

grain before insects devour it results in alternate periods of plenty and near famine. The people compete with the pests for survival. Their low standard of living thus becomes understandable.

Members of the grain-handling study group that returned from Russia only a few weeks ago report that the Soviets are having trouble with a beetle—the Klop cheropashka—in the Ukraine and Caucasus. This pest, which attacks wheat kernels in the milk stage, has reached pestilence proportions. Scientists have made some progress in developing a control, but there seems to be a breakdown in bridging the gap between research and application in the field. This could be another threat from Russia.

Communist China has neither the chemical supplies nor the equipment to deal with the enormous losses caused by insects and other plant and animal pests. The best the Chinese can do at present is to organize the peasants into brigades using simple and inefficient hand control methods.

The distribution of cattle in Africa is determined primarily by the presence or absence of the tsetse fly. This is a major reason why an African child, once weaned, may never again taste milk.

Closer home, the cattle tick and the human warble or torsalo fly cause tremendous losses to hides and to beef and milk production in Central and South America. Mortality among calves may be as high as 70 percent in some of the more heavily infested areas.

A recent report from Argentina indicates that 50,000 calves succumbed in a year's time to screwworm—the same one we have in this country. They have no effective means of dealing with this pest.

There is another point I want to emphasize about the importance of chemical pesticides in producing our food supply. That is the matter of quality. Consumers in the United States now demand produce that is free of blemishes and infestation.

But in the Middle East, it is common to find insect larvae in the fresh fruit placed on the tables in the best hotels. And this, of course, represents the choicest of the crop. You can imagine the rusty, scabby, pitted fruit offered in the public markets. We wouldn't consider such produce up to standard and we wouldn't put up with it in the United States.

Any study made of the Middle or Far East makes us agree with Dr. John H. Lilly, of the University of Massachusetts, who said:

"The Bible doesn't say so, but it is a pretty safe bet that the forbidden apple that tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden was wormy."

We must not let our own food products deteriorate to the point that consumers refuse to buy them, or pay double for poor quality if they do.

#### PRESENT EFFORTS MUST CONTINUE

As chairman of the subcommittee handling agricultural appropriations, I am proud of the part I have in the work that American industry and scientists of the Department of Agriculture have been doing in this field in recent years. Truly I am convinced it takes all-out effort on a continuous basis, merely to hold the line.

We must discover new ways to control insects and other agricultural pests by developing new techniques for the use of chemicals and other materials if we are to hold our own. The American public needs to know this whole story.

Periodically, the Department of Agriculture publishes bulletins which show the necessity for and benefits to the American people of chemicals. One of the latest is picture story No. 127 entitled "Chemicals and Food" which was released in August. This release describes by word and picture the effect of various insects on many of our food crops. It also discusses various control methods for crops and livestock and emphasizes how

essential these are to the production of wholesome and nutritious food for the consumers of the Nation.

The publication of this information is timely and most helpful. Unfortunately, however, published by the farmers' department, it is read primarily by farmers who already appreciate the necessity for use of chemicals. And after all, they number only about 12 percent of the population. It is doubtful that the 88 percent will ever know of this bulletin or of these facts.

We must get these facts to the American people to protect them from themselves.

After all, if the food supply ever becomes short, more and more people will be required to produce food, and more and more of the consumer income will be required to buy food, leaving fewer people to produce, and less and less money to buy automobiles, air conditioners, television sets, and the million and one gadgets which are luxuries to much of the world but are accepted in our country as virtual necessities today.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH MUST BE PROTECTED

In the interest of the public health we must see to it that all the developments and findings applied today by the users of research results are not used even by a few to make a ready dollar, regardless of consequences. By the same token we must not permit the overzealous or politically ambitious, in efforts to curry favor with the 88 percent of our people who are nonfarmers, to destroy or dry up the safest, the most nutritious, the cheapest, and the widest variety of the most plentiful supply of the best food that the people of any nation ever enjoyed throughout history.

In protecting the public health of today we must not permit anyone to endanger the public health of the future by prejudicing public opinion against the very means which makes our ample supplies of wholesome and nutritious food available. We must not permit anyone to lead the consumer to destroy his own golden goose.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1961

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

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

Our Father, God, at the beginning of another week of counsel, with the deep desire that on this high hill of the Nation's welfare, all our deliberations may be begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we enter this forum of the people's hope through the gateway of prayer.

We thank Thee for memories of our fathers, who, in turbulent days, maintained their souls in peace and poise, and came through more than conquerors. Beget in us, their children, the secret of their strength, and in these days let us not be affrighted.

To our Nation and to ourselves, grant inner assurance that will not be shaken by the rage of deluded men.

As Thy servants and the people's in this temple of democracy, save us from any perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. Upon the altar of our freedom may there ever be lifted the offering of humble and contrite hearts.

In this day of destiny for us and for the world may we be worthy of our vocation as keepers of the sacred flame.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 2, 1961, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN WORKERS—TEMPORARY PARTICIPATION FOR FINANCIAL AID TO STATES FOR CERTAIN NEEDY CHILDREN—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received a letter from the President of the United States. The clerk will report the letter.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., February 6, 1961.

HON. LYNDON JOHNSON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith two bills: (1) To establish a temporary program for the payment of additional unemployment compensation to workers who have exhausted their State benefits; and (2) to authorize Federal financial participation for a temporary period in State aid to needy children of unemployed parents. I recommended such legislation on February 2 as a part of this administration's program for economic recovery and growth.

The need for prompt enactment of this legislation is clear.

In January, 5.4 million workers were without jobs. About 3.4 million were receiving unemployment compensation, and about one-half million who had already exhausted their unemployment compensation were still unemployed.

Unemployment compensation provides unemployed workers with necessary purchasing power. When this compensation is exhausted the purchasing power ceases. This has a serious impact not only on the worker and his family, but

on the economic health of the entire economy. The costs and effects of mass unemployment arising from a national recession clearly reach across State lines. The problem is national in scope, and the Federal Government has the responsibility for taking action as soon as possible to meet it. That is why I propose this temporary program as a first step. The extension of the unemployment compensation program will permit 3 million workers to receive benefits totaling about \$950 million.

There is also a pressing need for improving our public assistance. Pending completion of a study of a permanent program in this area, we should take action to help the States provide assistance to children whose need results from the unemployment of their parents. In some cases, the unemployment benefits of these parents have been exhausted; in others, such benefits are not payable or are not sufficient to meet the needs of the large family. Therefore, as part of a national temporary program dealing with the problems of the unemployed, some assistance for the children of needy unemployed workers should be provided.

The enclosed letters from the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare describe the legislation in more detail.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and proposed legislation will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

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

#### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar. Thereafter, we can have the morning hour.

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Brig. Gen. William R. Shuler, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; and

Rex Marlon Whitton, of Missouri, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

#### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Wendell Blancke, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad, the Central African Republic, and the Gabon Republic.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Palmer, 2d, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Nigeria.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Borden Reams, of Nevada, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey, and the Republic of Niger.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis H. Russell, of Maine, a

Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry S. Villard, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas K. Wright, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed by the Senate thus far today.

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

The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

#### NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] wished to be present to comment on this nomination. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination go over at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abram Chayes, of Massachusetts, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this nomination be passed over until we can contact one of the Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have known Phil Klutznick for a long time. He is by all odds one of the ablest persons who has served in government. He came here a number of years ago, to work in the housing field; thereafter, he returned to private enterprise. He has developed, among other things, west of Chicago, one of the most monumental and successful housing enterprises I have ever seen.

This nomination is an excellent one, and I fully concur in it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the Senator from Illinois has commented as he has on the nomination of Mr. Klutznick. I think the Senator's statement is not only an excellent and a generous one, but, as the Senator from Illinois has said, is well deserved.

