of "Uncle Sam," Miss Young made a little, obscure graveyard near Merriam, Noble County, Ind. the Route of the Lincoln Highway. The stonemason made a mistake in 1815 in the carving of the tombstone and the name that was recut, as the family hoped at some time to erect a monument fitting the character it represented.

BOX IS VISITED

Visiting the son, John M. Wilson, 93 years old, and his granddaughter, Mrs. Clea Zumpfer, both living at Ation, the following facts were obtained and fully verified:

Samuel Wilson, one of triplets—two boys and one girl—who was born at Wilmington, Del., March 4, 1778. Samuel died on March 7, 1878. He was the brother of Mary Wilson, who came to America from Scotland. There were no other children in the family.

Growing to manhood there, Samuel with his brother joined the Lewis and Clark Expedition. They were political overtones.

In Indiana, and particularly in the district I represent, our people know that buried in a quaint and interesting little cemetery at Merriam, rest the mortal remains of the Nation's original "Uncle Sam."
Cumberland County. To this union 10 children were born—7 boys and 3 girls, as follows: Noah, David, Andrew, Samuel, Anthony, James, John, Mary, Angelina, and Lucinda.

By trade and profession Uncle Sam was a tailor and a thing both are on loan now has a guise that was used by Uncle Sam to alleviate the suffering of his patients, in the old days when Indiana among strangers they resolved to and kept the identity of(ciucusko Merriam where it now prototype of that picturesque personification carries an inscription referring to which when followed brought the above
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ROBISON. March 24

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED: WHAT'S A GOOD ANSWER, MR. PRESIDENT? The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I attempted to hold off a tough

QUESTIONNAIRE ON IMPORTANT NATIONAL ISSUES SENT TO RESIDENTS OF THE 39TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTER TAG] may extend his remarks in the body of the Record and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTER TAG. Mr. Speaker, this year I distributed a questionnaire on important national issues to a cross section of residents in the 39th Congressional District of New York, which I am privileged to represent. The district includes that portion of the city of Rochester and Monroe County which lies west of the Genesee River, and Orleans, Geneseo, and Wyoming Counties.

Replies to the questionnaires were submitted by 5,154 persons, and the tabulations of results furnishes some very interesting and significant information. For example, an overwhelming majority of replies favored a balanced budget and a reduction in farm price supports. By lesser margins the replies supported an increase in the Federal minimum wage standard and a continuation of foreign aid programs.

There was strong opposition to admitting Communist China to the United Nations. A majority also opposed stronger Federal regulation of radio and television programs and Federal aid to support public schools.

Other questions dealt with space exploration, social security, interest rates, relations with Russia and the choice for the next President of the United States.

A complete tabulation of the results is listed below in percentages of the total number of replies:

### Questionnaire Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you favor a balanced Federal budget as a means to maintain a stable economy and check inflation?</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Should the United States pay directly its share of the costs and risks of space exploration?</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you favor Federal aid to the States and communities for the support of public schools?</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Should the Congress enact legislation to reduce the present Federal minimum wage standard and a balanced Federal budget?</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you favor enactment of legislation to provide for stronger Federal regulation of radio and television programs?</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>und</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shoulefsocial security law be amended to (a) raise the present annual $1,000 ceiling on earnings for insured persons?</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>und</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you favor the Federal minimum wage raising the present minimum rate of $1 an hour to $1.25?</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replies to the War of 1812 Wilson's attachment to two different newspapers that appeared in two different days several years ago about this same gravemarker that they both refer to the date of death as being March 7, 1878. That obviously is a 3-year discrepancy with the date on the stone itself but one of the articles explained that by saying the stone-cutter made that error which had not been corrected because the family at that time hoped to erect one thing more fitting. Perhaps some highlights from the material contained in those articles might be of interest. For one thing, that Samuel Wilson was born at Wilmington, Del., March 4, 1778, and was one of triplets—two boys and one girl.

Samuel and his brother joined the Lewis and Clark expedition in 1804 and traveled with it until it reached the spot that now is the site of Mandan, N. Dak. There the brothers spent the winter, returning to St. Louis, Mo., the following spring.

Eventually Samuel made his way to Troy, N.Y., where he and a man named Elbert Anderson owned and ran a store. The War of 1812 saw that store become a Government supply headquarters, with Anderson as the commissary and Wilson as quartermaster. Included among the duties that fell upon Wilson was that of examining and marking all the packages designed for Government use. The identification mark was—"E.A.—U. S.—I am trusted to Elbert Anderson. It wasn't long before associates started calling Wilson "Uncle Sam." It is not made entirely clear how that began but one point is of interest in that respect.

It is said that once a longshoreman, asked what those initials—"E.A.—U. S."—meant, came back with this answer, obviously meant as a joke: "For Elbert Anderson, the commissary, and Uncle Sam, his superintendent, for he and the United States are all one. He represents the Government, too."

JOKE CREATE NATIONAL SYMBOL

Regardless of the fact that it was intended as a joke that name quickly took hold and Wilson afterward was known as Uncle Sam. Since then, too, "Uncle Sam" has been known everywhere as the personification of our Government.

Wilson had some thrilling experiences being on the U.S. Constitution in the battle in which it sank the Guerriere.

At his honorable discharge Wilson got two lands from Government. Both of these, which he disposed of to others, were for Indiana land.

Following the War of 1812 Wilson married a Pennsylvania girl and to that union 10 children—7 boys and 3 girls—were born.
question from one of my sons with the remark "That's a good question." It did not work. His response was, "What's a good answer, Dad."

The President, through Arthur S. Flemming, his Secretary of Health, Educa­tion and Welfare, has, in effect, said in effect, that what to do about medical care for the aged is a good question. Secretary Flemming said yesterday:

All the administration has endorsed is the exploration.

We know it is a good question. What the President and people want to know is what is a good answer. Many of us think that the Forand bill — H.R. 4700 — is a good answer, maybe not the best but certainly the best we have seen so far.

Yesterday Secretary Flemming told the Ways and Means Committee that the administration had decided it was necessary to "explore further some complex issues" before devising "principles of a proposed social security bill." I suggest that it is plain that Secretary Flemming, who recognizes the need, was overruled by the President and by Republican leaders who do not recognize the need. The Committee is thoroughly concerned with the care for the aged but of Old Guard reactionary prejudice.

It is good to know that the House Ways and Means Committee is presently considering with reporting out a Social Security bill for 1960. I am one of many Members of Congress who believe that among its provisions should be found the kind of protection against hospital and nursing home costs for our citizens and beneficiaries which is contained in the Forand bill.

This proposal extends the scope of our social security system by paying for these costs from the self-financing social security fund, using reimbursement methods closely related to those now used by plans such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

The Year of Illness

It is, I believe, no exaggeration to say that the health care of an expensive illness lies deep in the heart of our older men and women. Too often, we know, they are unable to purchase the kind of protection they need, because of their lowered retirement income. In 1960, 60 percent of people aged 65 and over had less than $1,000 a year in net income.

This concern is not limited to our senior citizens, but is shared by their married sons and daughters who, with heavy family responsibilities of their own, are disturbed by the fact that they cannot always help their parents meet these costs to the degree that they would wish to do so. All evidence shows, moreover, the pressing need for better and more adequate medical care for people in this age group.

We have become so embroiled in a discussion of how best to take care of this crucial problem that we have, too frequently, lost sight of what the problem is. We have been told, on the one hand, that some kind of protection should be provided through the development of voluntary plans for this purpose, by limiting Government action to people who have been subjected to the needs test of our public assistance programs, or by voluntary low-fee schedules set at the individual discretion of doctors.

The Forand bill has been attacked as a step toward socialized medicine, disregarding the fact that the bill's benefits would be provided through the development of a discussion of how best to take care of lower retirement income. In 1958, the pressing need for better and more protection they need, because of their always help their parents meet these costs from the self-financing social security bill for the aged.

For and bill.

WIDE SUPPORT FOR FORAND BILL

In some 25 years of experience with this plan we have learned that this method provides a self-respecting form of protection against the loss of earnings caused by retirement, premature death of the wage-earner, and crippling disability. I am convinced that it is time to extend it to provide similar protection against the threat of loss to medical expense. The Forand bill is a carefully considered piece of legislation which has been before the Congress for 4 years now. It provides better support for organized labor, most senior citizen groups, and public welfare officials — including two former Commissioners of Social Security under this administration. It deserves our serious consideration of its merits, and our support.

It is reassuring to note that the present administration at long last has begun to recognize that the need for better care for our senior citizens is available at a price they can afford to pay. This is a problem which will not disappear through wishful thinking or interdepartmental committees. But I have been impressed by the ability of this conflicting and confusing stories appearing in the press during the past year, and particularly the past month, as to the administration's shifting solutions to the problem. Allow me to review for you some of the statements and pronouncements which have appeared during this period.

First of all, it may be noted that, in reporting the 1963 amendments to the Social Security Act, the Committee on Ways and Means expressed its great concern with the problem of providing for the aged and the aged and the aged. The administration made no statement that it might be possible to finance the cost of this problem, but the, administration had in mind provisions covering only catastrophic illness among the aged, and that the Department's staff was working on

Many of us hoped that, at this time, he would come up with a firm policy which the Congress could explore. Again we were disappointed when the Secretary of Ways and Means came up with no specific proposal and, for, one, was gratified that the able Senator [Mr. F. E. Forand] expressed his concern over the fact that the report itself had been "delayed and delayed," together with his conviction that "if this Congress was interested in trying to find a solution for this problem had been devoting his time to finding a solution rather than fighting a bill that I introduced 3 years ago, in the time we would have a solution by now."

The Secretary did, however, make one positive statement in his appearance at this time before the Committee on Ways and Means. He took the position that the objective "of making adequate medical care reasonably available to our aged population should, so far as possible, be achieved by a program of social insurance as part of a program that provides a self-respecting family assistance plan, but no mention was made of the health needs of the aged.

Meanwhile, letters from our older men and women continued to pour into congressional offices, urging consideration of the Forand bill. During the hearings conducted last fall throughout the country, by the Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging of the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, older men and women appeared repeatedly to state that their greatest worry was how they could manage to finance the cost of an extended illness. They were self-respecting men and women, proud of their present self-sufficiency, but greatly concerned by the fact that expensive medical care would wipe out their savings and force them to accept charity in one form or another.

"CONSIDERATION" BY THE ADMINISTRATION

Finally, on February 4 of this year, the President told his news conference that the administration was considering a proposal to increase the social-security payroll tax by one-fourth of 1 percent for both employers and employees to finance better care for the aged an amount of tax increase identical with that in the Forand bill. It was said, moreover, that the administration had in mind provisions covering only catastrophic illness among the aged, and that the Department's staff was working on
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THE ADMINISTRATION’S LIPSERVICE

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have reached the point at which responsible men in the administration, like the miller and his son, find themselves carrying the beast over the bridge. They have reached the point where they can no longer pass on the responsibility of “socialized medicine,” and to give lip-service to the voluntary method and voluntary insurance. In their effort to please all of the special interest groups, they have delayed so long that we can sympathize with their plight. To avoid the charge of “socialized medicine” they have somehow worked themselves into the position of coming up with a plan financed, in part at least, out of the general revenues. By most definitions this method is itself socialistic in the sense that it gives nothing for nothing. There is a vast difference in this approach and the social security method based on employee-employer contributions.

Moreover, in the face of their own statement that certain administrative problems might be created by the Forand bill, they seem to have produced, at this time, an administrative monstrosity which, instead of using the well-established and time-honored method of a social insurance plan, would set up another mechanism in the Public Health Service to provide such care. It will be interesting to see how long this makeshift proposal, the laborious product, to date, of months of high-level meetings, will survive. It seems likely to me that, like the poor animal in the fable, it is too weak and lacking in gumption to be able to carry that ass rather than the other way around.

The miller and his son tied the beast’s legs together and, with a pole across their shoulders, slung the ass over the bridge that led to the town. When they saw this, all the townsfolk came out to laugh. The poor animal, frightened by this uproar, began to struggle to free himself and, in this process, slipped off the pole and over the rail of the bridge into the water and was drowned.
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the costs of such protection are adjusted to the ability to pay because the payroll tax represents a proportion of earnings regardless of the number of family members covered. The social insurance method, used by the Forand bill, uses the same social principle we now have—to pay a larger family benefit to a man with a higher earnings. It is well with protection against medical costs at a cost related to his earnings, rather than to the size of his family.

A KNOWLEDGEABLE DOCTOR'S OPINION

With medical cost rising, it seems clear the voluntary insurance cannot successfully deal with the health problems of the elderly. In a letter of February 29, 1960, the man who served as president of the National Blue Cross Association, Dr. Basil C. McLean, M.D., wrote Congressman FORAND:

A lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the cost of care of the aged cannot be controlled by voluntary insurance, that adequate and comprehensive insurance is required in order to meet the complex responsibilities. However, the voluntary system is far from adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged.

Legislation along the lines of the Forand bill, which was passed by the Congress last July, is, as I have said, a carefully considered measure, one that he is open to reasonable changes in the provisions of the bill provided that they are within the framework of the social security system.

AIME FORAND is a patient man. He knows that the Ways and Means Committee, of which he is the ranking Democratic member, has many great and complex responsibilities. However, the time will soon be here when, if necessary, action on the House floor will be achieved through a discharge petition.

On Tuesday, March 22, 1960, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] filed with the Rules Committee a resolution for a special rule. It is my earnest hope that the Ways and Means Committee will be able to report out suitable legislation that is needed for the protection of our aged citizens from the threats of a medical and hospital bill they cannot afford.

In closing I want to bring to the attention of the House two excellent letters I have received. They discuss the need for such legislation as is found in H.R. 3470.

A county health officer in my district wrote to me this month. This is what he said:

My Dear Mr. PORTER: As you may be aware there is a paper published weekly by the American Medical Association entitled "The AMA News." One of the chief reasons for existence of this paper seems to be opposition to the Forand bill. The issue dated March 7 on the front page there is a headline reading "Write Your Congressman." I am doing so.

Within the past month or two there was an editorial stating that most people past 65 had no medical insurance because they had found by a survey that most people past 65 had $500. The fact that paying large medical bills would wipe out people's entire savings did not seem to be of any importance whatever. This editorial was so devoid of anything true. In fact, it made me just a little ashamed of my profession.

I would suggest that you acquire all the copies of this AMA News published within the last few months. I also want you to know that there is at least one physician in the Fourth District who is for and against the Forand bill. From my observation the attitude of the general public on the Forand bill does not coincide with that of the AMA. We know from any of these the scope of care that is needed for the aged.

The aged simply cannot afford to buy any but a small proportion of the aged. Mr. Porter, if you were young we had group insurance (sometimes paid by the employer) that paid our doctor and hospital bills. Hospital care averages $16 per day, compared with $10 10 years ago.

Insurance companies won't take a chance of losing $16 a day if they did it would cost so much it would be too expensive to do it. We might get sick enough to require hospitalization, for this a social security check wouldn't cover. How about the doctor? He has to be paid. Most of them charge $5 a call. You can't blame them, everything is going up, or used to be. Are we going to eat on after we pay seven or eight calls to the doctor out of what is left after paying the rent, back rent, school, taxes, etc., etc.? Many old people, through no fault of their own, have less than $100 a month to live on—per month. I hear someone say, "They can earn $100 a month." Just where are we to look for these $100 jobs, that are work people 65 or over can do? They are too old to learn new jobs. Employers (most of them) don't want you after you are 65 or 60 at the most. You can get away hungry between 60 and 65.

So what are you, our lawmakers, going to do for us? How about a program for people who are not working who are not covered who are not on any government assistance, other than those on welfare? We also need help on our doctor and hospital bills. If we get a job we have to pay our share in the cases. Then the social security is bawled up. Maybe the check will be delayed next month as a result of that. We have spent all our money, no money to live on. If your taxes are due that month Uncle Sam either charges you interest for deferred payment or sells something you own to get his.

Then after a few years (supposed to be carefree retirement) we pass on to our final resting place. Many have a little set aside to help pay that last expense. But if you have to keep dipping in, we won't have any money and our own social security account has a small amount. But how about the wife who doesn't have her own account? (That's me.) As long as you have $10 in the savings account, you are not eligible for welfare. Use the savings first, they say. So who is going to pay for me? So how about some bills being passed to help with doctors, hospital, medicine, and at last, funeral bills. Don't ask me where the money comes from. It is our national savings that is open to reasonable disposal. Why not accept this one proposal last July. The hard-working gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] filed with the Rules Committee a resolution for a special rule. It is my earnest hope that the Ways and Means Committee will be able to report out suitable legislation that is needed for the protection of our aged citizens from the threats of a medical and hospital bill they cannot afford. In the Fourth District who is for and not against the Forand bill. From my observation the attitude of the general public on the Forand bill does not coincide with that of the AMA. We know from any of these the scope of care that is needed for the aged.