I have known Mr. Klutznick for many years, and I served with him at the United Nations. I join in supporting the nomination.

Mr. HRUSKA subsequently said: Mr. President, I support the confirmation of the nomination of Philip M. Klutznick as the U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It is my privilege to have known Mr. Klutznick for more than 30 years. We first met when we were fellow students at the law school of Creighton University, of which both of us are alumni. Even then there was evident in him much of that energetic attitude which he has displayed since that time in all of his activities. He engaged well not only in his studies, but also in the extracurricular and community activities at that time.

The field of activities of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations is complex and extended. The activities no doubt are frustrating and even baffling to those who seek to deal with them.

However, I am confident that Mr. Klutznick will apply his talent, experience, and unbounded energy with assurance; and if a program can be made fruitful in that area of activity by anyone, this man certainly will do it.

His vast business experience is fortified not only by experience in the Government departments and agencies in Washington, but also by his service some years ago, as an alternate delegate to the United Nations, and by community service of wide range and creditable acquittal.

Mr. Klutznick will be helped in the discharge of the duties he is undertaking by reason of the extensive travels in which he has engaged from time to time both on business and on pleasure errands.

I wish him well in his new post, and I restate my confidence that he will give a good account of himself in the duties of his post.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

#### HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ivan A. Nestingen, of Wisconsin, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have known Mayor Nestingen for a number of years. He was mayor of the capital city of our State; and, as such, he was highly regarded. I am very happy to say that it pleases many people to know that he has received this appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mortimer M. Caplin, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be Assistant Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth E. BeLieu, of Oregon, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think every Member of the Senate is familiar with the work that has been done here on the Hill by Kenneth BeLieu. His nomination has been well taken by Members on both sides of the aisle; and I believe he will continue to be a very worthy public servant. He always has rendered constructive public service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure the President of the Senate, who is presiding on this occasion, would, in particular, like to be able to say here some kind and well deserved words about Mr. BeLieu. Therefore, let me, as the acting majority leader, state that I consider this appointment an excellent one. Mr. BeLieu will surely be a strong right arm to Mr. Connally, the Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations in the Army be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

#### NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

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

#### DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to consideration of the nomination to the Development Loan Fund.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been informed that a statement relative to Mr. Coffin will be made, but that we should proceed with the nomination. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

Mr. MUSKIE subsequently said:

Mr. President, it is a pleasure to endorse a good friend and a close political associate of the past decade, Frank M. Coffin, the President's nominee for the post of Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund. I am sure that most of you know him, either by reputation or from personal association. I want to enter my wholehearted support of his confirmation.

Frank Coffin brings to the task assigned him an impressive background. In high school and at Bates College he was a superior student, graduating from Bates summa cum laude. His legal training at Harvard Law School was marked by the same scholastic achievement, and he received his LL.B., cum laude.

From 1947 until 1956, when he left the law to become a candidate for Congress, Frank Coffin was known as one of Maine's most brilliant lawyers. He served as law clerk to the late Federal District Judge John D. Clifford, and then worked as trial lawyer for one of Portland's most prominent law firms.

In addition to his law practice, he devoted his energies to community programs. His civic leadership in the community chest, on the board of education for his home city of Lewiston, and as corporation counsel were recognized when the junior chamber of commerce named him as one of Maine's outstanding young men.

Frank Coffin entered politics to give new life to an ailing party and to bring quality and meaning to party platforms. As Democratic State chairman in Maine from 1954 to 1956, he succeeded in both endeavors, demonstrating the organizational ability which has marked his subsequent career in public office.

Frank Coffin's career in Congress has been outstanding. He was elected to the 85th Congress and was appointed to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Reelected in 1958, he received the additional appointment as a member of the Joint Economic Committee. He served on both committees with great distinction. It was his work which brought about the Foreign Affairs Committee study of United States-Canadian relations. As a result of this study, carried out by him and Congressman Brooks Hays, the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Committee was established. Last year he conducted a monumental examination of the European Common Market.

Mr. Coffin's interest in the Development Loan Fund is not new. He was one of those who participated in the drafting of legislation establishing the agency in 1957. He has sponsored significant amendments to the original act in subsequent sessions of Congress. He has made two exhaustive reports on the agency to Congress, in 1959 and in 1960.

All of these achievements have been possible because of Frank Coffin's keen intellect, his wide-ranging intellectual interests, and his capacity for hard work. He is persuasive and convincing in his actions and his words, because he brings to his presentations thoughtful, meaningful, and careful preparation. He speaks softly, but with the authority of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding.

Frank Coffin is a man in a generation, and we are fortunate to have the opportunity to work with him and gain the benefit of his service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks editorials from four Maine newspapers, as follows:

Editorial entitled "Coffin Should Do Well," from the Lewiston Evening Journal of January 26, 1961.

Editorial entitled "Kennedy Makes a Wise Choice," from the Lewiston Daily Sun of January 27, 1961.

Editorial entitled "Mr. Coffin Joins the Team," from the Portland Sunday Telegram of January 29, 1961.

Editorial entitled "Coffin's Talents Recognized," from the Waterville Morning Sentinel of January 30, 1961.

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

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal, Jan. 26, 1961]

#### COFFIN SHOULD DO WELL

It is pleasing that one of New England's outstanding young men should receive an important post within the new Kennedy administration. It is even more pleasing when this young man happens to be a native of the twin city area. Our reference, of course, is to the naming of former U.S. Representative Frank M. Coffin to head up the U.S. Development Loan Fund Corporation.

Due to a Republican landslide in Maine in the national election, Coffin was defeated by Gov. John H. Reed for the governorship. Since the former local attorney's return to Washington there has been much speculation regarding his future within the Kennedy administration.

There has been general expectation that any office offered him would be in the foreign affairs arena. As a Congressman Coffin displayed interest in foreign affairs and had the distinction of being named to the House Foreign Affairs Committee during his two terms of office. This was unusual in itself, as few freshmen House Members have been appointed to this highly important committee.

Coffin showed a flair for understanding foreign relations problems. Among his achievements was participation in a deeply analytical report on Canadian-American relations. Many of the recommendations contained within this report should serve the United States in the months ahead, since there has been growing restlessness displayed by our neighbor up north over what many Canadian leaders consider to be too much American economic influence in the Canadian economy.

Frank Coffin's new post technically establishes him at the Assistant Secretary of State level. It will not be completely unfamiliar to him in one respect, for he was among those who aided in drafting the bill to create the Development Loan Fund. The basic objective of the agency is to make available long-term loans under the Nation's mutual security program.

In accepting the office Coffin told the Journal that he believed the fund could make a major contribution in promoting progress, stability, and freedom orientation "to the one-third of the world's population on which our long-range chances for peace probably depend." We expect Frank Coffin to do an excellent job as Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun, Jan. 27, 1961]

#### KENNEDY MAKES A WISE CHOICE

This newspaper is gratified to learn that one of the significant policymakers of the Kennedy administration, in a post that will assume growing importance as the months pass, will be Frank M. Coffin, the former U.S. Representative of this congressional district, and the Democratic candidate for Governor in last November's election.

Mr. Coffin, it was revealed a day or so ago from Washington, will shortly move in as Director of the Development Loan Fund, an agency set up 4 years ago to supplement the foreign-aid program. Operating as a Government corporation, it makes loans to underdeveloped countries, on longer than conventional terms, and also advances credits for projects abroad for which other financing is not available. That is about all we know about Mr. Coffin's new job, but we expect to learn a good deal more, and it is rather impressive to discover that this corporation will control, if the full budget appropriation is approved, a fund of \$700 million.

From what we know of Mr. Coffin, and what we think we know of the new President, this corporation will play an important role in the cold war, with the available funds allocated imaginatively but also wisely.