Within the past month or two there was an editorial stating that most people past 65 had no medical insurance because they had found by a survey that most people past 65 had $500. The fact that paying large medical bills would wipe out people's entire savings did not seem to be of any importance whatever. This editorial was so devoid of anything true. In fact, it made me just a little ashamed of my profession.

I would suggest that you acquire all the copies of this AMA News published within the last few months. I also want you to know that there is at least one physician in the Fourth District who is for and against the Forand bill. From my observation the attitude of the general public on the Forand bill does not coincide with that of the American Medical Association.

The second letter comes from a couple in Sutherlin, Oreg., in my district. It reads:

SUTHERLIN, Oreg., October 6, 1959.
CHRIS PORTER,
Democratic Headquarters,
Roseburg, Oreg.

Dear Sir: We are a couple almost old enough for social security. Now with everything going higher and higher we are wondering how long we are going to have to eat, not to mention the medical bills. If we have a trailer, we still have to pay approximately $45 a year. Clothes (they do wear out). We get sick and have the chance to go to the doctor. Now that when we were young we had group insurance
other social viewpoints that date from the days of witch doctors and patent medicines. If the AMA wants to prove that it is really a 1950s modern organization, it should withdraw its bitter opposition to proposals that health care for the Nation's aged be provided under the social security system.

[From the AFL-CIO News, July 25, 1959]

SICK PEOPLE NEED HELP NOW

The Eisenhow er administration's approach to health care for the aged is a curious and mysterious one. It has a Wonderland tinge to its insistence on "individual initiative" and "thrift" by older persons who cannot afford the cost of medical care.

The House hearings on the Forand bill revealed the basic problem. The Nation's 15 million persons aged 65 and over are growing by 1,000 a day. Three-fifths of them have less than $1,000 a year income. They need much more medical care than other people. To get it, many are forced to go on relief.

The American Medical Association, after sparking a $6.5 million campaign to convince the public that President Truman's national health insurance plan was "socialized medicine," is now urging physicians to offer cut-rate fees to retired people in an effort to fend off the Forand bill.

Forand bill opponents argue that Federal action would halt the sale of private insurance for the aged, something the aged can't afford in any event. The process, it seems, means that choosing doctors, also something they can't afford.

Organized labor and other supporters of the 1942 Social Security Act have an answer: the aged need health care now and the people who will finance the Federal program as workers and consumers are willing to pay for it.

[From the White Collar, February 1960]

THE FORAND BILL

The Forand bill (H.R. 4700) would pay in full 60 days of hospital care for all persons eligible for old-age and survivors benefits. It would also pay for the costs of combined nursing home and hospital care up to 120 days a year in addition to certain surgical expenses. The cost of the program would be $4,000. The social security taxes levied on both employers and employees.

Unlike the contents of the American Medical Association's opposition, this is not socialized medicine. It is purely an extension of the social security system to provide hospitalization and nursing home care for the aged. It provides for a free system of voluntary insurance. He will reiterate the administration's opposition to the Forand bill and any other program with compulsory features.

A spokesmen for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department said the approach now favored by Mr. Fleming was for a system of voluntary insurance supported largely by Federal and State money. A private company under the plan, would provide insurance covering the cost of hospitalization and nursing home care, and the Federal and State governments would share the major costs of the insurance premiums. The insurance would be available at the age of 65 to persons with incomes of less than $4,000.

PLAN KEPT TO KEYED

The amount of Federal-State assistance on each policy would be keyed to the income of the person insured. The subsidies, on the average, would be shared between the Federal Government and the States on a 50-50 basis.

This was the only plan not specifically rejected at today's White House conference, it was understood. Among those rejected was one to finance a health insurance system by compulsory social security withholdings are computed in full. The committee's inaction. He introduced a resolution calling for 4 hours of medical help for the old. Meanwhile, Mr. Forand took a preliminary step toward forcing a vote in the House.
tion from organized medicine to the original Social Security Act of 1935 and to subsequent major amendments.

Many public-spirited physicians have shared our regret that the voice of the medical profession has not been heard more frequently with the voices of big business and the commercial insurance industry against each new form of social insurance, including the disability amendment to the Social Security Act of 1954, which has now gained general acceptance.

Today the most serious gap in our family security is the failure of the Federal Government to make payments for medical care for retired people and for families whose breadwinner has died. The Forand bill (H.R. 7400) would fill this gap.

There were congressional hearings on this bill in June 1959. Many prominent physicians, aware of the quarter-century successful operation of old-age and survivors insurance agreed with representatives of labor, professional, farmer, and welfare groups that this social security mechanism could be employed to meet the medical needs of retired people. Some of these doctors dared to speak out. They were not all in favor of the bill in its present form, and a number of them gave suggestions for improving it. These were welcomed by Congressman Forand and others who support the bill.

Excerpts from the statements of these men, all outstanding leaders in the medical profession, are contained in this leaflet. We, in the American Medical Association, express our appreciation for their support and their constructive suggestions.

Dr. Robert L. Dixon, Jr., M.D., commissioner of health, city of Philadelphia, 1952–59; board of directors, Hospital Council of Pennsylvania, 1959–60; chairman, Program Area Committee on Medical Care, American Public Health Association, 1958; diplomat, American Board of Preventive Medicine: "We have the clear impression that the negligence of Philadelphia and appear today on its behalf and specifically on behalf of its committee on government relations which, during the past 4 months, has been making an intensive study of the problem of financing hospital care of the needy in Pennsylvania."

"Unpaid care has become such a drain on the resources of our hospitals that the provision of hospital services is seriously threatened.

"There are currently about 250,000 people on the roll of the Philadelphia garment workers of southeastern Pennsylvania, and these people use about 35 percent of all free care given in the area's 58 hospitals. If these people are not given social security protection, a third of our free care deficits would be wiped out. State and local grants could then be applied to the remaining two-thirds, and hospitals would be financially able to devote a much larger portion of their income to improvement of services and the raising of wages."

"Under H.R. 7400, benefits would be paid to patients for OASDI recipients either directly from their social security payments, or indirectly through voluntary insurance plans.

"Such a system would minimize pauperism by making a means test unnecessary for obtaining benefits; it would eliminate the need for any contribution after retirement; it would spread contributions over the individual's working lifetime; it

1 The full text of the statements of the physicians cited here can be found in "Hospital. Nursing Home, and Surgical Benefits for OASDI Receivers," Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, 86th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 7400, July 18 through July 17, 1959, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Would avoid increasing the costs of voluntary hospital insurance for the younger population and for the households of persons; and it would appeal to State and local governments and their taxpayers, as it would not add to their tax loads."

"I have been impressed by the willingness of Philadelphia's Blue Cross to establish eligibility for the program of medical care for Baltimore's public relief clients assigned to Sinai; physicians have been invited to report their experiences to the Health and Welfare Department."

"I have every confidence that the Forand bill would be a great help to our hospitals and to our patients. It is really a great bill."

"Many patients are reluctant to go to municipal hospitals because of the charity aspect. The Forand bill would change this."}

Frank F. Purstenberg, M.D., medical director, Sinai Hospital Outpatient Department, Chicago; Sinai Hospital Medical Care Clinic, 1947—72, and assistant director of the program for the program of medical care for Baltimore's public relief clients assigned to Sinai; physician, Sinai Hospital Outpatient Department, 1939; instructor, medicine, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, 1939; fellow, American Public Health Association and American Medical Association.

"In my function as medical director of an outpatient department in Chicago, I have been faced with the problem that when they cannot get adequate medical care, I would like you to take the opportunity to offer the suggestion that we establish eligibility for the care that they need."

"The Forand bill in July 1959. Many prominent doctors have been invited to speak out. They were not all in favor of the bill in its present form, and a number of them gave suggestions for improving it. These were welcomed by Congressman Forand and others who support the bill.
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affected by the method of payment of the organization under which the care is provided.

"It feel very strongly that this bill would not control medical practice. It would make medical practice as the doctor wants to practice more available."

Franz Goldmann, M.D., director, health services coordination study, Council of Jewish Institutions for the Aged, New York City, said that the bill would, in effect, establish a second medical profession.

"To look forward, one must believe in old age. The idea of growing old graciously is to become a reality, if the concept of equal opportunity is to be translated into a practical plan, a plan that can be combined with social action directed toward development of as comprehensive a health program as possible.

"To consider solely the frequency of insurances or of any regard the maxim 'thou shalt not worship numbers.' What counts most is the type, scope, and adequacy of coverage. Benefits provided, more than any other age group, need home care by physicians, nurses and other personnel, medical and nursing care in the home, hospital care, and drugs and appliances—benefits rarely, if at all, included in contracts—and they require full coverage of hospital care. Benefits are provided in the form of hospital insurance, but this type of coverage is almost negligible. Benefits are provided but benefits are not provided.

"Inclusion of benefits in OASP would be of unlimited value if the pattern of benefits set by the voluntary plans were more comprehensive. If the ideal of growing old gracefully is to become a reality, if the concept of equal opportunity is to be translated into a practical plan, it must be combined with social action directed toward development of as comprehensive a health program as possible.

"The bill under consideration (H.R. 4700) has three noteworthy merits: (1) It provides for service benefits, thereby affording very much better protection than that offered to the majority of the persons carrying health insurance. (2) It includes full costs of hospital service for a period of 60 days, in contrast to the large number of voluntary plans covering hospital care for only about 30 days; (3) It includes nursing home services following hospitalization for a period of 120 days, which is considered by many to be a very serious gap in the benefits provided by the vast majority of all voluntary plans.

"The bill is deficient in that it calls for coverage of surgical service only, whereas elderly people need nonsurgical services as much, if not more."

George Bahr, M.D., special medical consultant, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York; member, Board of Hospitals, City of New York; president and medical director, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, 1935-57; trustee, New York Academy of Medicine; president, New York Academy of Medicine, 1943-46; chairman, Public Health Council, State of New York, 1935; director of clinical research, Columbia University, N.Y., said:

"I am consultant to, and previously president and medical director of, the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, which is responsible for the health of 550,000 persons in New York City.

"Most nonprofit health insurance plans such as * * * * the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York * * * have always provided hospital insurance to cover their coverage with undiminished benefits after retirement.

"But $60 a year even for virtually total medical and surgical care for a two-person family appears to be the highest doctors' bills at the time of illness seems to be too much to pay out of their small retirement income, especially as it is paid out of full estate on the basis of Blue Cross hospital insurance, which virtually doubles the cost.

"Only about one-third convert to individual insurance, and many of these find it impossible to continue to pay the premiums after a year or two. They drop out before they are within reach of the greatest medical need. As a result, slightly less than 4 percent of HIC's 550,000 insurers are 65 years or older. Three percent of this age group constitute 9.1 percent of New York City's population. This clearly demonstrates that the privilege of converting health insurance to an individual contract after retirement will not solve the problem, even though the benefits are continued in full measure and the annual premium rate is almost the same as the group rate.

"Only through the social security mechanism can people of moderate means prepay in advance during their years of employment those hospital costs of home care and nursing home care to which most people are exposed in their old age.

"[From The Machinist, Mar. 24, 1960]

HOW THEY CARE FOR THEIR AGED

When the House Ways and Means Committee amended the Fordham bill to provide health care to the aged, the committee will have before it some startling evidence showing that the United States is one of the few major nations of the world without such a program. The evidence, published by the U.S. Government's Social Security Bulletin, was compiled by Daniel S. Greig and Carl H. Farnman. This week, Ray Henry, the Associated Press social security columnist, brought the evidence to the attention of millions of newspaper readers. Here's a digest:

The United States is one of the world's few major countries without a government medical-care program for retired people collecting social security payments. And even the patient, uninsured, and ailing older-the medical care of whom represents the foundation of social security.

Is this no more socialistic than any other form of social security?

Apart from the obvious interest of the aged themselves in providing for the future, there is a no less obvious national interest in seeing them provided for. Senator McNamara's bill calls for $50 a month for eligible persons who have always contributed to social security taxes. But the Fordham bill or any other legislation that is passed, and even the patient, uninsured, and ailing older-the medical care of whom represents the foundation of social security is no more socialistic than any other form of social security.

Aged among the 104 million Americans have had no social security payments. In 1960, this will increase to 30 million. By 1980, 40 million will be over 65. And in 1980, there will be 15 million more over 80.

The United States is one of the few major countries without a government medical-care program for retired people collecting social security payments. And even the patient, uninsured, and ailing older-the medical care of whom represents the foundation of social security.

Aged among the 104 million Americans have had no social security payments. In 1960, this will increase to 30 million. By 1980, 40 million will be over 65. And in 1980, there will be 15 million more over 80.

Insured medical care for the aged will mean more hospitals, more remuneration for physicians, better health for the Nation as a whole.

Failure to see this is a failure of responsibility. That's why the AMA's myopia and callousness should have infected even the President.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1960]

COMPELLED PLAN FOR AGED OPOSED—ADMINISTRATION UNIFIED, FLEMMING TELLS PANEL—Editorial (By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, March 23—The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare today that the administration was united in its opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance for the aged.

The Secretary, Arthur S. Flemming, promised speedy exploration of possible alternatives but declined to say when recommendations might be ready.

Mr. Flemming testified at a closed session of the joint committees on health insurance.

He later made public his prepared statement and answered reporters' questions.

[From The Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1960]

HEALTH AND OLD AGE

There is a distressing lack of sensibility and imagination in the administration's failure to propose some system of health insurance for the aged. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, supported by Vice President Nixon, is said to have tried several schemes for a comprehensive medical-care program. The majority of the countries finance their programs from general tax revenues, and always have.

Three countries, Canada, Ireland, and Japan, have medical-care programs covering the aged. These are variations of the financing methods named.
The Cabinet officer, adhering strictly to the Eisenhower team's rules of conduct, refused to discuss the difficulties he had met in securing presidential backing of an alternative program.

**SUPPORT WITHERED**

At a White House conference yesterday he outlined the opposition to a substitute program of compulsory insurance for elderly persons with low incomes. President Eisenhower sided with Republican congressional leaders in withholding his support, at least for now.

Nevertheless, Mr. Flemming said on leaving the meeting, "I am pleased with this approach just as vigorously as possible."

"All the administration has endorsed is the explanation," he said.

The Secretary's testimony against any form of compulsory insurance was directed particularly at a bill sponsored by Representative Ames J. Forand, Democrat, of Rhode Island. The measure would increase social security taxes to provide hospital and surgical care for beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system.

Mr. Flemming recommended other amendments to the Social Security Act, including any that might provide hospital care for subscribers, regardless of age, and coverage of self-employed physicians.

**PROPOSALS WERE CLEARED**

All the proposed changes were cleared with the Republican leaders at a separate White House conference. Several others recommended by the Secretary were ruled "controversial" by the leaders. They concurred, he said, in not submitting the committee today.

The committee is considering the Forand bill, which adopts many proposals for social security revisions. The panel is expected to approve a number of liberalizing changes in the program, but a heavy majority is opposed to the Forand plan.

Mr. Forand interpreted Mr. Flemming's testimony on the health insurance question as evidence of a sharp difference of opinion within the administration. He said the Secretary's statements amounted to "swiping health insurance under the rug, at least for the balance of this session."

Secretary Flemming declined to say whether a disagreement existed in the administration, but he said he had been hopeful of White House backing for his voluntary plan as recently as last week.

The Forand plan, as outlined by an aide, is for an insurance program financed largely by Federal and State appropriations based on the insured person's ability to pay.

Mr. Flemming told the committee that the administration had decided it was necessary to "explore further some complex issues" before devising "principles of a practical program."

He cited the question of whether State governments, aided by the Federal Government, could provide the difference between the amounts subscribed by the policyholders in the low-income groups and the actual cost of the policy.

In the effort to arrive at sound conclusions, he said, "it will be necessary for us to begin immediately to consult further with experts in Government, with outside experts and with State officials."

"It is, of course, not possible to predict the length of time that it will take for those consultations to be completed.

He assured the committee, however, that the explorations "will be carried forward with maximum speed.

The term "nursing home services" includes medical care as generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care for in-patients, provided such service is by the nursing home furnished to its bed patients either through its own employees or through persons with whom it has made arrangements for such service. The term "hospitai services" includes such medical care as is generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care for bed patients, provided such service is furnished to an in-patient in any hospital or in a doctor's office. Surgical services may include oral surgery when provided in a hospital or in an office, but does not include surgery that is requested by the patient, but which in the opinion of a cognizant medical authority is not medically required.

**Free Choice by Patient**

(e) (1) Any individual referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) may obtain the hospital or nursing home service for which payment may be made shall, in any event, be made by an insurance company as a beneficiary under the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund under this subsection, and the amount of such payment.