There are, outside the Communist world, hundreds of millions of people whose transition from a primitive to a modern machine economy can only come about through huge investments in the exploitation of their natural resources and raw materials—power, metals, timber, machine tools, food, and all the rest. We need them on our side, and President Kennedy could not have selected a better strategist and field general than Mr. Coffin.

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, Jan. 29, 1961]

#### MR. COFFIN JOINS THE TEAM

President Kennedy's appointment of Frank M. Coffin as Director of the Development Loan Fund is acknowledged in this State with much enthusiasm. The qualifications of the former Congressman from our Second District are such as to make the appointment well received everywhere. Here in Maine we add that extra measure of pride and warmth reserved for local boys who make good.

The former Lewiston attorney served his district and his State as well as a Congressman as he had earlier served his party as its State chairman. We believe he would have served well as Governor. He may yet do so. For the present he will direct his considerable talents and demonstrated energy in the service of the whole country—and other nations too, for that matter.

While the post for which Mr. Coffin has been chosen is not of the first-line status of a Cabinet position, he is not heading some obscure agency which churns along in routine fashion whatever its direction or management. His agency performs a vital effort in the foreign aid program by its handling of long-range development loans which many times prove more effective than outright grants. Not only does such procedure encourage sound handling of such aid by the recipients but also is of particular value in those many nations where pride is hurt by the charity stigma of outright grants. Through its offices nations may be advanced credits for projects that cannot be otherwise financed, another procedure by which friendly relations may be cemented.

Mr. Coffin is admirably equipped for this role in which he will be involved in policy-making in the State Department. As Congressman the Maine man served on the Foreign Affairs and Joint Economic Committees, and did so with distinction. Among other things he made himself something of an expert on the problems posed by the European Common Market and the relations of the United States with Canada. The significant role of the Development Loan Fund cannot fail to be enhanced by his presence at its head.

President Kennedy's appointments have been generally well received. The selection of Mr. Coffin for this high Federal post is in line with the best of these.

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel,  
Jan. 30, 1961]

#### COFFIN'S TALENTS RECOGNIZED

The qualifications of Frank M. Coffin for the position of Director of the Development Loan Fund are unquestionable.

The former Maine Representative to Congress is recognized throughout Maine and in Washington as a man of ability. He made a tremendous impression on the leadership of the House during his service in that body and was recognized by appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Joint Economic Committee.

He served with distinction in Congress and his defeat last fall in his campaign for the Maine governorship was a reflection of credit to the Republicans rather than a discredit to him.

It is always pleasant to have a Maine man recognized in Washington but it is especially so when the man recognized is one of Mr. Coffin's stature.

President Kennedy is to be praised for his selection of Mr. Coffin for this important State Department post.

#### AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to have the Senate proceed with the nomination of Mr. Harriman?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. President, because the Senator to whom I referred is now present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, today the Senate has before it the nomination of one of this country's most distinguished public servants, W. Averell Harriman. We are all very fortunate that Governor Harriman has agreed to serve the new administration.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Harriman for a great many years.

Mr. Harriman brings to his new post of Ambassador at Large the experience of nearly 30 years of public service in the fields of international relations, domestic economic affairs, and State government.

He served with distinction as Ambassador to Russia during World War II.

He was later Ambassador to Great Britain, immediately following the war.

As U.S. representative in Europe under the Marshall plan, as our representative to NATO, and as Director of the Mutual Security Administration, he helped forge the Western alliance against Communist economic and military aggression.

His service as Secretary of Commerce and Governor of New York provide an intimate knowledge of the American economic and political scene, which will prove valuable in the carrying out of his duties with the new administration.

His friends in the Senate wish him well in his new job as U.S. Ambassador at Large.

Averell Harriman is an American patriot in the highest tradition of public service.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I am glad to support the con-

firmation of the Honorable W. Averell Harriman to be Ambassador at Large.

The long list of official positions he has held in the service of the United States and his State attests to his ability, his experience, and the confidence in which he has been held.

In 1950, I attended as an adviser to Secretary of State Acheson, the London and Brussels meetings of the Council of Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Conference, the second and third meetings of the Council. At those meetings the first steps were taken to establish a NATO defense force and at the Brussels meeting in December 1950, former President Eisenhower was chosen the first NATO Commander. The Organization of European Economic Cooperation was strengthened in meetings outside NATO and at the meeting measures were considered looking toward the entrance of Western Germany into NATO.

In connection with all of these important measures, Governor Harriman, who then was the U.S. Ambassador at Large in Europe, gave invaluable advice and judgment.

He has the experience, the judgment, the purpose to enable him to serve our country at this time with value and distinction. I am glad to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is conceivable that some Members on the minority side, and also some on the majority side, of the Foreign Relations Committee may wish to have data in connection with the nomination of Mr. Harriman printed in the RECORD. If so, I ask unanimous consent that that privilege be extended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois amplify his request so as to include statements by Senators on other nominations as well?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with all nominations considered by the Senate today, if any Senators not now on the floor desire to have printed in the RECORD short observations with respect to the nominees, that privilege be accorded.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I happened to be on the floor; thus, I do not come within the unanimous-consent request which was made and agreed to.

Therefore, I should like to say that I think these nominations are excellent in all respects; and I approve of all of them, and am delighted to be able to vote for their confirmation.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that morning business is now in order.

#### OUTFLOW OF GOLD—INTERNATIONAL BALANCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the reading of the message be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair is informed that the message has been read in the other body.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I wish to say that I had some opportunity to examine this message this morning. It is by all odds one of the most important messages that will come to the Congress, because it deals with the ebbing outflow of gold and with the whole question of international balances.

Yesterday I had an opportunity to examine my own thinking a little. I was in the House of Representatives when the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 was enacted. I had great misgivings about that measure 26 years ago, because that act vested in the United States all gold coin and all gold bullion, and also took away from the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve banks all claims to gold. On the heels of that activity finally came the proclamation under which the value of gold was raised to \$35 an ounce.

The measure had a design. We were in a depression, and admittedly so. Therefore the value of gold was raised from roughly \$21 an ounce to \$35 an ounce by the very simple expedient of taking so many grains of gold out of the standard gold dollar. I sometimes wonder whether our difficulties did not really begin with the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. To be sure, the design was to raise prices, but when gold value is taken out of the dollar, many more dollars are required to buy an ounce of gold, which is a polite monetary way of saying that the dollar is cheapened. When the dollar is cheapened, more of the cheaper dollars are required to buy the same article of merchandise. Certainly while the objective was probably a laudable one, a difficulty ensued, and the gold problem has been besetting us from that time to this. Among the reasons for our

difficulties, as pointed out by the President, are:

More favorable interest rates abroad on short-term paper; expenditures by soldiers and their dependents; the balance of trade, wherever it is not in excess and in our favor; the export of capital, as in the case of the Ford Motor Co., when it bought the remaining British-owned stocks in its British subsidiary at a cost of \$345 million.

I do not know how effective the proposals suggested by the President would be. Every one of them will require very careful scrutiny, including, of course, our relations with the International Monetary Fund. To most people, I suppose, it seems a rather bewildering and puzzling problem, and yet when we draw off and take a good perspective look, it is not so puzzling after all.

This is an important message because, in view of the diminution of our gold reserve, statutory commitments as to the amount necessary for gold backing of our currency, plus commitments already in effect abroad, could, I believe, exceed the entire gold stock of the country, which has dwindled from a high \$22,008 million, as I recall, in 1957 or 1958, to \$17,006 million. It is small wonder that there is concern in the administration, and small wonder that there is concern through the whole industrial fabric of our country and also abroad. Confidence is elusive, ephemeral, and hard to define, but when confidence ebbs, we must look out for our economy.