"Description of Hospital, Nursing Home, and Surgical Services"

(b) (1) For purposes of this section, the term 'hospital services' means the following services, drugs, and appliances furnished by a hospital to any individual as a bed patient: bed and board and such nursing services as are furnished by the hospital in connection with such hospital services, use of operating room, staff services, and other services, drugs, and appliances furnished by such hospital to its bed patients through its own employees or through persons with whom it has made arrangements for such service. The term "hospital services" includes such medical care as is generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care for in-patients, provided such service is furnished to an in-patient in any hospital or in a doctor's office. Surgical services may include oral surgery when provided in a hospital or in an office, but does not include surgery that is requested by the patient, but which in the opinion of a cognizant medical authority is not medically required.

The term "nursing home services" means surgical procedures (other than elective surgery) provided in a hospital, or in case of an emergency or for minor surgery, provided by a hospital or in a doctor's office. Surgical services may include oral surgery when provided in a hospital or in an office, but does not include surgery that is requested by the patient, but which in the opinion of a cognizant medical authority is not medically required.

"Free Choice by Patient"
with respect to the surgical services for which payment is provided by this section, (freely select the surgeon of his choice, or in such other classes of cases where these services are furnished by the hospital or nursing home for hospitalization or care in a hospital accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals except that the surgeon is certified by the American Board of Surgery or by another board or specialty council recognized by the Secretary after consultation with the Advisory Council, and except that, in the case of a patient who is an individual may select a duly licensed dentist."

“(3) Regulations under this section shall provide for payments (in such amounts and upon such conditions as may be prescribed by law) (a) to hospitals for hospital services rendered in emergency situations to individuals referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) by hospitals which have not entered into an agreement under such section to furnish care to the extent provided in this section, of the additional cost of accommodations occupied by them as their request which are more expensive than semiprivate accommodations.

“(4) Except as provided by regulation, no agreement may provide for payments (A) to any hospital or nursing home for hospital for hospital services which is obligated by contract with the United States (other than any agreement under such section) to furnish care at the expense of the United States, or (B) to any hospital for hospital services which is obligated by contract with a State or subdivision thereof to furnish at public expense care to the extent provided in this section, of the eligibility of the individual for such services as determined by application of a means test.

“(5) No supervision or control over the details of administration or operation, or over the selection, tenure, or compensation of personnel, shall be exercised under the authority of this section over any hospital or nursing home which has entered into an agreement under this section.

“(6) Agreements under this subsection shall be made with the hospital or nursing home providing the services, but this paragraph shall not preclude representation of such institution by any individual, association, or organization authorized by the institution to act on its behalf.

“(7) The Secretary shall enter into agreements with qualified providers of surgical services as defined in paragraph (2) of subsection (c). Such agreements shall stipulate that such providers shall constitute full payment for these services. Such agreements may be made with such individuals, hospitals, nursing homes, or associations or organizations authorized by the Surgeon General, dentists, or physicians to act in their behalf.

“(9) Nothing in such agreements or in this Act shall be construed to give the Secretary supervision or control over the practice of medicine by any manner in which medical services are provided.

“(9) Except to the extent the Secretary has made provision pursuant to subsection (a) for the making of payments to hospitals and nursing homes by a private nonprofit organization for the making of payments for hospital services, the person designated by the Secretary as the designated representative, he shall from time to time determine the amount to be paid from such Trust Fund under any agreement with respect to services furnished, and shall certify such amount to the Managed Trustee of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, except that such amount shall, prior to certification, be increased or decreased, as the case may, by any sum. Nothing herein shall be taken to mean that the amount paid to the provider of services for any prior period was greater than would have been paid to it for such period. The Managed Trustee shall pay from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, at the time or times fixed by the Secretary, in accordance with such certification.

"Nondisclosure of Information"

"(a) Information concerning an individual, obtained from him or from any physician, hospital, or nursing home, the American Board of Surgeons or other person pursuant to or as a result of the administration of this section, shall be held in confidence (for the purposes stated herein and for any further purposes) and shall not be disclosed or be open to public inspection in any manner whatever. Any person or other person from whom the information was obtained or to whom the information pertains shall be held criminally and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

"Medical and Hospital Services Under Women's Compensation"

"(1) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any services which an individual required by reason of any injury, illness, disease, or disability on account of which such services are being received or the cost of such services has been paid or reimbursed pursuant to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund or the Federal Men's Compensation Act of 1940. Any such provisions are otherwise available from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in any other person from whom the information was obtained or to whom the information pertains.

"Regulations and Functions of Advisory Council"

"(g) All regulations specifically authorized by this section shall be prescribed by the Secretary. In paragraphs (1) and (2), the Secretary shall consult with the National Advisory Health Council consisting of the Commissioner of Social Security, who shall..."
serve as Chairman ex officio, and eight members appointed by the Secretary. Four of the eight members shall be persons who are outstanding in fields pertaining to hospitals and health activities, and the other four members shall be persons who represent the consumers of hospital, nursing home, and surgical services, and shall be persons knowledgeable in the operation of such services by eligible groups. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve only for the unexpired portion of the term for which his predecessor was appointed and shall not be eligible to serve for more than two terms but shall be eligible for appointment to fill a temporary vacancy immediately preceding his reappointment. The Secretary is authorized to appoint such temporary or acting members as may be useful in carrying out its functions. Appointed Council members and members of technical committees, while serving on business of the Council, shall receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $60 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel, and subsistence expenses while so serving, away from the places of residence. The Council shall meet as frequently as the Secretary deems necessary, but not less than once each year. Upon request by three or more members it shall be the duty of the Secretary to call a meeting of the Council.

“Utilization of Private Nonprofit Organizations

“(h) The Secretary may utilize, to the extent provided herein, the services of private nonprofit organizations exempt from Federal income taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code which (A) represent patients of Federal hospitals, nursing homes, or surgical services, or (B) operate voluntary insurance plans under which agreements, similar to those provided for under section 225(a), are made by hospitals, nursing homes, and physicians for defraying the cost of services. Such organizations shall, in connection with the extent that he can make satisfactory agreements with them and to the extent he determines appropriate, utilize services and contributions to the effective and economical administration of this section. Such agreements shall not delegate (A) his functions relating to determinations as to whether the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical services furnished an individual may be paid for out of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund under this section and of the cost of administration determined by the Secretary to be necessary and required, and (B) his functions under its agreement pursuant to this subsection. Such payments to such organizations shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Secretary or as reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the organization and the Secretary, and adjustments may be made in subsequent payments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made to the organization under this subsection. Such payments shall be made by the Managing Trustees of the Trust Fund on account of the amounts paid out such organization during any six-month period, but not less than once each year. Such payments shall be made to the Secretary for audit.

“(3) An agreement under paragraph (1) with any organization may require any of its officers or employees certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance, to give surety bond to the United States, or such organization, in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund.

“Certifying and Disbursing Officers

“(1) No individual designated by the Secretary pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be liable in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payments certified by him under this section.

“(2) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in paragraph (1).

“Adjustments in Cash Benefits

“(1) For purposes of section 204, any payment by him under this section to any hospital, nursing home, physician, or dentist, with respect to hospital, nursing home, or surgical services furnished an individual shall be regarded as paid to such individual. The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective on the first day of the 12th calendar month after the month in which this act is enacted.

“(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 225(b)(2) of the Social Security Act, as amended by this act, and subsection (b) of this section, applications filed under such section 225(b)(2) which were otherwise valid shall be considered valid even though filed more than 3 months prior to the effective date of this act. The amendments made by this act shall be considered valid as of the first day of the 4th calendar month after the month in which this act is enacted.

“TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Changes in tax schedules

Self-Employment Income Tax

Sec. 201. (a) Section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to rate of tax on self-employment income is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 1401. RATE OF TAX.

“In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied on the self-employment income of every individual a tax equal to 6% percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year, and an additional tax equal to 4% percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year prior to beginning December 31, 1958, the tax shall be equal to 7½% percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year.”

Tax on Employees

(b) Section 3101 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees under the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 3101. RATE OF TAX.

“In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to each paying individual in his employ, equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121 (b))—

“(1) with respect to wages paid during the calendar year 1959, the rate shall be 2½ percent;

“(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1960 to 1962, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

“(3) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1963 to 1965, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4½ percent;

“(4) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1966 to 1968, both inclusive, the rate shall be 5 percent; and

“(5) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1968, the rate shall be 4½ percent.”

Tax on Employers

(c) Section 3111 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 3111. RATE OF TAX.

“In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to each paying individual in his employ, equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b))—

“(1) with respect to wages paid during the calendar year 1959, the rate shall be 2½ percent;

“(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1960 to 1962, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

“(3) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1963 to 1965, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4½ percent;

“(4) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1966 to 1968, both inclusive, the rate shall be 5 percent; and

“(5) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1968, the rate shall be 4½ percent.”

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman you refer to, Dr. McLean, never practiced medicine.

Mr. FORTER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman you refer to, Dr. McLean, never practiced medicine.

Mr. FORTER. I have no knowledge of that. I do know that the man has been very much concerned with specific medical needs. He knows about insurance programs. I am sure that he speaks with authority on this subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker. I was not doubting that, but the point was it was placed in the Record that the doctor was a practicing physician. He is not. I may say that the gentleman involved is perfectly correct. I think that is also in the Congressional Record.

Mr. FORTER. You think the gentleman did not know what he was saying because he was so ill?
Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I think there is real danger, that was the case.

Mr. PORTER. I want to read what the gentleman said.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. It may be that some of the doctors are ill through overwork.

Mr. PORTER. I think it is true that many doctors are, because their practice kept them so busy that they did not have the time to study these matters in the way Dr. McLean has had a chance to do. I am going to read his statement. I have letters from other doctors. I have many instigated or form letters from doctors against this bill. I find usually that the doctor who supports the bill has sat down and thought it out and expressed himself very well.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad now to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague and commend him for making beggars of these people. We send usually that the doctor for making a very need for health insurance for elderly citizens.

It seems strange that the President of the United States who might be said to be the No. 1 recipient of socialized medicine in the United States, aims a statement against the Forand bill. The President, since the day he entered West Point, he has never failed to buy an aspirin tablet. He has received free hospitalization, free medical attention, free physician's attention. The only restriction on him was to contribute the $1.58 to the Army for subsistence during this period of time. He is on a pension, but he still enjoys all these things; his wife enjoys them; his son Major Eisenhower enjoys them; his daughter-in-law enjoys them; his three grandchildren enjoy them. And I think these enjoy free hospitalization and free medical care; and I say to you it is a disgrace to see 15 million elderly people in America who are trying to live on a small amount of money, who cannot enjoy the American citizens.

President, since the day he entered West Point, he has never failed to buy an aspirin tablet. He has received free hospitalization, free medical attention, free physician's attention. The only restriction on him was to contribute the $1.58 to the Army for subsistence during this period of time.

I agree that could happen just as it happens under social security. There are many wealthy individuals, whose either do not need them. It is an insurance program, not a welfare program. But there are many elderly people who need it and will need it. We must meet any position concerned is, We do not always look to the social security type of program.

The overall cost, of course, comes out of the deductions from the wage earners just as social security benefits does.

Mr. PORTER. Does the gentleman know who would be among those individuals who might be extremely wealthy would benefit from this, as well as those whom we feel should benefit from it? Is that not inherent in this type of legislation?

Mr. PORTER. I agree that could happen just as it happens under social security. There are many wealthy individuals who either do not need them. It is an insurance program, not a welfare program. But there are many elderly people who need it and will need it. We must meet any position concerned is, We do not always look to the social security type of program.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman has an alternative I would like to hear it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The gentleman does recognize that those individuals who are of social security age at the present time would not have paid anything into the program.

Mr. PORTER. I recognize that.

Mr. HOLLAND. As it would be instituted. It seems to me there would be a great inequity there.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman would like to propose an amendment to take them out?

Mr. ALFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he believe in free choice of doctors, hospital, and medical facilities and the type of institution in which we recognize the American way would be maintained under this type of a system?

Mr. PORTER. Has the gentleman read the bill?

Mr. ALFORD. I have.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a free choice.

Mr. ALFORD. The gentleman must realize, if he has studied the bill, that the alleged free choice in this bill is a misnomer. There is no choice whether or not you want this compulsory health insurance, or whether you do not.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman talking about free choice of plan?

Mr. ALFORD. Free choice of the overall plan.

Mr. PORTER. It is a compulsory plan.

Mr. ALFORD. And there is no freedom of selection of doctors, hospital, and nursing facilities, only a choice of those provided by the Government.

Mr. PORTER. Those choices are very rationally set forth, though, and they provide a very wide scope. Certainly, a person would not want improperly certified or institutions to be available for these people. You are not taking that position?
Mr. ALFORD. Absolutely not. What I am saying to the gentleman is this: I am absolutely opposed to socialized medicine. I am absolutely opposed to any bureau that would be set up here that would submit a list of names. What about those individuals that would be left off of the list and so on? I just want to submit for the record that just because my parents may have reached the age of 65 or over, that they should not be deprived of their choice of physician or hospital facilities and so on. In other words, I think this: If we are going to socialize all the things in one little segment, then we might as well socialize all industries and everything else.

Mr. PORTER. That is absolutely not my thought.

Mr. ALFORD. That is what the gentleman is advocating. There is no right to have free medical care, nursing and other facilities, unless the voters so choose, and I do not think that adequately describes the American system for us to answer all the needs to which the gentleman has alluded. Now, the story of Federal control and regimentation is this, as I understand it, Federal administration, certification of doctors, certification of hospitals, nursing facilities, nursing homes, the fixing of fees and costs, and the promulgation of so many other regulations. Just the other day a veteran whom I believed to be entitled to hospital care, could not be taken care of because of all of the maze of regulations and so on. I submit that we should try other methods before we go to the Federal Government to call up this paternalistic type of procedure.

Mr. PORTER. I think the gentleman is on the side of the administration. He believes we should go exploring further. Let me read from page 11 of the bill: Social security and other health related programs are examples of governmental action which have led to a reduction in the rates of payment agreed on shall constitute full payment for these services. Such agreements may be made with any qualified organization authorized by the surgeons, dentists, or physicians to act in their behalf. Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. The same opposition that we hear from my friend from Arkansas occurred during the days of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I was on a committee of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania and sat there for months hearing the medical profession come in and tell us that we were on the start of socialized medicine. I would like to ask the good doctor, Do you wish to have the Workmen's Compensation Act withdrawn today?

Mr. ALFORD. I want to say to my distinguished colleague that I am not an authority on that bill. What I am trying to say today is the point of view from Oregon is this: I was only injecting myself into something which I feel I know firsthand and that is that we recognize that a need is present, but we do not recognize that we must always come to Federal Government for the answer. That is not the American way. The way of freedom of choice, freedom of enterprise, and so on is the American way.

Mr. PORTER. Does the gentleman want to go back and undo the Workmen's Compensation Act?

Mr. ALFORD. Do you realize that a White House conference has been called on the Workmen's Compensation Act and that we are trying to obtain answers to these many questions.

Mr. PORTER. Many conferences have already been called by this administration. There is one set on water pollution in December.

Mr. ALFORD. It will be of much more value after we have the White House conference on aging from lay people and social workers, hospital workers, and physicians from all over the United States in this conference, and then we will have a more appropriately and more intelligently, may I say, which would be the best answer to this problem which we are discussing here today.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman accuses the bill of wanting to go ahead and socialize everything, yet I suppose the gentleman's position does not include wanting to go back and repeal the Social Security Act.

Mr. ALFORD. It is interesting to note that members of the AMA fought even the Red Cross and the Blue Cross insurance plans when they were first brought out. They appeared before committees against it. The AMA is a very strong organization. They voted in the last few years to pay the people that they fought the plan of giving these benefits to the people.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will yield at that point, I am sorry that I was not one of the beneficiaries of that action. For the record the AMA does not enter into such campaigns.

Mr. HOLLAND. The gentleman may rest assured that I was not, either.

Mr. ALFORD. May I ask at that point, what benefits would we derive under this bill as far as the number of hospital days is concerned? Let us get down to specifics. We are talking about all the problems that involve the aging population, and I want to assure the gentleman that I am sympathetic to the problems they have but I am more sympathetic to their problem than anyone on the floor of the House today. I should like to ask the gentleman this question. Under the Forand bill what would they be entitled to if they had a bad automobile accident.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman does not know.

Mr. ALFORD. The measure provides a combined total of 120 days, hospital and nursing home care, each year, but with a maximum of 60 days of hospitalization. The great problem which confronts us today as far as medical care is concerned is the catastrophe that may come upon any one of us, such as a very bad automobile accident.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman wants the bill written more broadly. Is that his point?

Mr. ALFORD. I want to submit that the Forand bill is not the answer to the problem. It may be an answer to a political problem, but it is not an answer to the medical problem. I submit to the gentleman that we should sincerely try to help the old people of this country, but we ought not to do it in a presidential year, just for campaign purposes.