There being no objection, the message from the President was referred to the Committees on Banking and Currency, Finance, and Foreign Relations.

(For text of President's message see House proceedings for today.)

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND GOLD

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the President's message, of this morning, on balance of payments and gold, is an excellent, firm, and vigorous statement outlining programs for action on many fronts. This message is especially reassuring in that it repudiates, without any equivocation, any resort to protectionism or any thought that our balance of payments situation will prevent our doing whatever is necessary in our foreign economic assistance program.

I am much pleased at the President's notice of the importance that increased agricultural exports can play in this problem. I have been deeply gratified by his statements, and those of other members of the administration, that they will proceed as vigorously as possible to bring into the picture increased exports of our agricultural commodities.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### REPORT ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of

Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during December 1960, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with the Governments of Korea, Brazil, Vietnam, and Indonesia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

##### REPORT ON U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1960, together with a report of the annual inspection of the home, 1960, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### REPORT OF D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., requesting an extension of 60 days in which to submit the annual report of that system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

##### REPORT OF U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

##### REPORT ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### PUBLICATION ENTITLED "ECONOMIC INQUIRY INTO FOOD MARKETING—INTERIM REPORT ON FROZEN FRUIT, JUICES, AND VEGETABLES"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing—Interim Report on Frozen Fruit, Juices, and Vegetables" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including a report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

##### REPORTS ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Board in the grades of GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Administration in the grades of GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

##### REPORT OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Cultural Center, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Center, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

##### "HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

"Whereas there are several million persons past the age of 65 in the United States; and

"Whereas this age group is afflicted with most of the same problems which face the population in younger age brackets, especially with regard to food, clothing, shelter, medical care, employment, and profitable use of leisure time; and

"Whereas the agricultural States and the lesser industrialized States of the United States are financially unable to furnish a grant to these aged persons in keeping with their needs; and

"Whereas this age group would retain much of their self-respect and personal satisfaction if they were given an opportunity to work and earn a small supplement to their budget; and

"Whereas such persons are penalized by earning any amount of money under the present Federal Social Security Act; and

"Whereas this age group would not only assist themselves from a monetary point of view and from the point of view of personal satisfaction from being needed and wanted, but would also help the Nation by their fruitful employment; and

"Whereas a precedent has been established by requiring the State agency to disregard the first \$50 per month of earned income to the blind in arriving at a determination of need for that category; and

"Whereas the old persons of our Nation should not be penalized by an inequitable provision in the law denying them similar rights to the indigent blind persons; and

"Whereas the 1961 White House Conference on Aging recognized the inequities in the Federal social security law and resolved that that Conference request the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that a State may exempt the first \$50 of earned income in determining an old person's need: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 63d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):*

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully urged to amend title I of the Federal Social Security Act to provide that any State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of the individual claiming old-age assistance; except that, in making such determination, the State agency may disregard the first \$50 of earned income.

"SEC. 2. That upon the adoption of this resolution, a copy of same shall be furnished by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, and to all members of the Arkansas delegation to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

##### "HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"Whereas it is becoming apparent that the United States must eventually turn more and more to synthetic sources to supplement its petroleum resources, and for this reason the promotion and development of new

domestic sources of fuel oils, including the mining and production of oil shale, is essential; and

"Whereas the depletion allowance now allowed on the mining of oil shale is less than that accorded the oil and gas industry; and

"Whereas the oil shale industry, in the exploration and promotion of oil shale deposits and in the mining of oil shale, should be given the same tax treatment as is accorded the oil and gas industry, in order to expand the oil shale industry and create a competitive market between the two industries: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein),* That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Act so as to provide that the depletion allowance allowed on the mining of oil shale be raised to 27½ percent of the value of the oil produced from oil shale mined; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the farmers of the Columbia Basin entered into a contract with the U.S. Department of the Interior in October 1945 providing for repayment for their land, for construction of irrigation canals, for the irrigation water they use, and for \$8 million for installation of drainage facilities in the Columbia Basin; and

"Whereas these farmers have honorably met all their obligations under the terms of this contract since its inception; and

"Whereas recent studies indicate that the cost of completion of the drainage system for that portion of the Columbia Basin presently receiving water has been underestimated by \$36 million; and

"Whereas this gross miscalculation was not the fault of the farmers; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation during recent years has proposed that the farmers of the Columbia Basin renegotiate this contract with the Department of the Interior to the end that these farmers would be required to pay the entire \$36 million for this underestimated drainage system; and

"Whereas these farmers are among Washington's finest citizens, laboring long hours daily and living on meager and uncertain incomes; and

"Whereas Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson, and Conservation Director Earl Coe, as chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission, have all urged that a 2-year moratorium be declared on all charges against Columbia Basin farmers for drainage construction: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington,* That we join in requesting that President John F. Kennedy direct that this 2-year moratorium be now declared on all charges for drainage against the farmers of the Columbia Basin, thus allowing time for complete study of this problem by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and agencies under his direction; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That we congratulate the farmers of the Columbia Basin, not only for their labors and courage in converting the Columbia Basin from a desert to healthy, productive farmland, but also for their calm persistence in the face of seemingly overwhelming obstacles, and for their faith in the ultimate fairness of the legal democratic processes under which we live; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall; and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico relating to the extension of benefits to certain veterans which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the foregoing resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. CHAVEZ on February 2, 1961, page 1615, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A resolution adopted by the Abilene, Tex., Chamber of Commerce, relative to the construction of a proposed addition to the existing postal facilities in Abilene; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HICKEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 1

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:*

"Whereas the livestock industry is one of the main industries of the State of Wyoming and a necessary industry of the United States; and

"Whereas the said industry has sought adequate protection from excessive imports of meat and livestock from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the said industry and allied businesses have been seriously affected by such imports and are threatened with further inroads to their economic existence by the continuation of such imports; and

"Whereas the numerous organizations within said industry have repeatedly and to no avail sought relief through the executive department of the United States by its application of the escape clause and peril point provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as amended; and

"Whereas the policies and practices in the field of international trade if permitted to continue present a threat to all domestic industry: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring),* That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to remove the authority of the executive department to act on the escape clause and peril point provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as amended and place such authority in the hands of Congress where the constitutional authority and responsibility is vested; be it further

*"Resolved,* That quotas be exacted on imports of dressed and live meat animals as well as wool, woolsens, and other meat animal products; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Joseph J. Hickey, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, chairman of Agriculture Committee of House and the chairman of Agriculture Committee of Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION S

"Whereas Dakota Territory, of which North Dakota was a part, was created on March 2, 1861, out of part of the land of the United States known as the Louisiana Purchase, and the year 1961 will be the 100th anniversary thereof; and

"Whereas North Dakota is making elaborate plans to commemorate the creation of the Dakota Territory this year; and

"Whereas in addition to the many events and activities the people of the State will observe regarding this historic event they would certainly appreciate commemorative stamps being issued by the Postmaster General honoring the Dakota Centennial Celebration in 1961: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein),* That the Postmaster General is requested and urged to issue commemorative stamps which will honor the 100th anniversary of Dakota Territory and help the people of North Dakota celebrate this historic event; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Postmaster General, and all members of the North Dakota congressional delegation."

#### NEW JUDGEShips NEEDED IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York. The resolution sets forth the serious problem which the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York has had in trying to cope with a tremendous backlog of cases without any increase in judge power since 1936. The resolution points out that the serious delay in the disposition of cases in this district can be alleviated only by the addition of five judges permanently assigned to the court.

Mr. President, the conditions outlined in this resolution cannot be permitted to persist. I hope that Congress will give early attention to the long overdue need for additional judges in this district as well as in the southern district of New York, which also has a critical court congestion problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the eastern district of New York is a Federal judicial district and its territorial jurisdiction includes the five counties of Kings, Queens, Nassau, Richmond, and Suffolk, having a combined population in excess of 6½ million people, which is greater than 43 of the 50 States of the Union; and

Whereas this district represents one of the fastest growing areas in the country in population, industry, and economic power, and has had a 22-percent increase in population in the last decade alone; and

Whereas there are at the present time only six U.S. district judges regularly appointed and assigned to this district, which number has not been increased since 1936; and

Whereas the backlog in civil cases in this district in 1959 was so great there was an average delay of over 4 years between the commencement of such actions and the trial of the same, and necessitated the temporary assignment of five additional judges from other judicial districts to this court in an effort to reduce the backlog; and

Whereas it was also necessary to have additional judges from other districts temporarily assigned to the criminal part of said court; and

Whereas the number of regularly assigned judges in this district are so few that it permits usually only the assignment of one judge to the criminal part of the court; and

Whereas there is presently a backlog of criminal cases awaiting trial, which are delayed because of such shortage of judges; and

Whereas it is the firm belief and conviction of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York, Inc., that justice delayed is justice denied; that the tremendous past growth and indicated future development of the eastern district has and will continue to add to the number of cases initiated in this court and that this condition can be alleviated only by the addition of five judges permanently assigned to this court; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, adopted by the membership at a meeting duly called and held on January 23, 1961, be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, to the chairman of the Judiciary Committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives and to the duly elected Members of Congress representing the eastern district of New York, and to the various bar associations.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS CITY (KANS.) SYNOD OF EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas City Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church at its last annual meeting in Elmo, Kans., adopted resolutions regarding the necessity of controlling nuclear weapons testing and urged continued negotiations for a general reduction and control of armaments.

The churches representing the Kansas City Synod bespeak the sentiment of many of our religious denominations regarding these two important matters affecting our international relations.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it resolved*, That Kansas City Synod recognizes the immediate necessity of controlling all kinds of nuclear weapons testing and advocates a persistent effort on the part of the United States for a multilateral agreement on the cessation of such testing.

*Be it resolved*, That the Kansas City Synod encourages our Government to continue ne-

gotiations in good faith for the general reduction and control of armaments—conventional, nuclear, biological and chemical.

#### RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., be inserted at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

*Resolved*, That the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County express its appreciation to the special committee on distressed areas and its chairman, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, for the consideration and interest given to the problems of northeastern Minnesota and urge that said committee continue its efforts, and that assistance and aid be recommended and granted to this area for development of its natural resources.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing certain expenditures by the Committee on Public Works; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### REPORT ENTITLED "LOCAL 706, PLUMBERS AND STEAMFITTERS UNION, EL DORADO, ARK."—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 42)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report entitled "Local 706, Plumbers and Steamfitters Union, El Dorado, Ark.," pursuant to S. Res. 249 and section 5 of S. Res. 255, 86th Congress, 2d session, which was ordered to be printed.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 793. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 794. A bill to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act, the National Labor Relations

Act, and the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 795. A bill to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes;

S. 796. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 797. A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 798. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due and owing and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 799. A bill to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to public sales; and

S. 800. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 801. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. HART):

S. 802. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 803. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 804. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 805. A bill for the relief of Yu Liao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 806. A bill for the relief of David Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 807. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 808. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a national parkway in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 809. A bill to authorize the transfer of a Bureau of Reclamation bridge across the Colorado River near Needles, Calif., to San Bernardino County, Calif., and Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 810. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 811. A bill to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 812. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 813. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 814. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the punishment of any individual who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for indecent molestation of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 815. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a new contract with the city of Sturgis, S. Dak., with respect to the use of sewage facilities of such city by the Fort Meade Veterans' Hospital, Sturgis, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 816. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 817. A bill for the relief of Octavio Jimenez Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the manufacturers' excise tax on croquet balls and mallets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 819. A bill to provide for suitable works of art in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Wise Farmer; and

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Valentine Augustus Toote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution designating May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States with reference to income taxes on nonresident individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

#### REQUEST FOR PRESIDENT TO URGE CERTAIN ACTIONS FOR LITHUANIA, ESTONIA, AND LATVIA

Mr. KUCHEL submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, which appears under a separate heading.)

#### DEDUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL FEES AND TUITION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable individuals to deduct educational expenses for themselves or their dependents up to the amount of \$300 per year.

No one can doubt that the education which an individual receives is often the determining factor in his future success or failure. At no time in our Nation's history has that been more true than today. The money which an individual spends on education, for himself, for his children, or his other dependents, may well be the most important investment he ever makes. More importantly, money spent upon education pays dividends far into the future for the whole country.

Therefore, I believe, Mr. President, that the Federal Government should encourage individuals to invest in education by permitting at least a part of the expenses of education to be deducted from Federal income tax payments. Businesses are permitted to deduct business expenses on the grounds that these expenses generate further business and, in the long run, additional revenues. This is surely true of education, for the differences in income levels among those with high school, college, and graduate degrees is a very well known fact.

I have limited the amount which may be deducted under the terms of this bill to \$300. Personally, I favor a much larger figure, because I know that education is a very expensive business these days, with many indirect and associated costs as well as the fees and tuition. But in view of the large amount of revenue loss which would result if a larger deduction were permitted, I have felt compelled to restrict my proposal to a \$300 deduction for direct expenditures for tuition or fees to an educational institution.

The Internal Revenue Service has informed me that the revenue which would be lost by permitting such a tax deduc-

tion today would amount to about \$300 million a year. However, I firmly believe it would repay itself many times over from the increased earnings of those who could thus afford additional education.

Furthermore, tax deductions are permitted under present law to philanthropists and others who make charitable donations to educational institutions. Why should this deduction be denied to those who, often at greater personal sacrifice, pay their money to educational institutions in order to educate their children or themselves?

Mr. President, the Federal Government must continue to assist our people in obtaining an education for themselves and their families. The Government must likewise continue to aid in the necessary construction of college and university facilities. The Federal Government must continue to assist in the financing of various scholarship programs. The Federal Government must support and initiate important and worthwhile research which can contribute to our Nation's future security. But let us not forget, while we help the institutions, that the crux of the problem often lies with the individuals or the parents of the individual who must find the money to pay the tuition and education fees.

My bill would permit the deduction of any tuition and fees paid to any recognized educational institution. This would include tuition paid not only to colleges and universities, but also to private schools, parochial schools, technical training schools, summer schools—in short, to any of the recognized places of education. It would not, however, apply to persons who receive direct grants from States or communities under State laws designed to block school desegregation.

This is a new concept, more extensive than any which have previously been introduced. I have deliberately presented it in this form. Those persons who are ready to spend their money on education, for themselves or for their children, should be encouraged and aided to the greatest extent possible by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 792) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section*

217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"Sec. 217. TUITION AND FEES PAID TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an educational institution for tuition and fees for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such educational institution.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) EACH INDIVIDUAL.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees with respect to any one individual only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed \$300.

"(2) SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees for the spouse of the taxpayer only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(c) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Amounts paid for tuition and fees with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DEPENDENT.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning assigned it by section 152(a).

"(2) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'educational institution' has the meaning assigned to it by section 151(e)(4).

"(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses).

"(2) INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING STATE OR LOCAL FINANCIAL AID TO AVOID DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid for any individual with respect to whom any payment is made by a State or local government under a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for children who attend private schools in the area of their residence, or who attend public or private schools away from the area of their residence, if it is determined that the purpose of the State or local law is to provide financial assistance—

"(A) for the education of children in an area where any public school is closed to avoid compliance with the decisions of the courts of the United States with respect to segregation in public schools, or

"(B) for the education of children in an area where public schools are open and have complied with such decisions (whether or not such compliance was pursuant to a specific order of a court of the United States) whose parents or guardians do not wish them to attend a school which is part of a school system in which any school has complied with such decisions.