Let us wait until we have all this evidence in before we bring in a verdict. We have had machinery set up to do this. Mr. PORTER. The amount of money in social security payments is not enough, in my way of thinking people to live on, either. But it is the best we have been able to do under all the circumstances to date. The Forand bill has been written up by a gentleman who has studied, by actuaries. It has been approved by many groups including many doctors. It has shortcomings, no doubt about it. But certainly it is devised to meet a particular need. You can call it political. Of course, it is political. Anything that has to do with the needs of the people of this country is political. Social security was political, workmen's compensation was political.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLLAND. First of all, the doctors have had a long, long time to work out some plan to take care of the poor and the needy. In the State of Pennsylvania we have some very large State hospitals. In any case, the administration at Harrisburg has to pay these hospitals—I was on the committee on appropriations, and I know—$8.50 for every patient they bring in who pays the patient something. That money is then paid out of real estate taxes. I think this is the way to permit man to keep his dignity, after he reaches old age. He can go into a hospital and get medical attention without going through all this red tape which the gentleman from Arkansas has indicated we have in the VA today. I might add this—and I am not saying this in any derogatory way at all, that in the last world war, according to the statistics, 49 percent of the boys from Arkansas who were examined for the service had emotional or physical reasons. That is a very high percentage.

Mr. ALFORD. If the gentleman will permit me to reply, with reference to the Forand bill, I think it is the need. The gentleman points up very particularly an age group that is not covered under the VA today. I might add this—and I am not saying this in any derogatory way at all, that in the last world war, according to the statistics, 49 percent of the boys from Arkansas who were examined for the service had emotional or physical reasons. That is a very high percentage.
Mr. HOLLAND. I am talking about doctors. Why do the doctors take care of them for nothing?

Mr. ALFORD. May I say something about what has been said here today? We are all in good faith, but let us remember what one of the arguments against the fact that my medical society has been all for the Blue Shield plan. We have had a committee looking into the fact that that cover all the people, not just one particular group, and the people who are covered individuals that that million dollars and are fully able to pay; yet they would be covered just the same.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have an hour following the gentleman, in which I intend to discuss this problem at considerable length.

Mr. PORTER. I have a very short time left. If there is anything my friends from California or Missouri wish to say, since your party is in control, I should like to encourage. Every Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have an hour following the gentleman, in which I intend to discuss this problem at considerable length.

Mr. PORTER. Very good.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to add one thing to what I said. We Members of Congress are enjoying socialized medicine. We have doctors and nurses according to medical science at our hospitals and all we pay for is our room. We should be the last to deny the people of America the same privileges.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to add one thing to what I said. We Members of Congress are enjoying socialized medicine. We have doctors and nurses to take care of us. We can go to Bethesda or Walter Reed Hospitals and get the best medical care, and all we pay for is our room. We should be the last to deny the people of America the same privileges.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. I am going to support the Forand bill. I do not necessarily believe that it will provide all of the solution or even the best solution. But I think some of the arguments against it are valid in part. But let us at least say that we will take a bill like the Forand bill and if necessary amend or change it, so that in the long run we will have something that is of real service to all the people of the country.

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say a word about our American way of life. Very often when proposals are made for a social change we hear that argument. To me, the American way of life is to make any change at any particular time the people think it best. We cannot be proud of many things in our way of life. If you look back in the past, certainly, chattel slavery was part of our way of life, child labor and breadlines a part of our way of life. In the thirties, social security became a part of our way of life. I think it is quite proper and in accord with our way of life to make any change that the people think it best.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman.

INTEREST RATE ON LONG-TERM BONDS

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

Mr. PORTER. Gladly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding to me. He has a special order on the Forand bill which is a very important subject today before our country, and I know he is going to make a general statement to the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal said about the need to raise the interest rate on long-term Government bonds, and there is a bill, as you know, pending for that purpose, that has been reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means. But we have had a very interesting development during the first 2½ months of the year. I want to call your attention to some of the things that have been happening. I hold in my hand a January 19 statement of the Treasury Department. It shows that 91-day Treasury bills were sold at an average interest rate of 4.43 percent. I also have in my hand a statement of the Treasury Department dated Tuesday, March 22, which shows that short-term bills, which were sold to the public at 3.03 percent; in other words, 1.4 percent off 1.4 percent less interest than just 2 months ago.

The offering of bills on January 19 was $1 billion, in round numbers. It was oversubscribed, the applications totaling $1.878 million; in other words, almost twice as much money was offered for these bills as was desired.

The March 22 offering was $1,200 million. Applications ran to $1,553 million, or a good $753 million more than was offered by the Treasury Department and at the low interest rate of, in round numbers, 1.4 percent. The interest rate on 91-day notes has gone down 33½ percent in 2 months' time.

Now, let us consider the 182-day bills: On January 19 an offering of $400 million was made, and $919 million subscribed for that offering at an interest rate of 3.17 instead of 4.66, showing a drop of 1½ percent in interest or, again, a drop of 33.5 percent of the interest rate in 2 months' time.

We are down to 3 percent money on short-term bills and this bill which is pending before the Rules Committee will have a 4.25 percent interest rate limitation on long-term bonds. Admittedly these are 91-day bills and 182-day bills, but these bills traditionally draw a higher interest rate than do long-term bonds.

Why does the Treasury not offer some long-term bonds right at this time and get an interest rate of around 3 percent? Why does the holding back of the market would absorb it and they want this 4.25 percent limitation removed, which has been on the bonds for some 30 years. We have never had to raise this rate ever during World War II. We never had to raise the interest rate when we were running as much as a $54 billion annual deficit. We did not have to raise the interest rate. In fact, the average interest rate on long-term bonds was about 2.75 percent during the time we were running a $54 billion annual deficit.

For 4 straight years when we ran over a $200 billion deficit we did not have to raise the interest rate. But we had a different monetary policy at that time. We had a policy where the Open Market Committee tradition­ally carried a $4 billion or $5 billion inventory of bonds. It is carrying an inventory now at only about $1 billion. They will not go into the market and support the bond price because they want the bonds to sell at the highest interest level possible. Yet in spite of the fact that they are not supporting it, the interest rate has dropped. Market and discounted, stock prices are coming down on the stock market, which means bonds will be more favorably received because people are buying them for the number, 3 percent. In other words they have a guaranteed yield. In spite of the drop in the stock market and an additional desire for the bonds, they are willing to take the bonds at around an average of 4 percent.
Another thing I would like to say is that the Democratic Party had a platform plank which I am going to read. This is one of the planks of the Democratic Party:

The Republican debt management policy of higher interest rates serves only to benefit a few at the detriment of the general taxpayer, the small borrower, and the small- and middle-class investor in Government bonds. We pledge ourselves to a vigilant re-examination of this management policy in order to reduce interest rates in the service of our common welfare.

It would be well for the Democratic Party to look at the plank in its 1956 platform and look at the trend in the market on bonds, and be very slow in surrendering the traditional policy of the Democratic Party which has been a policy of low interest rates for the benefit of the people, and not to accede to this high interest policy that is for the benefit of interest earners and not the taxpayers that have to pay the interest.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.
Mr. SLACK. I would like to ask this question: As I understand it, the 3 per-cent is on short-term bonds?
Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; 91- and 182-day bonds.
Mr. SLACK. The point the gentleman is making is that long-term bonds should be offered for this low interest rate, instead of pursuing the policy which they are today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Traditionally we have had a high interest rates for short-term bonds because they are in and out of the market; it is not a permanent investment. While the market is down I believe they should offer long-term bonds and sell them at a lower interest rate than we are selling the short-term bonds. This is traditionally, of course, whether it would be necessary to rate bonds and whether we would sell them.

Mr. SLACK. I suggest that the Treasury would be wise to make an offer of 2 billion or 1 billion or 5 billion issues of long-term bonds and test the market and just see how it would be absorbed before it is sold at a lower interest rate which has been traditional for several decades.

Mr. SLACK. I thank the gentleman. Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding to me.
Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for his statement. Certainly, in a Government such as ours, based on public opinion, to be any effective in our campaign this year—how we handle our national debt and also how we provide for our aged.

MEdICAL AND HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. George P. MILLER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CURTIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.
Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have placed in the Record at page 6320 of the daily edition of the Congressional Record an article giving the American Academy of General Practice of Physicians at Kansas City, Mo. Three weeks later, I gave the same speech before the convention of Missouri Insurance Agents Association.

As I stated, when I placed this in the Record, I prepared the speech to be delivered to these seemingly diverse groups to impress the general background of the problem of our society faces on medical care and hospital care for the aged. I expressed the belief that the tremendous progress that has been made in advancing the well-being of all our American citizens had made ineffective the demagogery which was based on using the term "retirement" as the means of transferring wealth from the "haves" to "have nots."

This belief is now being put to a more severe test than I had anticipated. I am wondering, indeed, it is true we can have a rational, national debate on the subject of Federal spending, and in particular in this health area. Indeed, if the discussion that preceded me on the floor had been of the caliper of debate that would prevail on this subject, we could move forward in this area, because it was temperate, and it discussed the issues. Unfortunately, that is not the kind of debate we are apparently going to have.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been studying this matter for some time. I have been a member of the Subcommittee since 1953. I am presently the ranking Republican on the Social Security Subcommittee. There are many, many complex problems involved in this matter that need a great deal of thought as we proceed.

However, today a pressure group, which is probably the most effectively organized for political action of any group in our society, has apparently decided to use the kind of demagogery that can still be used which is probably the most effectively organized for political action of any group in our society, but I would remind my colleagues that the American citizens is called Americans for Democratic Action—of which the most powerful segment is the Committee on Defense Organization of the CIO-AFL. I am not completely lordly. I did begin to see this cartoon reprinted in other newspapers that work with the Washington Post on ADA-sponsored programs. The reporting by certain members of the press before we come to recognize as being part of this apparatus, have been slanting their news stories along this line.

Now the issue that Americans should be concerned about is how do we meet the problem that our old people have in this field of hospital and medical care. It is a serious problem. It is one that has not been completely met in our past. Let me ask my colleagues and our citizens that no society in the history of the world has ever solved this problem and that our society in the year 1960 has probably come closer to solving this problem than any other society ever has.

The progress will be even greater in the future if we do not destroy through unwise action, the programs that are already developing this progress and that promise further progress in the immediate future.

I might say based upon the programs we now have in effect that an accurate deduction is that 80 percent of the aged over 65 will have hospitalization in the last part of 1965. The progress that has been made in the past 10 years in particular in meeting the problem of health and medical facilities for the aged has been almost miraculous. The progress in the field of medical health has been so great in the last few years that it has aggravated the other problem of cost. The very progress in advancing medical science, in drugs, medical and hospital care, has enabled our elder citizens to live on an average of 10 years more than before. Of course, aggravates the economic problem that each person faces in financing those extra 10 years of life.
more damage to these older people than any other single thing. It is this ADA group that must assume responsibility for the inflation that cut in half the purchasing power of the dollar of these people, almost all of whom are on fixed incomes. Now this group having created this damage would make the demands for the elegant health for the aged into the political arena. Through a "know nothing" propaganda campaign they are promoting further fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Federal Government which would have further deleterious effects on the problems of our aged through inflation.

Now let us discuss the Forand bill. Does it really assure real health progress to retired citizens as the 3-penny post card, mass produced by the COPE, states? Or will it damage the progress we have made?

I think it will do damage, that it will throw us backward, and thwart the progress we have made. This is the issue. The issue should not be to get votes, but to provide proper health for our aged citizens and for our society as a whole.

H.R. 4700 would, if it became law, provide the 11 million persons eligible for OASI or OASDI benefits but not receiving benefits for aged dependents and survivors with up to 60 days of hospital care, a limited amount of nursing home care, and certain surgical benefits. Sufficient money to pay for this program would come from an increase in the OASDI payroll tax of one-quarter of 1 percent on the employee, and an equivalent amount on the employer.

But the proposal is discriminatory and neglects a substantial group of our aged.

There are, for example, almost 2 million men and women on old age assistance who would not be benefited by H.R. 4700. And there are 2.5 million persons over 65 who are not receiving either OASI or OAA benefits but are currently eligible for OASI. H.R. 4700 would not benefit them either.

Seven years ago I sponsored legislation which is now law to permit the retired people who were not covered under the social security law to receive the benefit of a retirement income credit against tax to equalize the situation between persons receiving and not receiving social security benefits which are tax exempt.

Many of these people not on social security have lower cash incomes, on the average, than the incomes of those who receive monthly OASI benefits. These are the people who are most apt to have severe financial difficulties in paying their health care costs.

Putting it another way, the persons really in need would derive no benefit whatsoever from the passage of this bill. H.R. 4700 would do nothing for those who need it the most.

Those who favor the Forand type of legislation limited, as it is, to this one aspect of our aged citizens, reason from these following premises:

First. The aged are poor to pay for their health care costs. But it would not cover everyone, just those with incomes, the problem of health care services for them.

Second argument advanced by those who favor the Forand type of legislation is the aged cannot get private health insurance. But it would not cover everyone, just those who are about to have adequate hospital or medical care if they seek it. In other words, our Community Chest agencies, our welfare programs, are taking care of the indigent. The problem is not the indigent in this particular situation. It is those who can afford to pay, those who have limited means, and those who are confronted with a catastrophic illness who find themselves in a serious plight.

The second argument advanced by those who favor the Forand type of legislation is the aged cannot get private health insurance. But it would not cover everyone, just those who are about to have adequate hospital or medical care if they seek it. In other words, our Community Chest agencies, our welfare programs, are taking care of the indigent. The problem is not the indigent in this particular situation. It is those who can afford to pay, those who have limited means, and those who are confronted with a catastrophic illness who find themselves in a serious plight.

The second argument advanced by those who favor the Forand type of legislation is the aged cannot get private health insurance. But it would not cover everyone, just those who are about to have adequate hospital or medical care if they seek it. In other words, our Community Chest agencies, our welfare programs, are taking care of the indigent. The problem is not the indigent in this particular situation. It is those who can afford to pay, those who have limited means, and those who are confronted with a catastrophic illness who find themselves in a serious plight.

The second argument advanced by those who favor the Forand type of legislation is the aged cannot get private health insurance. But it would not cover everyone, just those who are about to have adequate hospital or medical care if they seek it. In other words, our Community Chest agencies, our welfare programs, are taking care of the indigent. The problem is not the indigent in this particular situation. It is those who can afford to pay, those who have limited means, and those who are confronted with a catastrophic illness who find themselves in a serious plight.
Against this background let us examine the premise upon which the supporters of H.R. 4700 base their arguments. Although the health needs of our older persons may be greater than those in other age groups, are the aged too poor to pay for their own medical care? The answer is that some are, but the majority are not. The findings are told—and the gentlemen who preceded me used these figures—that three-fifths of all people over 65 have less than $1,000 per capita annual income. Although this is an old statistic, it would be hard to find a more misleading statistic. It is equally accurate and just as misleading to state that in 1957 almost half of these people over 14 years of age also had incomes of $1,000 or less per year, and 47 percent of those between the ages of 14 and 65 had incomes below $1,000 a year.

Let us just illustrate this. Suppose we organize a social club with only two requirements for membership: one, that no wives have incomes of their own, and two, that all husbands earned at least $25,000 a year. If we use the same statistical techniques that I have used, calculating the figures of three-fifths of all our people 65 and over have less than $1,000 annual income, we could come up with this: there is no one in this social club has incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Obviously the money income figure cited by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for those aged is inadequate for the aged in considering the financial problems of the aged.

Income drops after retirement, yes, but no age group is likely to have as favorable a liquid asset position as the aged. The post-retirement funds constitute less than 5 percent of the overall financial resources of the aged. Furthermore, the needs of the aged person are usually less; the heavy expense of raising a family are behind; for the most part couple does not exist. The median income of the OASI, almost 3 of every 4 beneficiaries own their own homes; most of them free of mortgage. And the average non-farm home for the homemaker was $8,390; and add to that the household effects and so forth.

Only 4 percent of the aged live in the homes of relatives. A survey in 1957 by the National Opinion Research Center determined that only 6.9 percent of those interviewed would be unable to pay a medical bill of $500.

Second, consider the financial resources of the aged we can do it sensibly only if we know how large a portion of income from employment, social security, pensions, interest, dividends, savings, investments, insurance, and other assets. We can only measure financial resources intelligently if we consider them in terms of family income and assets, not individually.

Then note the figures used. $1,000 per capita when many of these people, in fact I think the majority of them, are couples and the average couple comes $2,000 per married couple. And when we attempt to figure out the number of people who cannot afford adequate health care we must know how many already receive it from a religious group, fraternal group, through membership in a union, as ex-senemen, as members of the Armed Forces.