For purposes of this paragraph, any State or local law granting concessions with respect to State or local taxes for amounts paid by parents or guardians in providing an education for children residing in an area described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for such children."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out:

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees paid to educational institutions.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) TUITION AND FEES PAID TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—The deduction allowed by section 217 (relating to tuition and fees paid to educational institutions)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

#### MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS OF FRAUDULENT AND OTHER UNETHICAL BUSINESS PRACTICES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices.

Fraud, deception, and illegal practices by unscrupulous operators have cheated Americans from Maine to Florida and New York to California. Fly-by-night business organizations and unethical security salesmen have milked millions of dollars from consumers and investors each year.

In addition to the suffering inflicted on the American public, legitimate businesses have also felt the impact of distrust generated by these individuals. State law enforcement agencies have been quick to move after uncovering evidence of illegal operations; however, due to the manner in which these people conduct their businesses, such evidence is difficult to obtain. Even after an unscrupulous business operation has been driven out of one State, it will often migrate to another State and continue its fraudulent activities. A central file containing a pool of information gathered by State and local law enforcement agencies pertaining to unethical and fraudulent business practices would help put an end to the constant hunt for the sly fox.

My proposal would provide for such a central filing system in the Office of the Attorney General similar to that maintained by the FBI on criminal activities. Here would be compiled records of injunctions, dissolutions and other civil actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices which would be made available to all law enforcement bodies.

Time is of the essence. Daily reports are received of the underworld moving into more and more legitimate businesses. Whether the criminal wears a mask and carries a crowbar, or wears gray gloves and carries a list of stocks, we should be vitally interested in his apprehension. This is an important measure for launching a counterassault against the treasury of the underworld. I hope it will have prompt consideration and approval.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief analysis of the bill and the text be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 793) to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized to provide, within the Department of Justice, for the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of records of injunctions, dissolutions and other civil or administrative actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices.*

SEC. 2. Any records acquired, collected, classified and preserved pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be made available by the Attorney General for exchange with, and for the official use of, any duly authorized official of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

S. 793 would authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices. It would further provide that these records be made available for the use of and exchange with any authorized officials of Federal, State, and local governments.

#### CLOSING OF RAILROAD STATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The proposal was the outgrowth of a decision rendered on April 19, 1960, by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Chicago & North Western Railroad against the Telegraphers Union.

A special subcommittee composed of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], held public hearings but no further action was taken before the adjournment of the 86th Congress.

I reintroduce that measure, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I made before the special subcommittee on June 21, 1960, together with an Associated Press article entitled "Mitchell Heads 15-Man Railroad Study Group."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Illinois and the article referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 794) to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement and article presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. Chairman, the bill which this subcommittee is considering today is the result of a recent decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case involving the Chicago & North Western Railroad and the Telegraphers Union. According to the facts stated by the Court the railroad was faced with the problem of having many of its stations only 7 to 10 miles apart. The stations had been established this close together about 100 years ago before farmers and others living in the rural areas along its route had trucks, automobiles, and good roads. In those days the farmers had to have railroad stations close at hand because they hauled their produce and other goods by horse and wagon over inadequate roads. Now, however, with our network of good rural roads and the extensive use of trucks, the stations as close together as 7 or 11 miles were no longer of economic value. They were handling little if any business and the personnel manning them were working less than 1 hour a day and sometimes as little as 12 minutes a day yet drawing a full day's pay. The railroad therefore developed what it called a central agency plan which meant it would consolidate the activities of certain of the stations along its route. It obtained the permission of the various State commissions to make this consolidation.

In South Dakota the public utility commission, in approving the consolidation, found that the employees affected in that State averaged 59 minutes of work a day and that the maintenance of such stations on a full-time basis would constitute mismanagement because of the lack of public need.

The railroad offered to bargain with the union concerning how this plan would be put into effect, including the transfer of the personnel to other jobs, severance pay, and an arrangement for limiting the number of layoffs per year to an agreed percentage of the total number of jobs of the union, over and above the reduction in the number of such employees by attrition.

The union rejected these offers of the company to bargain collectively and instead it demanded that the company amend the existing labor contract to provide that no job then in existence could be abolished or discontinued without the consent of the union. When the company declined to accede to this demand, the union issued a strike call and the company obtained an injunction barring the strike which the court of appeals made permanent under the Norris-LaGuardia Act on the ground that the union's demand was not within the realm of collective bargaining. The Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 decision reversed the lower court and called upon Congress to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the related acts, if it did not agree with the judicial interpretation which it was placing on the language of those acts, saying:

"If the scope of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is to be cut down in order to prevent 'waste' \* \* \* Congress should be the body to do so."

This bill is designed to do that and only that. It permits change and progress and yet protects the right of collective bargaining as to the terms of employment. As I stated at the time I introduced the bill, and I quote:

"I want to emphasize, however, that this progress requires due regard for the welfare

of those whose lives are dislocated by such progress and that the bill is not intended to change the law on bargaining as to rates of pay, rules, working conditions, severance pay, and other matters."

There is no intention in this bill to in any way eliminate the requirement of collective bargaining as to any of the matters pertaining to a job. The bill relates only to the question of whether or not there should be a job.

I want to give several examples of this to make it clear. In the railroad case this would be the question of how many railroad stations the railroad had to have. In other situations it might be that a building was installing escalators to replace some of its elevators. The bill would make the decision as to the number of elevators it would keep, a question for the company to decide. The number of elevator operators required to man the elevators would, of course, depend on hours of work and many other factors, all subject to collective bargaining. Or, take any of our industries in which there are constant changes in products and services. In the electronics industry transistors are now doing much of the work formerly done by vacuum tubes. If this Supreme Court decision stands, a company would not be able to change from the manufacture of vacuum tubes to the manufacture of transistors without the consent of the union if the change required the elimination of any jobs in the vacuum tube division.

It would mean, if this statute and the interpretation which the Supreme Court has just placed on it had been in existence 50 years ago, that we would still have men making horse blinders unless the union of horse blinder employees consented to the discontinuance of their jobs. On this same point the Wall Street Journal recently had an interesting article on photocopy machines in which it gave this example:

"To submit evidence of a bone fracture to an insurance company, the Allegheny General Hospital in Pittsburgh simply runs an X-ray photo through a copying machine and a doctor circles the break and writes in the patient's name. The nickel-a-copy duplicate represents a 100-fold saving over the making of another X-ray film at a cost of \$5, as the hospital used to do."

Just by having a clerk use a photocopy machine instead of an X-ray technician using an X-ray machine the hospital saved \$4.95 out of \$5. It therefore has that 100-fold saving in its X-ray department available to use for additional nurses and other medical services. We all know that the cost of medical treatment is high today. Should the Supreme Court be permitted to make it even higher by its decision, bearing in mind that many of our hospitals, particularly in rural areas, could be subject to this type of union demand?

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 22, 1960]

MITCHELL HEADS 15-MAN RAILROAD STUDY GROUP

President Eisenhower today named Secretary of Labor Mitchell to head a 15-member commission to investigate the dispute between railroads and the operating unions over work rules and practices.

The President selected Mr. Mitchell upon the recommendation of the railroads and the five railway labor organizations involved in the controversy over what the railroads call the featherbedding problem.

In announcing the membership of the Commission, Mr. Eisenhower said the group represents "a major and constructive innovation that will prove to be a significant achievement in the progress of labor-management relations toward greater maturity and stability."

"In resolving this problem in a manner fair to the men, helpful to the industry, and in the best interest of our country, the members of the Commission will provide service of incalculable value," Mr. Eisenhower added.

FOUR OTHERS NAMED

Mr. Eisenhower said he was particularly pleased that Mr. Mitchell, who will leave office January 20 when the Kennedy administration takes over, had agreed "to provide this additional and significant service to our Nation in the cause of industrial peace."

In addition to Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Eisenhower named four other public members of the Commission.

He also approved the recommendations of the carriers nominating five members and the recommendation of the operating unions which resulted in the setting up of the Commission.

The group can only make recommendations after its scheduled 1-year study is completed. But officially it can seek to persuade the industry and the unions to go along with recommendations or proposals during that time.

WORK BEGINS NEXT MONTH

All members of the Commission, except one, were on hand when Mr. Eisenhower announced the appointments. Immediately after the 14 members present conferred briefly. Their real work, however, is not expected to begin until some time next month.

Mr. Mitchell described today's meeting as a get-acquainted session. The formal organizational meeting will be held in Mr. Mitchell's office January 6.

Mr. Mitchell said this is the first time that a Presidential Commission has been set up as the result of a voluntary labor-management agreement.

The railroads had insisted upon setting up the investigation Commission with its recommendations to be binding. The unions at first objected to the Commission plan but agreed to it when the railroads yielded on their insistence that the recommendations be binding.

The longstanding dispute involves what the railroads describe as make-work practices or featherbedding. They contend this costs them in the neighborhood of \$500 million annually.

AGREEMENT OF UNIONS

The unions, disputing this, say the rules and practices involved, such as placing a fireman on diesel locomotives, make for greater safety. They also contend that the overall work force on the railroads has been reduced to such an extent in recent years as to jeopardize safety.

As public members, in addition to Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Eisenhower named the following:

John T. Dunlop, of Belmont, Mass., professor of economics of Harvard University, who was the only Commission member absent today; Charles A. Myers, of Weston, Mass., and the staff of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Francis J. Robertson, of Washington, D.C., attorney and arbitrator, and Russell A. Smith, of Ann Arbor, Mich., arbitrator.

The five members nominated by the carriers:

Daniel P. Loomis, of Washington, president of the Association of American Railroads; T. A. Jerrow, of St. Paul, Minn., vice president of operations, Great Northern Railway; Guy W. Knight, of Philadelphia, director, labor relations, Pennsylvania Railroad; J. E. Wolfe, of Chicago, vice president of personnel, Chicago, Burlington, & Quincy Railroad, and B. B. Bryant, of Huntington, W. Va., assistant vice president of labor relations, Chesapeake and Ohio Railway.

Nominated by the operating brotherhoods were:

A. F. Zimmerman, of Cleveland, assistant grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; S. C. Phillips, of Cleveland, assistant president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers; S. W. Holliday, of Vancouver, Wash., vice president, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen; H. F. Sites, of Harrisburg, Pa., vice president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and James W. Fallon, of Minneapolis, vice president, Switchmen's Union of North America.

The railroads and the unions will bear the expenses of their members of the Commission. The public members will receive expenses and a per diem fee from the Government, but the amount has not been set.

#### MORE EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, a bill to provide for more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes.

The proposed bill, which I send to the desk, would authorize the President to reorganize the Executive Office, including its various components as he deems best in the interest of efficiency, expeditious administration, and better management of the office.

I request that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 795) to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE  
OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, a draft bill entitled "A bill to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes."

The proposed bill would carry out a recommendation of the President communicated to the Congress in his budget message on January 16, 1961. In that message the President stated:

"The duties placed on the President by the Constitution and the statutes demand the most careful attention of the staffing and organization of the President's Office. While the present organization of the Executive Office of the President reflects many constructive steps taken over a period of years, much remains to be done to improve the facilities available to the President. The first requirement for improvement is for the Congress to give the President greater

flexibility in organizing his own Office to meet his great responsibilities.

"Specifically, the Congress should enact legislation authorizing the President to reorganize the Executive Office of the President, including the authority to redistribute statutory functions among the units of the Office; to change the names of units and titles of officers within the Office; to make changes in the membership of statutory bodies in the Office; and, within the limits of existing laws and available appropriations, to establish new units in the Executive Office and fix the compensation of officers. Such action would insure that future Presidents will possess the latitude to design the working structure of the Presidential Office as they deem necessary for the effective conduct of their duties under the Constitution and the laws. Enactment of such legislation would be a major step forward in strengthening the Office of the President for the critical tests that will surely continue to face our Nation in the years to come. These matters are obviously devoid of partisan considerations."

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,  
Director.

#### USE OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY BY STATE DISTRIBUTION AGENCIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes.

This bill is introduced at the request of the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is similar to a bill (S. 3493) on which the committee held hearings last year.

Section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator—now the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies for utilization by such Federal agency, without reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency. The act further provides that the State agency may utilize, without reimbursement, the property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in carrying out the program of distribution of surplus property to education, public health, or civil defense activities.

I ask that a letter dated January 17, 1961, addressed to the President of the Senate and which was referred to the committee, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 796) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Mc-

CLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
January 17, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We herewith forward for consideration a draft bill "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes." This draft has been prepared in cooperation with the General Services Administration.

For the purpose of facilitating the operation of the programs for disposal of Federal surplus property for educational, public health, or civil defense purposes, section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator (now the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization), and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies (i.e., the State agency within each State designated under State law to distribute Federal surplus personal property allocated for educational, public health, or civil defense use within the State). These agreements "may provide for utilization by such Federal agency, without payment or reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency in carrying out any such program, and for making available to such State agency, without payment or reimbursement, property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in connection with such utilization."

The draft bill would amend this section in two ways:

1. Subject to the approval of the Administrator of General Services, it would enable a State agency to obtain the use of donable Federal surplus personal property, under and subject to the terms of a cooperative agreement, for its own administrative needs in carrying out the disposal programs, after this Department or the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has determined that the desired property is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective operation of the State agency in performing its functions in connection with the surplus property disposal programs.

The advantages of allowing the State agency limited access to such property are twofold: (a) The use of donable surplus property in lieu of property of the Federal agency that would otherwise be made available to the State agency under present section 203(n) authority lowers the cost of the program to the Federal Government, (b) the use of donable surplus property by the State agency in lieu of property that would otherwise have to be purchased by that agency acts to reduce the charges assessed against the donee institutions by the State agency in order to cover its costs of operation.

2. The draft bill would permit legal title to surplus property the use of which is thus made available to a State agency under a cooperative agreement, to be vested in that agency upon a determination of the Administrator of General Services that such action is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective use of the property. This authorization is directed primarily at expediting the State agency's use of surplus motor vehicles in administering the donation programs; vesting the legal title to the

vehicles would best enable the agency to comply with State motor vehicle registration laws. A corresponding advantage is that the Federal Government would avoid any claim of tort liability arising from the allegedly negligent operation of those vehicles by State employees.

We would appreciate it if you would refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advised on December 30, 1960, that it perceives no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,  
Secretary.

#### PROVISION OF QUARTERS, AND SO FORTH, TO CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, a bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States.

This bill would continue the basic authority now granted Government agencies by the act of March 5, 1928 (5 U.S.C. 75a) and it would clarify existing statutory authority for the providing of quarters, household furniture, and other services to civilian employees of the Government who occupy Government quarters.

In the 86th Congress, an identical bill was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and that bill was passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget addressed to the President of the Senate requesting the introduction and consideration of this proposal, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 797) to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE  
OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C. January 13, 1961.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit herewith a proposed bill "To authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the proposed bill is to provide for the charging of uniform and equitable rates for occupancy of Government-

owned quarters on a rental basis. The bill would consolidate and restate related provisions of law and regulations which authorize the furnishing of quarters to Government employees, and it would vest authority in the President to prescribe regulations which would insure fair and consistent treatment for all persons—civilian employees, military personnel, and non-Government personnel—who occupy rental housing under like circumstances. A more extensive explanation of this proposal, its background, and purpose is provided as an attachment to this letter.