And what an unfair reference to President Eisenhower the gentleman from Nebraska, who said because President Eisenhower received all of that as a member of the Armed Forces. We in the Congress have felt that that was a proper and just thing to do. Then you have to further look to receive benefits as professional courtesy, as members of specific religious orders, as veterans entitled to compensation and care. We know, for instance, that 16 percent of the aged are public welfare recipients. As such under federally aided public funds program, they are eligible to receive medical care and do receive it. We don't know the answer to questions these facts pose. Here are some things we have got to know. How much do the families of the aged help out? And how much of our older people are affluent? My point is that the economic problems of older people are not only complex and diverse but difficult; to analyze precisely. Yet it is suggested that we undertake a large and expensive legislative action with tremendously important consequences, with no real guidance. We are being asked to grope our way through the statistical techniques on an off-chance, that will stumble into an effective solution. No one denies that there are instances of severe hardship among our older people or among any other segment of our society. Such cases do exist, although to what degree we can only guess. One of the great things about the social security bill that I believe our committee is going to bring out is that the problem is to a very serious problem involving a group of people who are totally disabled, who are below the age of 50. If you are totally disabled, it doesn't matter if you are 55 or 65 or 75. That is an area in which we are directing our attention and that is an area in which I believe the Committee on Ways and Means will take the lead in the affirmative action that we have to give. We are directed to the area, that is an area, I might state, to which the administration has been giving attention.

Certainly the weight of all of the evidence seems to suggest one conclusion; the financial and health problems of the aged have been considerably exaggerated by the proponents of the Forand type of legislation, and on the basis of the figures that I have given, it is impossible to justify the creation of a massive Federal mechanism for compulsory national health insurance, even though the mechanism would deal only with a single and somewhat artificially determined category and one segment of our aged population.

Implicit in the thinking of those who support the bill is the belief that the health care needs of older people can be conveniently separated from their other needs. Nothing could be a greater misjudgment. As I stated earlier, the needs are: housing and recreation; in preparation for retirement; in finding acceptance and understanding within the community; in developing new interests; in using talents and capabilities; in seeking love and affection.

As an example of how interrelated the needs of the aged can be, a former housing commissioner of the State of New York has pointed out that hospital construction of the amount proposed would be reduced by 20 percent if adequate housing were made available for them.

How many Members of Congress realize that last year this Congress passed a bill that made one of the greatest features to ameliorate this very problem of helping the aged. We made FHA-type loans available to private nursing homes. I may say to those who like to utilize the American Medical Association that they helped sponsor that legislation. I was the main sponsor. I went to them and asked their permission, and I said, this area of facilities for good, adequate, safe private nursing homes is one of the greatest need of the aged people.

Furthermore, if we could get these private nursing homes, we would cut health costs considerably, because the old people in many instances do not have to go to hospitals. The nursing home, which is the facility they really need, is much less expensive. The typical hospital costs. If we can build nursing homes of one floor instead of renovating old mansions of three or four stories, we can cut the cost to the aged in that type of modern, up-to-date, private nursing home facility.

So there are things being done. Just because there is not a propaganda machine reporting this genuine progress, there is no reason for our people to think that nothing is being done.

Further, the Nation's doctors have repeatedly stated that no person regardless of age, illness, needs. There is no reason for the physician to use his services because of inability to pay. Expert medical testimony before the Ways and Means Committee established another point. The aged have the same sort of needs. As Dr. Frederick C. Swartz told the Ways and Means Committee:

"Care for any segment of our population—the aged included—calls for a cooperative attack on the problem by nurses, doctors, hospitals, social workers, insurance companies, community leaders, and others. It requires flexibility of medical technique—an ingredient which would unquestionably vanish the moment Government establishes a health problem on an institutional print without calling for mass treatment."

In the case of the aged, their health problem primarily involves acute illness and the extended care of the chronic. In a very large percentage of cases, the main need is not for an expensive hospital stay or a surgical operation, but for medical care at home or in the doctor's office.

How many Members have heard of the Veterans' Nursing Home Act? It was the only male member for a good many years of the Board of Directors of the Visiting Nurses Association in St. Louis. It involved the technique of teaching people how to care for people, old people particularly, in their homes, so that they do not have to go to a hospital or even to a private nursing home.
In other cases, the important requirement is nursing care in the patient's home, or the home of relatives. And in still others, custodial care in a nursing home or public facility may be the only answer. The point is that the medical needs of this insurance group, and of the aged, are subject to countless variations.

The Forand bill wishes not only to assist the aged population who do not need the greatest amount of assistance but it wants to help all. And in the effort to be both equitable and efficient, the area of hospitalization and surgery is a great deal of this is quite recent, but this whole program has been done almost within the past 10 years.

Finally, there are some insurers who offer health insurance contracts that become paid up at age 65.

This wide diversity of plans reflects free competition among many insurance companies which vie with one another in the effort to provide ever more adequate benefits through more efficient methods.

As for the benefits available to the aged under private health insurance, the percentage of insured rising more rapidly than for any other age group.

A recent study group estimates, and I have used the figure before, that by 1965 that figure of aged covered under health insurance will be 80 percent of our aged population desiring and wanting health insurance to protect themselves. Mind you, in all of this discussion we are not talking about the poor. The poor are already taken care of. We are talking about people who can afford to pay if the insurance is available.

This growth reflects the steady expansion of the voluntary health insurance mechanism, which today provides necessary insurance for over 6 million persons. It also reflects the Intensive experimentation carried on by insurance companies, Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, and other types of insurance organizations toward broadening the availability and improving the quality of coverage for the aged.

The increase in coverage of these 65 and over can be expected to continue. Better than 70 percent of the total population today enjoy the benefits of adequate health insurance.

Those who have had this protection during their working years and as I have said this percentage will answer is clearly that it could not.

This was not the case, however, with most of the present aged who did not have this kind of protection during their working years.

The Health Insurance Association of America estimates that 65 percent of the aged need no protection and will be insured by the end of this year; and as I have said this percentage will increase to 80 percent by the end of 1965; and 90 percent by 1970.

Health insurance, like medical care, cannot be designed on a production line basis. Health insurance is written in many forms, by many types of insurers, and with a wide variety of benefits. It is this widespread choice, which allows the buyer to select the coverage best suited to his individual needs, that provides the workable alternative to the compulsory system called for by H.R. 4700 and other plans. On the one hand is coverage tailored to meet the individual's own, particular circumstances; on the other is a rigid, single pattern of benefits which bills like the Forand bill would impose on everyone—rich or poor.

The choice is clear. The facts show that private health insurance is increasing and, within the past 10 years, has more than met the needs of the aged, as well as the needs of other segments in the population. To substitute a compulsory system of health insurance for the voluntary system of health insurance that has proved its ability and willingness to do the job is neither a reasonable nor a sound decision, especially because the in the very process of sub-

There is the third premise of those backing such proposals as Mr. Forand. That the health problems of the aged can be solved simply by extending the social security system into the field of health care.

As I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, these fall completely for better than 4 million people—those on old-age assistance, and those ineligible for OASI benefits. Yet this is the category of the aged population most likely to include the hardships cases.

Let us examine a number of other objections to these ill-conceived bills. Assume, if you will, that we allowed the Federal Government to control the disbursement of funds under such programs, as all of them specify; that we allow an agency of the Federal Government to do the job as well as any private agency can; that this agency be given the right to set rates of compensation for hospitals, nursing homes, dentists, and physicians; that this agency be empowered to audit and control its expenditures to hospitals, nursing homes, and patients; and that this agency set and enforce standards of hospital and medical practice. What are the odds, indeed, it would be compelled to do.

Could the Federal Government assume these responsibilities—fiscal and otherwise? Without affecting the quality of medical care which it dispensed? The answer is clearly that it could not.

The Government, in such a case, would undertake to provide a service which is different from the patient's point of view. It is inevitable that Government would tend to control the purveyors of those services, for he who pays the fiddler calls the tune.

The author of these bills disclaims that intention of meddling with the free practice of medicine. Just the same, if a single Government agency were placed...
In the position of buying perhaps 10 to 20 percent of all care in the Nation's general hospitals, it takes no expert to see that this agency would possess great power to disrupt the operation and management of hospitals.

And possessing such power, no legislative restrictions this Congress could impose would neutralize such a Government agency from wielding its power.

In the final analysis, the result of this would be that Government employees would, willy-nilly, be telling the doctors how to diagnose and treat them; the hospital administrators how to run their hospitals; the nursing homes what they could, and could not, do.

Whether this is the intent of H.R. 4700 or not, this certainly would be one of its effects, for as the Supreme Court of the United States has observed, "it is scarcely lack of due process for Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." Indeed the Federal Government may properly be called derelict if it does not ride herd over the money it spends.

If Government pays the bill, Government will regulate the health care it buys with public funds.

Therefore, the matter of unnecessarily overcrowding our hospitals, which are hard pressed as it is to cope with the demands for care of our rapidly growing population. Passage of the Forand bill would mean that our hospitals would be swamped, and our doctors overwhelmed by the increased improper use that would surely result.

If this is unpredictable, then we have learned nothing from the experience of Great Britain, of Canada, and of other nations which have experimented with national health insurance. It follows, as the night the day, that people will seek to collect a benefit for which they are paying—regardless of whether they need it or not.

The medical profession warns us that patients should be placed in hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions only when necessary, and that the longer we allow the treatment they are given, should be governed by their medical condition, and not by the arbitrary limitations of legislation or regulations.

It is a warning that must be heeded. The relationship that exists between a doctor and his patient is an individual and private one. To disrupt it with the inflexible presence of Government, to seek to substitute a collective approach for an individual approach to patient care—these are foolhardy abstractions.

Let us comment briefly on the costs of H.R. 4700—present and future.

It is proposed that it be met by a tax of one-quarter of 1 percent on the employer, one-quarter of 1 percent on the employee, and three-eighths of 1 percent on the self-employed.

Is that enough—even for now?

Actuarial estimates by the insurance industry are that costs under H.R. 4700 would amount to about $2 billion and $6 billion for the first year of the program's operation. By 1980, according to this expert opinion, costs would range from nearly $6 billion to more than $7.5 billion. And that would require a level premium of from 2.32 percent to 2.97 percent of taxable payroll.

That is a far cry from the tax presently proposed.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to remind the Members of Congress that social security taxes are already scheduled to reach 9 percent of payroll by 1969.

The Forand bill increases—whatever they work out to be—would be in addition to the increases already provided for by the Social Security Act.

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, currently authorized OASDI benefits will cost by the year 2060, between 10.5 percent of payroll—the Department's low estimate—and 15.96 percent of payroll—the high cost estimate.

At what point will the taxpayers rebel? Some of them are now paying more in social security taxes than they pay in income taxes. And as time goes on, and more scheduled increases are put into effect, this trend will be intensified.

The proponents of this type of legislation are suggesting, in effect, that we add to the tax burden, bit by bit, in the effort to determine how much the camel can bear. I should like to remind them that a point can be reached at which one more straw will break the camel's back. And when the time that requires to see the entire mechanism of social security jeopardized by public rebellion.

Mr. Speaker, bills like H.R. 4700 have no built-in rollback feature. They start small, as a rockslide will; and then end up as avalanches. Once a measure like the Forand bill becomes law, it is idle to wish it off the books; and once passed, no second guessing will help.

Like Sinbad the Sailor, Old Man of the Sea, H.R. 4700 would cling to the shoulders of the American taxpayer generation after generation.

But if we pass this measure, would it remain in its present form? We would deceive ourselves to think so.

The Members of Congress would, thereafter, face continual demands for more—more coverage, more elaborate benefits. And eventually, the thin end of the wedge having been duly inserted, we would reach the point where everyone—every man, woman, and child in the country—would be under a national, compulsory health insurance plan.

Many of the bill's supporters admit this open-end feature.

For example, I heard Mr. Walter Reuther, of the UAW-CIO, state, in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee last July:

"It is my feeling that the UAW is officially on record as backing a program of national health insurance."

To sum up, then, Mr. Speaker, although the corpse of socialized medicine was decently buried nearly a decade ago, it is dead but it will not lie down.

H.R. 4700 is a thinly disguised attempt to resurrect it and the manner in which it is being propagandaized as a 1960 election issue demonstrates it.

Furthermore, H.R. 4700 is an effort to create an irreversible mechanism for solving what is, at worst, a temporary problem. Even more than that, it is an attempt to rob more of those who reach retirement age of the better equipped financially to live in self-sufficiency.

They are bringing with them, into the retirement years, pensions, the health insurance of their choice, property, and a social security card.

We would do them real service if we worked to prevent the erosion of their wealth and the immediate future and, if we searched for ways of easing their heavy burden of taxation.

I believe the present programs we have developed medical and hospital care for the aged programs in which the Federal Government plays a part—the State and local government play a part, the private employer, many of our unions, our community chests, our churches, our pious citizens who believe that the commandment "Honor thy father and thy mother" still has modern application, and the old people themselves, who as a matter of discipline and dignity provide for themselves, play a part, are all doing well. There are devices existing in our society which will solve the problems of the aged in the financing of health care.
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Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include an editorial from the March 24 issue of the Wall Street Journal captioned "The Helpless and the Good Society."

THE HELPLESS AND THE GOOD SOCIETY

When one—a Congressman, let us say—sees people old, sick, helpless and without the means for either medicines or care, he would be very inclined indeed not to move to cast about for a way to relieve the distress.

For unnecessary suffering is not only a personal concern. To a compassionate person it seems also a reproach to society, and from the earliest days of civilization society has grappled with the problem of the old and helpless. Ancient emperors tried with largess; the feudal system tried to create an encompassing agent of society. Made measures as the Forand bill which seek to put medical care for the aged under social compulsion must have the richness of America. They will need the charity or paternalism. They will need the energy in many forms to take care of those who cannot take care of themselves.

Yet a reflection ought to show that these remedies are not merely ineffectual remedies but can defeat the very purposes intended, the proper care of the aged. If the problem is really solved, it would have been solved long ago.

To begin with, the proposal to put every old person under a blanket of Government paternalism overlooks the profound progress that the American society has made already in dealing with this problem. It's the compassion for Americans to recognize that, despite the individual cases of hardship, old people here today have better medical treatment and better care than ever before in history or than they do currently in countries where socialism reigns.

So the problem, for America, is first of all the problem of exceptions. Even one case is a matter of concern, but the way to attack the problem is not by planning a pittance for all the people in this situation with social security, but by planning measures that can be allocated to each will be small anyway. A Nelson Rockefeller has no need of what the Government will pay him when he is 95, while others need the money desperately.

To do that, we need only disproportionate; it is absolutely defeating. The smallest calculation would show that if the Government is to undertake to pay the medical expenses for all, the cost of this program which can be allocated to each will be small indeed. On the one hand we will have the ridiculous situation of the Government taxing the poor to make medical payments to those able and willing to care for themselves. On the other hand, the truly helpless can receive only a pittance.

To some extent we have already got ourselves into this situation with social security anyway. A Nelson Rockefeller has no need of what the Government will pay him when he is 95, while others need the money desperately.

But this is only a part of the difficulty. A general proposal to put every person under a blanket of Government paternalism is not the solution. Everyone in this paternalism—the cost of it, if one may speak of bookkeeping—diminishes the problem of exceptions, for the problem of exceptions is not with the Government, but with the individual himself in each case. The present law provides that in the case of survivors of persons who in the future meet certain conditions, the new law would constitute a marriage that she entered. There was no objection.

The present law provides that in the case of survivors of persons who died prior to 1940, there is necessary in some cases. We believe it would be desirable to apply to this group let's out in the 1939 amendments the principle of retroactivity which has been generally applied in the more recent amendments. There are about 25,000 widows 75 years of age and over who would be made eligible for benefits by this proposal. This would mean additional benefits of about $60 million in 1961, increasing later to an average of about $85 million a year.

Another change that we recommend at this time is to provide benefits for the dependents of people who died fully insured before 1940.

In recent years amendments to the law have been made eligible not only those who were insured for a period of a year or more, but those who met comparable conditions in the past. This was not done because of the case of survivors of persons who died prior to 1940.

Another proposal that we recommend that would enable more people to qualify for benefits, is the extension of the Social Security in present law under which a widow and her children are denied benefits because one of a family is adopted into a good faith and believed to be valid. We also recommend five extensions of coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program. We propose:

1. That coverage be extended to include services (or than domestic services) performed by a parent for a son or daughter.
2. That coverage be made available to policemen and firemen under State or local retirement systems.
3. That coverage be extended to self-employed physicians on the same basis as that applicable to self-employed people now covered.
4. That the protection of the program be extended to employees and self-employed people in Guam.
5. That nonprofit organizations be permitted to extend coverage to their employees under this plan, on a voluntary basis.

We also recommend changes in the disability program discussed with your committee in the past. They are intended for eliminating the second 6-month waiting period for applicants with a previous period of disability, or for extending a 6-month trial work period to those who are not under State rehabilitation programs; (3) a proposal for authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to reverse the disability determination for the first 6 months by the States, provided applicants request reconsideration of such decisions. The last provision is aimed toward accomplishing this by providing for full assurance of a reasonable degree of uniformity in the determinations of disability in the States. It would also speed up the processing of some cases and avoid needless and time-consuming appeals.

We believe that the benefit for each child of a deceased worker be increased to three-fourths of the worker's benefit amount divided by the number of children getting benefits. If there are two children, for example, each child is eligible for a benefit equal to one-half plus one-eighth, namely five-eighths, of the worker's benefit. If there is one child who goes to work and has his benefit withheld, the other child is still eligible for 25% of the benefit. About 900,000 children would get benefit increases immediately as a result of this provision. The number of beneficiaries fits of about $60 million in 1961, increasing later to an average of about $85 million a year.

The EDITORIAL

The present law provides that in the case of survivors of persons who died before 1940, there is necessary in some cases. We believe it would be desirable to apply to this group let's out in the 1939 amendments the principle of retroactivity which has been generally applied in the more recent amendments. There are about 25,000 widows 75 years of age and over who would be made eligible for benefits by this proposal. This would mean additional benefits of about $60 million in 1961, increasing later to an average of about $85 million a year.

Another change that we recommend at this time is to provide benefits for the dependents of people who died fully insured before 1940.

In recent years amendments to the law have been made eligible not only those who were insured for a period of a year or more, but those who met comparable conditions in the past. This was not done because of the case of survivors of persons who died prior to 1940.

Another proposal that we recommend that would enable more people to qualify for benefits, is the extension of the Social Security in present law under which a widow and her children are denied benefits because one of a family is adopted into a good faith and believed to be valid. We also recommend five extensions of coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program. We propose:

1. That coverage be extended to include services (or than domestic services) performed by a parent for a son or daughter.
2. That coverage be made available to policemen and firemen under State or local retirement systems.
3. That coverage be extended to self-employed physicians on the same basis as that applicable to self-employed people now covered.
4. That the protection of the program be extended to employees and self-employed people in Guam.
5. That nonprofit organizations be permitted to extend coverage to their employees under this plan, on a voluntary basis.

Another change that we recommend that would enable more people to qualify for benefits, is the extension of the Social Security in present law under which a widow and her children are denied benefits because one of a family is adopted into a good faith and believed to be valid. We also recommend five extensions of coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program. We propose:

1. That coverage be extended to include services (or than domestic services) performed by a parent for a son or daughter.
2. That coverage be made available to policemen and firemen under State or local retirement systems.
3. That coverage be extended to self-employed physicians on the same basis as that applicable to self-employed people now covered.
4. That the protection of the program be extended to employees and self-employed people in Guam.
5. That nonprofit organizations be permitted to extend coverage to their employees under this plan, on a voluntary basis.

Another proposal that we recommend that would enable more people to qualify for benefits, is the extension of the Social Security in present law under which a widow and her children are denied benefits because one of a family is adopted into a good faith and believed to be valid. We also recommend five extensions of coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program. We propose:

1. That coverage be extended to include services (or than domestic services) performed by a parent for a son or daughter.
2. That coverage be made available to policemen and firemen under State or local retirement systems.
3. That coverage be extended to self-employed physicians on the same basis as that applicable to self-employed people now covered.
4. That the protection of the program be extended to employees and self-employed people in Guam.
5. That nonprofit organizations be permitted to extend coverage to their employees under this plan, on a voluntary basis.

Another change that we recommend at this time is to provide benefits for the dependents of people who died fully insured before 1940.

In recent years amendments to the law have been made eligible not only those who were insured for a period of a year or more, but those who met comparable conditions in the past. This was not done because of the case of survivors of persons who died prior to 1940.

Another proposal that we recommend that would enable more people to qualify for benefits, is the extension of the Social Security in present law under which a widow and her children are denied benefits because one of a family is adopted into a good faith and believed to be valid. We also recommend five extensions of coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program. We propose:

1. That coverage be extended to include services (or than domestic services) performed by a parent for a son or daughter.
2. That coverage be made available to policemen and firemen under State or local retirement systems.
3. That coverage be extended to self-employed physicians on the same basis as that applicable to self-employed people now covered.
4. That the protection of the program be extended to employees and self-employed people in Guam.
5. That nonprofit organizations be permitted to extend coverage to their employees under this plan, on a voluntary basis.
In approaching this problem I feel that we should keep in mind the developments that have taken place on two fronts.

First of all, there is the very significant fact that the Federal Government has taken in recent years to help deal with the hazards of old age and death. Congress has made available for continued growth in coverage and adequacy of voluntary health insurance for the aged. The Hill-Burton program of course has benefited persons of all ages in providing more adequate hospital and other health care facilities. Provision has now been made for providing for PIIA type of guarantee for the construction of private nursing home facilities. This could prove to be a significant factor in the direction of the development of the federal health facilities and cost of the aged. Congress has made provision for continuation of the House Concurrent Resolution on Aging in January 1961, at which all problems in this area will be discussed by citizens groups representing all walks of life. There are among the significant advances that have been made in recent years in extending the benefits of health insurance to people 65 years of age and over.

We estimate that approximately 42 percent of the persons in this age group have some protection against the cost of hospital care. While we do not have complete data on this, it is the case that approximately 6.5 million aged persons currently have some health insurance. Contrast this figure with that for 1952 when it was estimated that only slightly more than 3 million aged persons had any coverage of this kind.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans have been extending their benefits and improving their coverage. Several insurance companies have aggressively entered the field to provide better protection to aged individuals. For example, Blue Cross which operates all over the country has taken various steps to assure that persons age 65 and over are offered the opportunity of obtaining protection against the cost of hospital care.

Most local Blue Cross plans provide periodically for "open enrollment" when individuals can subscribe to hospital coverage. Additionally more and more Blue Cross plans are extending the time during which they will pay hospital benefits. While all the 66 Blue Shield plans will continue coverage after age 65 for persons who have been enrolled before that age, there are 32 plans that now have no age limit for initial enrollment, and 2 others permit enrollment at any time. The health insurance data with respect to Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans is similar for the aged either approved or in various stages of development.

Insurance companies also have been working to make health insurance available to older people. There is considerable variation in the types of coverage that are offered and in the benefits they provide. It is difficult to generalize on the protection offered to the aged under the many plans that are now available. However, the significant fact is that more and more companies are offering group and individual health insurance, and in many instances these plans have become the cost of nominal hospital, surgical, and in-hospital medical expenses. Additionally, several companies in the process of being introduced or will soon present polices that will provide protection against catastrophic costs of long-term or other expensive illnesses.

In addition, more and more employers are extending the benefits of group health insurance to retired persons and their dependents, including payers who are paying all or a substantial part of the cost of the group plan.

In testifying before the members of this committee on March 19, 1969, in opposition to H.R. 4700, I made the following statement: "Enactment of H.R. 4700 would have far-reaching and far-reaching consequences. I would establish a course from which there would be no turning back. The opportunity for continued progress for the protection and security of voluntary health insurance for the aged would be stifled before its full potential could be gauged..."

Since appearing before the committee last year, we have given considerable attention to the question of using a payroll tax in order to provide more of the aged with better protection against the risk of catastrophic illnesses. We believe that a restricted program of this kind would be subject to the same fundamental objections that we have made of H.R. 4700.

Therefore, I think it is clear that as an administration, we will oppose any program of compulsory health insurance.

At the same time I desire to emphasize again that I believe that continued progress in the direction of covering an increasingly larger segment of the aged voluntary health insurance programs will still leave us with serious problems. There will still be aged persons who are protected. But who would be willing to participate in voluntary health insurance programs if provided with policies at rates that they could afford to pay. This administration—indeed all thoughtful citizens—xeed to be in a position to approach these problems with a sense of urgency. But we are no less aware of the necessity for seeking and finding solutions that are adequate rather than impede the progress we all desire.

We have been investigating, therefore, the feasibility of a program that would help accelerate rather than impede the present voluntary approach to this problem. In these studies we have been keeping in mind the following guiding principles:

1. That there should be no compulsion on anyone to participate in any health insurance program.

2. That there should be no action taken by anyone that would tend to stifle private initiatives in the health insurance field. Anything done in this area should build on, and not undermine or replace with a Federal system that would impede the progress that is now being made by private effort.

3. That we should strive to strengthen and stimulate our existing private system so as to foster additional progress—both in terms of scope of protection and numbers of persons protected.

4. That we should preserve and strengthen the private relationships which now characterize the rendering of health care services.

5. That we should have the opportunity of participating in any program that might be developed.

6. That we should be available to the aged—particularly in the low income groups—protection against the severe burden of catastrophic costs of institutional care in connection with long-term and other very expensive illnesses.

Before arriving at a final conclusion as to whether such a private program can be devised within this framework of principles, we are not proposing a program that would destroy the very progress that has already been made in helping our aged citizens...
not only meet their health care needs but also their other economic and social requirements.

It is basic that once a social program has been established, that program is never to be abandoned, but it can be improved to a mistake in major part. It is also true that government can give to its citizens only that which it has first provided. That is all the Congress in seeking to ameliorate the problems of one segment of our citizenry must be sentient of the effect of congressional action on our entire citizenry. It is also essential that we examine not only the immediate implications of a proposed legislative cure, but we must also examine its long-range implications.

In recent days I have noticed in the press and elsewhere criticism of the administration for not having a total solution today to a problem that has existed and challenged the minds of men since the beginning of organized society—namely adequate provision for the aged including their health care problems. This unwarranted criticism has chosen to overlook or has been deliberately mindful of the outstanding progress that has been made by the present administration to this end. As examples of this progress I cite the following irrefutable facts:

In 1952 the last year prior to the present administration coming into power there were 5 million beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program compared with 13.7 million in 1959 including 460,000 who were receiving disability insurance benefits. The average monthly benefit paid to an old-age recipient under the OASI program in 1953 was $19.25 contrasted with an average monthly payment of $72.78 in 1959.

The range of benefit payments provided under the law in 1953 was a minimum of $12 and a maximum of $116. The range in 1959 was $23 to $127.

The number of persons who benefit from the old-age and survivors insurance program to be $414.1 million in 1959 with increasing emphasis devoted to problems of the aged in the latter period.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Flemming, highlighted the need for these increases in this area at the time of his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means on March 24, 1960. At that time Mr. Flemming stated the following:

The number of persons who benefit from the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program has increased very materially. As of March 19, 1960, the $414.1 million increase has been a marked increase in the payments to the beneficiaries. Payments under the old-age assistance program, including medical services, have been liberalized. There has been a sharp increase in the funds the Federal Government has made available for medical research. More and more of these funds are being directed toward problems of the aging. The Hill-Burton program of the Federal Government has made available for the construction of private nursing home facilities. This could prove to be a significant advancement in dealing with the health care facilities and health costs of the aged. Congress has made provision for a White House Conference on Aging in January 1961; it is to be hoped that this problem in this area will be discussed by citizens groups representing all walks of life.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that a Government solution to the health problems of the aged is not now on the agenda should not be interpreted as a willful neglect or culpability on the part of the responsible Government officials. The absence of a solution does not indicate neglect of prior indifference on the part of these officials but instead is testimony to the difficulty and magnitude of the problem under consideration.

A solution has been proposed by certain of my colleagues serving in the Congress. This solution was originally sponsored by my able committee colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. Forand). I recognize that he has conscientiously sought the approval of the White House, F.H. 4700, which would provide surgical, hospital, and nursing home care to present beneficiaries of the OASI program to be paid for by the imposition of a compulsory payroll tax on the presently working population. It is my conviction, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Forand's solution is unwise and unsound. Its enactment would in my judgment create more problems than it answers.

I would make these observations in regard to the so-called Forand proposal:

This is an election year but in the interest of preserving the integrity of our social security system, amendments to the act should not be an election subject. Everyone wants to see our aged citizens get everything in life that it is possible for them to have in our free enterprise system. Unfortunately, there are by definition no economic goods and services that are free—someone has to pay. That is true in private enterprise and is to be more true in Government enterprise because of the higher cost that usually attends Government endeavors.

It is conceded that to some unascertained extent a problem does exist in connection with health care for our aged citizens. However, I submit that the health care problem is not peculiar to the aged; it frequently is just as acute in the case of individuals and families who have not reached retirement age.

The recognition of the existence of a problem does not of itself establish the obligation of the Federal Government to undertake to provide a definitive answer. Most of the agencies of Government are already overburdened with the duties imposed by the problems confronting the aged generally recognize that caring for our older citizens calls for cooperative endeavors of family members, insurance companies, professional practitioners, churches, community endeavors, and society generally.

Mr. Forand's proposal does not supply a workable answer to the problem of providing for the health needs of the aged. The problem is essentially outside the framework of the social security program as it is now constituted. Such a solution would inevitably serve to weaken the retirement and survivorship aspects of the existing benefit system.

I am convinced that those who are most constructively interested in the social security system are those who seek its overexpansion but instead are those who work to safeguard it from the assumption of obligations that could weaken or destroy the system.

I am mindful of the fact that health care requirements to individuals reach their highest point with age but I am also mindful of the tremendous progress that has been made in recent years toward providing health care for all segments under free enterprise and without Government domination. American medicine has placed health care and professional services before economic considerations in providing the indigent of all ages. The insurance industry is striving to deal effectively with the increasing demand for health care financing for the aged.

It is significant to note that in regard to health care the national health insurance protection is rising more rapidly than for any other age group. Almost half of our aged population now has health insurance. Furthermore it is projected that the national health insurance group will rise to approximately 50 percent of those who need and want this protection by the year 1970. Doctors have taken formal action in their professional societies to promote medical services to the indigent and at half price to the aged generally.

For a number of reasons, not the least of which is inflation, some 18 percent of the aged are public welfare recipients under federally aided public assistance programs. As such these individuals are eligible to receive health care under these programs for 90 percent of their medical needs. Any segment of our aged population is eligible to receive medical assistance from the Veterans' Administration, military and other Government agencies as well as from private sources.

Today upward of 125 million Americans are protected against illness through some form of voluntary health insurance and through voluntary protection against wage loss due to disability. It is to be regretted that this
protection does not cover 100 percent of our population but it must be realized that Mr. Forand's proposal does not provide protection to 100 percent of our population.

In fact the Forand bill discriminates against those who through no fault of their own are excluded from the protection of the OASI program. Our aged population today includes approximately 15.5 million people and 4 million of those people would be ineligible for the benefits under the Forand bill. It also is projected that by 1969, two of every three families of Americans along with their families who today are in the Nation's working force and who have just as real economic problems as the aged. The Forand bill with its statutory limitation on duration of services fails to take care of the catastrophic situation which is the real problem in the health care area.

It is inevitable that if we launch into a Forand type program, pressures will be brought to bear in future years which will lead us to a sweeping, all-inclusive, Government run national health program. Such a program would involve the expenditure of vast sums of money, certainly upwards of $20 billion annually.

Such an expenditure would be reflected in the cost of doing business and would cause rising prices so that our domestic producers would be less able to compete in domestic and world markets. The inflationary consequences of this rise in the general price level would adversely affect all Americans and would particularly strike at the very age group who today are in the Nation's working force and who have just as real economic problems as the aged. The Forand bill purports to help. As I said, someone pays for what anybody gets, and the Federal Government must maintain supervision over the expenditure by Government of the tax money taken from its citizens.

A massive Government supervised health program is one more step and a major one in the direction of a regimented society. The inflationary consequences of this proposal carried to its logical extreme would rob the aged in terms of purchasing power of their savings, insurance, bonds, and other liquid assets.

In the 26th annual report of the trustees of the social security trust funds we find that the OASI fund operated at an annual deficit in the 3 years 1957 through 1959. A modest increase in the fund of $62 million is projected for 1960 which means that the OASI trust fund at the present time is insufficient to pay 2 years' benefits. Therefore, liberalizations expected today must inevitably be paid for by tomorrow's taxes.

We all have knowledge of the crowded condition presently existing in hospitals and we know that the cost of these institutions has increased through 1959. A modest increase in the number of employees of the social security trust funds, for example, would bring an increase in the number of people working on wages from employment and in self-employment. Social security taxes under existing law range up to 4½ times as long as average stays in non-Government hospitals.

The Forand proposal would tax our working population to pay hospital and other health care costs for our aged citizens regardless of their economic circumstances, be they wealthy, poor, or in between. The bill provides for an increase in the social security tax of 4½ percent each on employees and employers on wages from employment and 3½ percent on self-employment. Social security taxes under existing law and with further changes are already scheduled to reach 9 percent of payroll in 1969.

Responsible actuarial estimates in regard to the Forand proposal clearly indicate that the program would be under-financed by the schedule of tax increases provided in the bill. Testimony was presented to the Committee on Ways and Means during our hearings last year on this actuarial point but that the first year cost of the program would be in excess of $2 billion and that by the year 1980 the annual costs would range from $6 to $7.5 billion. The increased actuarial security taxes to cover such costs would very likely serve to preclude other meritorious liberalizations of the Social Security Act. The health care features of the Forand proposal would virtually rule out the possibility of cash benefit increases, liberalization of the retirement test, and the elimination of inequities in existing law. Also, the proposed bill would for the first time deny to an individual the freedom to choose how he will use his social security benefit dollars. The bill would be a hardship for the time being on those not currently working individuals but would pay differing benefit amounts for medical care services in the various geographical locations of our Nation.

In 1960 the Congress passed legislation creating a White House Conference on the Aging. Congress already has or will be called upon to appropriate taxpayers' money for this enterprise to the extent of about $6 million. Thousands of informed citizens are now busily engaged in State conferences on this subject. It is expected that 3,000 delegates will attend the National Conference to be held in Washington, D.C., next January. The persons participating in this Conference bring experience and ability to their undertakings in behalf of deferred and finally realized problems of the aged. To enact a health care program at this time, from which there would be no retreat, would serve to preempt the worthwhile endeavors involved in the White House Conference on the Aging.

For the benefit of interested persons, I would briefly summarize the objections to the Forand proposal:

1. The Forand amendment is discriminatory. It would tax present workers with little or no regard for their ability to pay and would pay benefits to the aged regardless of their economic circumstances, be they rich, poor, or in between. It excludes 4 million of our aged population who through no fault of their own are denied social security protection. It also excludes the millions of Americans in the working force along with their families who may have just as urgent medical-economic problems as the aged. The proposal fails short of providing for the catastrophe situation involving the Nation's aged.

2. The Forand amendment is un soundly financed. The tax increases provided in the proposal are inadequate for financing social security taxes by 1969 to 9½ percent with respect to the employed and 6½ percent on self-employment taxes. These taxes would be inadequate to pay the costs of the social security system if it included a Forand type health program. Responsible actuaries have demonstrated that the average stay in Federal Government hospitals ranges up to 4½ times as long as average stays in non-Government hospitals.

The Forand proposal would tax our working population to pay hospital and other health care costs for our aged citizens regardless of their economic circumstances, be they wealthy, poor, or in between. The bill provides for an increase in the social security tax of 4½ percent each on employees and employers on wages from employment and 3½ percent on self-employment. Social security taxes under existing law and with further changes are already scheduled to reach 9 percent of payroll in 1969.

Responsible actuarial estimates in regard to the Forand proposal clearly indicate that the program would be under-financed by the schedule of tax increases provided in the bill. Testimony was presented to the Committee on Ways and Means during our hearings last year on this actuarial point but that the first year cost of the program would be in excess of $2 billion and that by the year 1980 the annual costs would range from $6 to $7.5 billion. The increased actuarial security taxes to cover such costs would very likely serve to preclude other meritorious liberalizations of the Social Security Act. The health care features of the Forand proposal would virtually rule out the possibility of cash benefit increases, liberalization of the retirement test, and the elimination of inequities in existing law. Also, the proposed bill would for the first time deny to an individual the freedom to choose how he will use his social security benefit dollars. The bill would be a hardship for the time being on those not currently working individuals but would pay differing benefit amounts for medical care services in the various geographical locations of our Nation.

In 1960 the Congress passed legislation creating a White House Conference on the Aging. Congress already has or will be called upon to appropriate taxpayers' money for this enterprise to the extent of about $6 million. Thousands of informed citizens are now busily engaged in State conferences on this subject. It is expected that 3,000 delegates will attend the National Conference to
6. The Forand amendment would operate to preclude meritorious liberalizations and improvements in existing law by delaying for the second session of the 87th Congress the establishment of a penalty taxes solely for health care. The financing costs of the health care features of the Forand proposal would be, moreover, on the overall basis of cash benefits increases, liberalization of the retirement test, and the elimination of estate exemptions under the law. The Forand proposal would also for the first time deny to an individual the freedom to choose how he wishes to pay for health care with added dollar addition working individuals would be taxed at the same rate under the bill but benefit amounts for medical services. The Forand proposal is, therefore, working toward geographical location in our Nation.

7. The Forand proposal would preempt the work now in progress of the White House Conference on the Aging. In 1958 Congress authorized the establishment of a White House Conference To Study Problems of the Aging for which approximately $2 million will be appropriated. Thousands of informed citizens are already at this task and $800,000 will attend the National Conference to be held in Washington, D.C., next January. The participating conference bring expert testimony to help to define and find solutions to the problems of the aged. The law prescribes that the Conference on the Aging is to be held by the Committee on Ways and Means at Washington, D.C., April 9, 1961, and it is expected that recommendations to the Congress would be forthcoming shortly thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, it has been alleged that the enactment of the 1961 Social Security Act of Resources, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, in his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means on March 22, had breached a promise which he made to the committee last year to have a health care plan to come to the floor of the House of Representatives. I am trying to look at all of the possibilities in connection with the solution of what I recognize, as you know, to be a very real problem.

I can assure you that as far as the additional statements are concerned that they will be given personal attention and I will certainly try to take time, first of all, to get acquainted with the contents of the report that was submitted to you, and in the second place I have tried to look at all of the possibilities in connection with the solution of what I recognize, as you recognize, to be a very real problem.

My hope would be that they would be available to the Congress and that they come into the second session of this particular Congress.

Now, as far as the administration of a program is concerned, I think that we have to keep in mind the fact that this would be a new departure as far as social insurance is concerned.

In the letter that I transmitted to the committee I referred views on this particular bill, I said this:

"Such a system!"—that is, the one envisioned by this bill—"in order to meet the objectives of saving of the risks in an economical manner, must be designed to meet all or substantially all of the costs of those services that a person underakes to provide. In this significant respect, the compulsory health insurance under H.R. 4700 differs from the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program which contemplates, and in fact provides, an incentive for supplementation of a basic floor of protection broken through a combination of an incentive and thrift and private insurance."

Then a little later on, I indicate that this program would be time-reversing and irrevocable consequences.

On top of the last page of my letter I indicate this:

"Such forescore of future opportunity for private efforts to demonstrate their capacity to deal with the problem would require far more convincing justification than is afforded by present evidence that non-profit and commercial insurance cannot meet the need. It would demand, moreover, the payment of an additional price in the form of governmental intervention into arrangements that are on the whole better left within the framework of nongovernmental action."

Then I proceed to list some of the new types of administrative problems that would confront the Government if we move in this direction.

This extract clearly indicates that the Secretary had hoped that he would be able to recommend a sound solution; it does not indicate a promise to recklessly advocate something just for the sake of making a recommendation. The statement does indicate the very genuine desire of the administration to develop in a proper way the clear definition of Government's role in contributing to the alleviation of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that organized labor is again rendering a disservice to the union membership and to the American people through its political pressures in behalf of the clearly un­sound Forand proposal. As I have demonstrated, the labor bosses' advocacy of H.R. 4700 is a total disregard of the facts. The labor bosses are supporting this discriminatory solution fraught with inflationary overtones that is unsoundly conceived to conceal the failure of the labor movement to constructively contribute to a solution to the health needs of our aged citizens.

Mr. Porter, opposition to the Forand bill should not and cannot be construed to constitute indifference to a solution to the health problems of not only our aged citizens but indeed of all of our citizens. In my judgment the opposition to the Forand bill should instead be construed as indicating a determination to find a proper solution to the problem and an unwillingness to engage in a reckless or a dangerous action. I am referring to the fact that the Federal Government in the executive branch and in the legislative branch who will not work diligently to this end. The solution requires an approach on the basis of political propaganda and pressure. The solution will not be developed by distorting or disregard all the facts which bear on this challenging and complex problem and the index is not developed on the basis of a partisan approach.

Mr. Speaker, I would again commend my colleague from Missouri for his very learned evaluation on the problems concerning which we have admired and respected aged citizens. I join with him in pledging myself to earnest endeavor to find the proper answers to these problems.

Mr. Utt. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California for his very kind remarks?

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, gladly.

Mr. Porter. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to have the opportunity to hear the gentleman's presentation, but I am not sure that the late Senator Taft would have agreed with his point of view.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I say to the gentleman that the late Senator Taft and I were very close personal friends. I managed his campaign in the State of Missouri in 1946 and 1952, and I think he would have very much in accord in our approach to these matters.

Mr. Porter. In regard to the Federal Government's role in connection with health?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I would even say that, because in the days when Senator Taft made some of his proposals, we had not had this progress that I have been reconning. Since 1952, just to take these bold figures, it shows an increase from 26 percent of our people being covered beyond age 65 with health insurance in some form, where we are up to over 60 percent for the year 1960, and we know of the progress and the policies that are in effect today to get this progress. So, you see, we do not stand still in this country. If we will only pay attention to the thing that has made this country great, which is education, our priority will be for the millions of American men and women will be doing things for themselves.

Mr. Porter. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. Porter. The gentleman said that part of this campaign was blaming the Administration for what is being apparently the principal people behind it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did. I refer to a specific campaign and I pointed out that it was blasphemous. Actually I referred to a quote that was taken from the Bible and placed out of context, I might say. The blasphemy consists in this—and I suggest the gentleman read the message. The propagandists said that anyone who does not approve of the Forand bill is casting out the older people. That is something that we need not have in our political debate. And when the Bible is quoted to further that, I say it is blasphemous.
Mr. PORTER. I am sure that the gentleman agrees that the teachings of Christ are such that we should take care of the humble and the ill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But His teachings did not include attacking the motives of those who were trying to do the same thing.

Mr. PORTER. If I may complete my statement, by way of preliminary; the gentleman says that the ADA adherents and the American press—and he cites Mr. Curtis—speak of a small segment of the American press, and that the doctors’ lobby is far better financed and is working on this matter with far more resources.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I do not. I might say to the gentleman that I do not agree with that. As a matter of fact, what is so difficult in connection with an apparatus like the ADA is that some of them project their thoughts and ideas as if they are professors in universities in some instances; others as if they are working—objective news reporters; or that they are objective cartoonists, calling their shots as they see them. Instead of working in an apparatus to assist in perpetrating a national propaganda scheme. There is the difference. The doctors, Lord bless them, are not engaged in that kind of activity.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALFORD. There were statements that were made here, and I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. There were quotations from the Bible and our Lord was mentioned in a statement with reference to the needy. I would like to stress one point, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the distinguished gentleman, who is an authority on this subject, and a very close observer of the Committee on Ways and Means, this question. The needy and the poor and the indigent of this country are not covered by the Federal welfare program. Is it they?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; the gentleman is correct. I think it is one of the great things in our society that we can say that really the indigent are taken care of today in America. There may be a few here and there; but if their need is called to the attention of anyone, they are taken care of, because we have the facilities in our society to care for them.

The Forand bill, of course, has nothing to do with those people. That is an important point to dwell upon, if this is going to get into a propaganda campaign; that is, that the people of this country understand that the proponents, those who are starting this propaganda machine, are trying to create in the minds of people that they are talking about the needy when in fact they are not referring to any needy group. They are not talking about the needy.

Mr. ALFORD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will yield, I think it should be made clear, and I thought it would be made clear, that the Forand bill insurance program is based upon workers who put aside money when they are making that money. No one has ever said it was a subsidy or welfare program.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Swenson] may extend his remarks at this point in the debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] for his very scholarly statement on the needs of the aged.

He has performed a fine public service in calling attention to the weaknesses and inadequacies of H.R. 4700. I, like him, have given much consideration to this very subject of which I sincerely believe we ought to give serious consideration to other plans that will recognize the total problem. I hope that those of us who are working in this matter—in and out of Congress—will read and study this fine statement and then join those of us who want to do a more adequate job of meeting this very real problem that needs our attention now.

COST OF LIVING AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. S Sector] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, everybody complains about the rising cost of living. Various agencies attempt to state the amount of change in percentage figures. For instance, the Department of Labor puts the increase at 9%, the Bureau of Labor of the Department of Labor put it at 25% from 1942 to 1990. In computing this increase, they take a proportion of each commodity and services that many people buy, and they take the price of all the goods and services in the total, that is, they weight the items. The individual purchaser, or the family unit, may not follow the buying pattern of the general run of people. Low income families must necessarily spend a larger proportion of their incomes for food, for instance. To such a family, the rising cost of living really means the rising cost of food.

So many factors enter into the cost of living that it is unreasonable to expect the average man to trace all of them to their final result. In the final analysis, we tend to want an increasing amount of goods and services as a return for less and less work. Therefore, a good measure of any change in the cost of living would be the total amount of our national product divided by the total number of man-hours spent in its production. The only remaining problem then would be introduced a distribution among those who should receive it. There is no doubt that we have increased our productive capacity enormously in the last 20 years through the application of better methods and improved machinery.

For instance, production on the farm per man-hour is said to be three times as great as in 1940. Yet the price of food in dollars has gone up instead of down. Why? Is somebody profiting at the expense of the farmer and the consumer? Nearly everybody is willing to point out the culprit. It is the wholesaler, or it is the middleman, or it is the retailers, or it is the manufacturer. It is the laborer, it is the retailer, it is the cost of advertising. And so on. We can see only get dizzy if we try to follow the reasoning in each case.

One proposal for holding the real cost of living in practical limits would be to equate the value of every item of goods and services with the value of a single pound of food. One who has a bushel of wheat served as the unit, for instance, then a cow or an automobile or a coat or a trip to Bermuda or a man-hour of work would be worth so many pounds of wheat according to some formula for computing the equivalences. Most schemes for controlling the prices of things suffer the same disadvantage. They sound well, but they cannot be made to work in practice.

At the start of the last war, the Government put an immediate clamp on both prices and wages. We endured this invasion of what we consider our inalienable rights while the war lasted. After the war, prices of goods and wages jumped sharply. Now many people urge that the Government step in and do something to halt the continued rise. Practical plans for doing this do not seem to be in evidence. In the recent prolonged steel strike, the Government was criticized for not intervening on one side or the other. Then, when it did get somewhat indirectly into the negotiations, it was criticized for interference. The only plan officially endorsed by the administration was that everybody should exercise restraint in attempting to improve his position relative to others. Meanwhile the cost of living continues to go up.

PEACE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The establishment and maintenance of peace in this country and in the world is the major concern of all our people. Those whose husbands, sons, and daughters failed to come back from the last war do not want to see another. Those who participated and came back without injury have had enough. All who contributed in a civilian role to the final victory want to avoid the sacrifice of thousands of young men. I served nearly 4 years as a navigator in the Naval Air Corps during the war. I do not want to repeat the experience myself, and I look forward with the greatest horror to the prospect that my children, or my children's children, should be caught in another and more horrible slaughter.

I have introduced legislation setting up a Department of Peace in the Federal Government. The major function of the
Department would be to study causes of friction among nations and ways of solving differences peacefully without resort to arms. But it would be foolish to trust in such a Department alone to preserve the peace in this age of tension. Until we can get universal acceptance of the idea that a Department of Peace must be prepared to fight. While I shall make every effort to achieve the objectives of the Department of Peace, I am equally prepared to support and encourage the military forces that no nation dare attack us. We have never in our history engaged in offensive military action, we have no intentions now to start an offensive war, and I believe we never will have. But we know that powerful forces exist in the world intent on our destruction. The only hindrance to letting them loose against us is the sure knowledge that we will meet force with force. The communist nations aligned against us are bullies. They respect nothing but force. The only way to handle a bully is to check him with immediate deterrent force. We are already spending a considerable slice of our national income, perhaps 9 percent, in building up our deterrent strength. It may not be enough to spend billions more now in guarding against disaster than to wait and hope that nothing will happen, and then be compelled to sacrifice not only our money but thousands of human lives, to spend billions more for a war that might have been averted if we had only been strong enough. We do not want another Pearl Harbor. The "too late" policy of the early 1930's laid us open to the belief that we could be attacked with impunity. After we had been attacked, we had to spend time, money, and men to recover the force and prestige we had lost unnecessarily.

Many men prominent in public life have gone on record to the effect that our preparedness program is too weak and inadequate to meet the needs of both political parties. Their integrity and their understanding of events cannot be questioned. They are in a position to know, and they have the facts on which to base their conclusions. I agree that we are already far below Russia in military effectiveness, and that we are losing ground year by year. They point out that Russia is spending at least twice as large a proportion of her national output on weapons as we are spending. Further, Russia needs desperately to increase the supply of consumer goods, while we enjoy a surplus of practically every civilian commodity. We can well afford to devote a larger share of our income to building up our strength. Meanwhile, administration policies waver from one position to another. They take up one military project after another, spend large sums in its development, and then abandon it for something else. We are not getting even on a total program that will do the job. It is certainly that we have the knowledge by which we can determine our needs. We have the technical skill, the organizational resources, and the materials to make a program that would be adequate, if we used them to the extent that they are needed.

Considerations of economy aside, a balanced budget will not save us from annihilation if an atomic war breaks out. Failure to act now will convince our enemies that we are really bluffing, that we have no firm commitment to a policy of resisting aggression. We have to refuse to fight at all when the chips are down. Already there is talk of breaking our promises in Europe, in the Middle East, and in eastern Asia. We must bolster up our national will to make the sacrifices necessary. We must restore our military power in international confrontations. Penny-pinching now in the economy will inevitably lead to waste and extravagance later when the full force of the storm strikes us, as it always has. The best way to preserve peace is to be abundantly able to wage war.

WRONG DONE JULIUS WILDESTON, OF NEWARK, N.J.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct a serious wrong that was committed against the good name of Julius Wildstein, of Newark, N.J., by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the floor of the House on March 9. It is regrettable when debate descends to the level of personalities, when name calling is substituted for calm and objective discussion. However, we can perhaps excuse a Member resorting to denunciation in the absence of arguments of merit and reason. It is inexcusable to impugn falsely a man's honor and integrity. A grave injustice has been done to Mr. Wildstein, as the following letter from him makes clear.

Under date of March 21, Mr. Wildstein has written me:


The Honorable HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR CONGRESSMAN ADDONIZIO: My attention has been called to an item appearing in the Congressional Record of March 9, 1960 (No. 44), at page 5083, in which Congressman WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, referring to an item placed in the records of the House, accused me of not being responsible for: "On February 23, 1960, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, quite frequently, it seems, for one reason or another, we have charged with responsible leadership in the executive branch of our Government face criticism and complaints, rather than acclaim, for their efforts.

Thus, it is a matter of considerable pleasure when the opportunity arises to offer praise for an example of steadfastness and courage in Federal Government administration.

I refer to the forthright reassertion recently given the American coal industry by Mr. Elmer F. Bennett, Under Secretary of the Interior, when he announced, with the approval of his superior, Secretary Fred A. Stanton, that the Department has no information that
would justify an increase in oil import quotas for the first 6 months of this year, despite the current high levels of imports.

In a letter to Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Mr. Bennett, as Acting Secretary, declared that importers of residual oil do not point to this danger for several years.

doubt the validity of the import levels which were established for the 1958 import quota. We have no information which would appear to warrant an upward adjustment in the residual allotment for this 6-month period.

Despite this clear expression by Mr. Bennett, however, there are well-founded reports that importers of residual oil, consisting mostly of the major international oil companies, expect to bring tremendous pressure on the Department of the Interior, which administers the quotas, to increase them before this half year is over.

If this rate continues—and it shows little signs of abating—many importers will be certain that their quotas will run out in March before June 30. If this occurs, we may expect to hear anguished cries that critical users of residual oil are being forced into hardship by arbitrary and autocratic procedures. We are not interested in the domestic coal industry, do not wish to shed the light of pure facts on"
American industries. The basis of the Presidential proclamation was that a continued high level of oil imports was injurious to the national security of the United States because it weakened the domestic energy base so vital in time of emergency. The inclusion of residual fuel oil under this mandate plainly interfered with the American energy supply, which is the cornerstone of national defense.

Imported residual oil increases the dependency on our basic economy on fuel and energy resources from outside the United States, which are, of course, unreliable in time of war, in the same way that imports of crude oil increase this dependence. Imports of residual oil displace domestic sources of fuel and energy in the same way as do imports of crude oil. And the same retardation of growth and of the economy that have characterized the effect of excessive imports of crude oil on domestic petroleum development, are apparent in the effect of uncontrolled imports of residual fuel oil on the American energy industry.

The original level at which imports were to be maintained under the Presidential order was that of 1957. This standard was followed generally in the establishment of import quotas for April, May, and June 1959—as far as residual oil was concerned, this meant roughly 343,000 barrels per day.

However, the 1957 basis for import restrictions was abandoned when the quotas were set for the final 6 months of 1959. At this time the amount of imported residual to be allowed entry became involved with the estimates of the residual petroleum production and demand made by the U.S. Bureau of Mines. This estimate was predicated on elements of normal demand, abnormal demand, because of unloading of the coldest cold cargo, and an allowance for building of stocks, even though the Bureau had no accurate storage figures to indicate such a need. Under this vague system, the quotas for the 6 months were increased to 365,000 barrels per day. If normal weather had been assumed and no allowance made for stock building, the quota would instead have been cut to approximately 330,000 barrels per day under this system.

With the establishment of the residual quotas for the first 6 months of 1960, at 345,000 barrels a day, the complete abandonment of the 1957 basis became obvious. Emphasizing the abandonment was a revised version of the Presidential Proclamation issued on December 10, 1959, and signed by the President.

The Secretary of the Interior shall keep under review the imports * * * of residual fuel oil to be used as fuel and the Secretary may make, notwithstanding the levels prescribed in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section [the 1957 level] and on a monthly basis, a determination of the maximum levels of such imports as he may determine to be consonant with the objectives of this proclamation.

While no justification accompanied the announcement of the higher quotas, it is probably the case that this new policy was predicated on the postulations of market demand derived by the Bureau of Mines.

Despite the facts that residual stocks were high, prices were weak, and importers had been slow to use quotas during the earlier part of the January-December quarter period, thus indicating a needed reduction in residual quotas, the allowable imports were actually increased by 60,000 barrels a day. This increase appears to be interpreted by the oil importers to signify an open-ending of the control program—an open invitation to use up the quotas and then ask for more. Without relying on my reading of the publication of the oil industry, reported an interview with an official of the Department of the Interior.

He explained that importers can bring in as much of their total 6-month imports allowable as they wish during the early months of the year. Implicit in this is that, if importers do run out of quotas well before the end of the 6-month period, there will be allocated additional import quotas of residual oil.

Unfortunately, this erroneous assumption seems to have had a strong effect on the members of the oil giants, who are, of course, responsible for dumping residual oil in the Eastern United States.

In January of 1960, the first month of the current quota period, an average of 224,000 barrels per day was imported, nearly 300,000 barrels more than the average allowed under the quotas. The January total was more than 22 million barrels, nearly twice the over-all 6-month allowable of 77 million barrels, this figure is nearly 30 percent of the total quota.

The average daily importation during the month of January was 660,000 barrels, totaling some 19.4 million altogether. This chewed up another 25 percent of the 6-month quota thus bringing the percent of the quotas used in only one-third of the period to 54 percent. This rush to sell residual certainly seems to indicate that the oil giants are doing their best to use up the quotas as fast as possible in the hope of obtaining supplementary allocations once the original ones are exhausted.

It is obvious that if this strategy adopted by the oil importers succeeds, it will be a serious reduction in the mandatory control program on residual oil. It is also obvious that the destruction of the mandatory program would be a catastrophe to the American fuels industries and, consequently, to the Nation as a whole. We in this body cannot stand idly by and watch a small group of willful businessmen destroy the energy industries and the national security of the United States.

It is for this reason that I so wholeheartedly commend Under Secretary Bennett for his forthright affirmation that the Department of the Interior will stand firm in the face of this all-out attack on the oil-import control program. This affirmation is an important one to the oil importers, as you all know, provides an important economic contribution to the State which I represent.

The importation of any residual oil at all is harmful to the domestic coal industry. However, if imports were maintained at the level of 1957, as originally set by the Presidential proclamation, this great American industry could plan on coal displacement of some 30 million tons annually and thus have some stability and continuity introduced into its marketing plans. However, in 1959, of which only the last 9 months were under this program, residual oil equivalent to 38 million tons of coal was imported. And, even more startling, the level of imports during January and February of 1960 was at a seasonally adjusted annual rate equal to 53 million tons of coal. When one considers that total annual production of coal in this country is currently only slightly more than 460 million tons, the grievous injury done by the accelerated importation of residual oil is readily apparent.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these facts, the members of this body can only urge Under Secretary Bennett to remain steadfast in his position that no new quotas will be granted prior to the June 30 expiration date. Undoubtedly, tremendous pressures will be brought to bear on the Bureau of Mines to cause it to grant supplementary quotas. This pressure must be resisted. Mr. Bennett and his dedicated associates in the Department of the Interior must successfully defend the mandatory controls on residual oil imports against the planned onslaught of the oil giants so as to safeguard the health of the American fuels industries and the maintenance of our national security.
The Kaiser organization has applied these principles in Argentina, Brazil, India, Turkey, Israel, and a number of other foreign countries. In fact, it is applying them right now in the independent, 3-year-old nation of Ghana. This is one of the most spectacular engineering projects of modern times.

Known as the Volta River project, it calls for a series of three dams across the Volta estuary, and will require about 5 years to complete and will eventually supply the new nation of Ghana with thousands of kilowatts of electric power to help diversify the country's cocoa-based economy.

Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah has long recognized the value of the project to the economic development of his country, and he has indicated his determination in this matter. This new report emphasizing the feasibility of the project was submitted to Prime Minister Nkrumah in March 1959.

Shortly thereafter, the Government of Ghana signed a separate construction contract with Kaiser Engineers for preliminary engineering design and certain preliminary construction work under a $3 million contract.

Kaiser Engineers subsequently under separate contract is constructing about $7 million in preliminary dam work such as access roads, housing, utilities, warehouses, and so forth. Final engineering design is also under way.

The first dam and power plant to be built at Akosombo, on the Volta River, will provide 768,000 kilowatts. All three will generate 1,080,000 kilowatts.

Prime Minister Nkrumah has also called upon Mr. Edgar F. Kaiser to accept the initiative in forming an aluminum consortium, composed of a number of major aluminum producers, for the purpose of building an aluminum reduction plant in Ghana with an initial annual capacity of 120,000 tons. The plant would cost $100 million to $150 million and will tap into Ghanaian bauxite deposits and Volta River power. The ultimate capacity of the plant would be 220,000 tons. The aluminum produced would be supplied to world markets outside the United States.

Mr. Kaiser accepted the Prime Minister's invitation and has since discussed the matter with other major producers. A company has been formed and designated the Volta Aluminum Co. It was formed for the purpose of considering the full possibilities of establishing an aluminum industry in Ghana along with the attendant problems and costs involved. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that a review of the situation will be made by the new Government, and a decision given to the Ghana Government before September of this year.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of cooperation we need between the newly developing countries and American industry. This is the area in which America can make its greatest contribution. We all recognize the strong nationalistic feelings currently evident in the various developing countries and American industry should do all in its power to assist this young country and its people in developing a strong, active economy that can withstand the blandishments of communism.

The Kaiser organization has proved its mettle in a number of other countries, as well. It has developed a flourishing automotive manufacturing business in Argentina through the establishment of Kaiser Argentina, S.A., which builds Jeep vehicles and three passenger cars.

It organized Willys-Overland do Brazil in Brazil where it also does a thriving business in the manufacture of Jeep vehicles and two passenger cars. Both of these companies are affiliates of Willys Motors, Inc., of Toledo, which is owned by Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. It has associated itself with aluminum fabricating firms in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and London, England. In addition, it has developed tissue deposits in Jamaica, and is ready to build an aluminum reduction plant in India, the largest United States-Indian private industrial project to date.

Willys Motors, Inc., has established assembly plants in Turkey, India, and Australia, while Kaiser Engineers are working on projects in India, Australia, and Brazil.

These are only a few of the areas in which the Kaiser organization is show-
The following Members, at the request of Mr. Alfonso, and to include extraneous matter:

MRS. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. FRIEBEL.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MULDER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 28, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:


1952. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1953. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1953, pursuant to the act of June 16, 1916, entitled "An act to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America and to define the rights and limitations of the organization and its members"; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

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. THORNBERY. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 487. Resolution for consideration of S. 1795. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise certain provisions relating to the promotion and involuntary retirement of members of the regular components of the Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the House Committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 488. Resolution for consideration of Concurrent Resolution 682. Concurrent resolution providing under section 9(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Act of 1950, resolution of the Congress for the disapproval of the national stockpile of approximately 470,000 long tons ofnatural rubber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 487. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10650. A bill relating to the employment of retired commissioned officers by contractors in the national defense and the Armed Forces for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 488. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3331. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, canal, and related areas; to provide for the employment of American citizens for the operation of the Park and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1420). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FREIDEL. Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 487. Resolution amending House Resolution 146, 86th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FREIDEL. Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 441. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 147, 86th Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. House Resolution 4208 of title 18, United States Code, so as to require in certain cases as to the suitability of a Federal prisoner for parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTHILL. H.R. 11355. A bill to amend section 4208 to provide for the coverage of physician and insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FING. H.R. 11355. A bill to amend section 4208 of title 18, United States Code, so as to require in certain cases as to the suitability of a Federal prisoner for parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYTHILL. H.R. 11355. A bill to readjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN. H.R. 11355. A bill to allow credit or refund of tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable division of property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California. H.R. 11356. A bill to amend section 35 of title 10 of the United States Code so as to increase the punishment for knowingly giving false information concerning destruction of aircraft and motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON. H.R. 11357. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments...
to Bernallillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULDER:
H.R. 11578. A bill to amend section 70 of the Housing Act of 1934 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments in utilizing state or local authority in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. UDALL:
H.R. 11379. A bill to amend the act of December 29, 1916, so as to prevent the mining and removal of coal and other mineral deposits in certain stockcarring homesteads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADemas:
H.J. Res. 660. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a proclamation designating March 25 as Greek Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWIN:
H. Con. Res. 645. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the centennial of the birth of Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:
H. Con. Res. 646. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the U. S. moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons shall be continued; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANG:
H. Con. Res. 647. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the conduct of the relations of the United States with Red China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALFORD:
H.R. 11360. A bill for the relief of Joe J. Farmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:
H.R. 11362. A bill for the relief of George Paschos, his wife, Demetra Paschos, and their minor child, Paraskevi Paschos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBEITE:
H.R. 11364. A bill for the relief of Judy Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ATTICA:
H.R. 11380. A bill for the relief of Alpo Frantiola Crano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:
H.R. 11389. A bill for the relief of J. K. Graber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H.R. 11387. A bill for the relief of Vicko Beusen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H.R. 11986. A bill for the relief of Dr. Henry H. Cohen; 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:

By Mr. BREDDING: Resolutions adopted at the 32d Annual Meeting of the Intermountain Veterinary Medical Association held January 20–23, in Salt Lake City, Utah, urging the investigation of the imports and handling of cattle from other countries and the need for adequate quarantine facilities for animals on the Pacific coast be recognized and investigated by the Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Mrs. Gladys Towne and 126 others, favoring World War I Veterans' Pension Act of 1960, and payment of a pension to World War I veterans as stipulated in pension bill H.R. 9338, referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOUGH: Petition of Louis H. Reithman and 99 other members of American Society of Major World War I, Inc., Lima, Ohio, favoring the passage of H.R. 9339, referred to as the World War I Pension Act of 1960; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Littleton W. Ballard, Maryland State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Sunbury, Md., relative to various resolutions and papers, laid on the Clerk's table, referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENTLEY: Resolutions of the American Legion, Dickey, Md., relative to varius resolutions adopted at the 55th Maryland State conference relating to the World Court, the Pan-American, art as a weapon, peaceful coexistence and disarmament, and cultural exchange; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
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EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Forty-second Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN H. RAY OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with other Members in recognition of the Byelorussian Independence Day. The Byelorussians are among the largest of the many ethnic groups included in the Soviet Union. Unfortunately they had been subjected to czarist and Soviet oppression since early modern times and had thus lost their independence, but not their love for independence and freedom. For centuries they struggled against their oppressors, always against heavy odds, and they had no chance to free themselves until 1918.

Soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime by the Russian Revolution, these 10 million Byelorussians felt free, took their fate into their own hands, and proclaimed their independence in March of 1918. Henceforth for a little more than 2 years they waged a continuous war against their former masters, particularly against Communist Russians. In 1921, before Byelorussians could consolidate their strength, the country was attacked by Soviet forces, it was overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Since then, for almost 40 years, some 10 million Byelorussians dream of the days when, for a brief period, their homeland was free and they enjoyed independence. Today they observe the 42d anniversary of their proclamation of independence, and hope that soon they will celebrate it in a free and independent Byelorussia.

Phenomenal Growth in Air Traffic Between Pacific Northwest and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS M. PELLY OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest congratulates the Civil Aeronautics Board, for its unanimous decision of last Friday in which it made the Northwest-Hawaii certificates of Northwest Airlines and Pan American World Airways permanent.

This order by the CAB is particularly significant inasmuch as the States of Washington, Oregon, and Hawaii were indignantly unanimous in their insistence that they were right and the CAB examiner was wrong when he proposed to cut the air service in half. The CAB examiner was wrong when he proposed to cut the air service in half.

The Board did not react to pressure; it reacted to logic. When the whole economic picture was spelled out before the Board by Government officials, business and civic organizations from Hawaii and the Pacific Northwest, the CAB lost little time registering its sharp disagreement with the recommendations of its examiner.

There are few sections of this country growing more rapidly than the Pacific Northwest. Addition of Hawaii to our Union of States necessarily means greater travel and commerce between Honolulu and the mainland. You can imagine the stunned reaction of the people in my area, Mr. Speaker, when we learned the CAB examiner proposed that a pattern of competition which had been operating for 12 years suddenly be abandoned and a monopoly substituted in its place. The growth of Washington and Oregon demands more air service than has been operating over the Pacific Northwest. It does not necessarily mean a third carrier on this route, because new jet equipment, flying greater frequencies, will be adequate to meet all the needs that we have.

Competition itself made this route successful, Mr. Speaker. Starting in