An identical proposal was introduced in the 86th Congress by Senator McCLELLAN as Senate bill 3486. It was reported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations in Report No. 1570 and was passed by the Senate on June 14, 1960. The bill was referred to the House of Representatives where it rested at adjournment.

Since this proposal, if enacted, will improve and clarify Government administration of employee housing facilities and services, I recommend its favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,  
Director.

#### SOLUTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PROBLEM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as the newly appointed chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I have been immersed in the reports and hearings of the subcommittee and orienting myself in its activities of the last 7 years. The record of the subcommittee is replete with evidence of the struggles all over the Nation of law enforcement and other public officials as they endeavored to cope with a postwar plague of this social disease more commonly called juvenile delinquency.

The reports of the subcommittee—particularly in the past 4 years—have warned the Congress of the threat to our national welfare posed by an ever-increasing rise in the type, number, and seriousness of juvenile crime, which permeates every stratum of our society. In the 11 years between 1948 and 1959, juvenile crime increased 177 percent. This phenomenal growth reflects a serious lag on the part of those authorities and organizations responsible for coping with the problem and on a society that permits it. It also reflects unfavorably on the Congress for not stepping in to help the States where the States have been unable to help themselves.

During these 11 years, juvenile crime has not only increased in its frequency, but has made basic changes in the patterns, socially and geographically. Also the seriousness in the nature of the crimes has changed significantly. There is more brutality, more sadism, and more wanton ruthlessness. The crimes have become increasingly serious and more senseless than ever. This cannot be permitted to continue.

It is because of these truths that I introduce this measure to provide Federal assistance for projects to develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems. It also provides that \$5 million shall be spent yearly for the next 5 years to help States train quali-

fied personnel to work in the delinquency field in the areas of prevention, treatment, and control.

A similar measure was introduced in the last Congress and passed by the Senate providing \$2,500,000 a year for these purposes. The Delinquency Subcommittee has repeatedly been told by experts that the \$2,500,000 appropriation was both necessary and welcome, but that it was only a token—a beginning in the vast job yet to be done. Mr. President, I share those sentiments. If delinquency is to be combated at a local level, then communities need the tools this legislation provides.

In introducing this measure, I take cognizance of the general advance in the public awareness of the seriousness of the problems that have been encountered in implementing antidelinquency campaigns. For the last 7 years, the Delinquency Subcommittee in crisscrossing the Nation has heard an ever-rising chorus of pleas by State, county, municipal, and private organizations for aid of this type. We now have a new administration, and it will be more responsive to that chorus, I believe.

In local communities across the Nation, there has been much frustration and duplication in trial-and-error experiments to cope with urgent delinquency problems. While some projects have succeeded admirably, others have had considerably less success. In all cases, however, the experiments have been hampered by a lack of funds, a lack of coordination, and in particular, a lack of adequately trained personnel. All told, it has been indicated to the Delinquency Subcommittee that this critical lack of trained personnel—and the virtually nonexistent facilities to train them—has been a contributing factor to the other deficiencies.

Permit me to cite some examples of how critical this personnel problem is:

The Honorable Donald E. Long, of Portland, Oreg., who represents the feelings of a good many judges of the United States, has said that in his opinion the training provisions of this type of Federal legislation were the most important needs of the present generation.

The judge pointed out that of the 2,000 juvenile courts in the United States, many of them have county judges, and only half of the counties in our country that are dealing with delinquents have even minimal probation services. The judge stated further that a study by the National Probation and Parole Association indicated a need for 15,000 probation officers dealing with the problems of juveniles. Yet at the time of the study, there were only 2,100 probation officers dealing with children alone, and 3,400 serving both children and adults. What makes matters even worse, only 1 out of 10 of these probation officers had completed any type of training for the job. An additional 4 out of 10 lack a college degree and are not eligible for professional training. When this occurs, we compound the seriousness of an already grim situation.

In the opinion of Judge Long:

Many of them (the probation officers) were qualified, but it is staggering that they had

not the skills and the training that they should have \* \* \* in dealing with the behavior problems of the children coming to the various juvenile courts.

For this reason the judge concluded that—

Priority first should be given to a training program to assist the volunteer organizations, to assist the States and local communities in providing under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an efficient program of training.

From another part of the country, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Delinquency heard in Philadelphia from Dr. E. Preston Sharp, executive director of the Youth Study Center and one of the outstanding authorities in the field of delinquency, who stated:

There are training schools and institutions for the rehabilitation of delinquent children, and one of the most difficult tasks is the training of persons who work with and live with the children. We have to go out on the street and select them on the basis of personality adjustment and background and give them a couple of days of orientation and put them to work.

It is inconceivable to me that these situations can be allowed to continue in this Nation. I have become painfully aware of the confusion and evil that result from this paucity of trained workers in the delinquency field, and I hope every other Member of the Senate feels likewise. From an analysis of waves of violence in New York, it appears certain that the major contributing factor was a tremendous shortage of available personnel to meet a problem that all authoritative persons knew was approaching rapidly.

Here in Washington it was shocking to learn that the District's social agencies were forced to hire people of questionable moral standards. These untrained and unqualified personnel eventually brought their evil proclivities on young children who had been committed to our institutions ostensibly for retraining. Thus, instead of retraining children to have socially acceptable attitudes, they were trained further in their warped and distorted views of adult society, which was now exposing them to incompetent, morally depraved adults.

Mr. President, this is a disheartening picture I am painting, I know, but I feel compelled to do so. With knowledge of these facts, I am certain the Congress will act.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I commend this bill to the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 802) to provide Federal assistance for projects to develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### STATE OR LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill the purpose of which is to require that in all emergency relief programs, such as drought relief, and so forth, underwritten by the Federal Government, there shall be a minimum of 25 percent State or local participation.

Under the existing law the Federal Government is underwriting all of the cost of these emergency relief programs, with the result that there is little incentive on the part of the State and local communities to supervise the distribution and to insure that the relief goes to those for whom it is intended.

It has been disclosed that under this program with non-State participation, millionaire ranchers, owners of race horses, and other unqualified types of operations have been declared eligible for relief payments.

For instance, the fabulous King Ranch received several thousand dollars in relief with no objections being raised by the State administrators, presumably on the assumption that the Federal Government was assuming the cost anyway.

In another instance the owner of the racehorse Swaps, even while his horse was winning the Belmont Sweepstake, was applying for and receiving relief payments.

One self-styled rancher with only a polo pony and a bird dog was drawing relief to feed his livestock.

Recognizing these abuses the administration in previous years strongly recommended this proposed legislation but no action was taken.

This proposal should be enacted by Congress now. At the present time these programs are not being utilized; therefore, it would be much easier to make this correction now and be ready for a future situation should another emergency develop.

The outlining of a definite formula of State participation would put the State legislatures on notice as to the rules under which they could participate.

This proposal can be strongly recommended as being necessary from the standpoint of good administration as well as being a step toward turning back to the States those functions which can be best administered at local levels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 803) to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Sen-

ator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1933, the Intercoastal Shipping Act.

An identical version of this bill, S. 3005, passed the Senate during the 86th Congress, 2d session, March 28, 1960.

Mr. President, when the Senators from Alaska urged the Federal Maritime Board to order a suspension of the proposed increased freight tariffs filed by carriers in the Alaska trade, it was said by the Board that no suspension order would issue. Instead, the Board announced that the increased tariffs would become effective prior to hearings. This announcement distressed everyone who realized that, whatever the outcome of the hearings, the consumers in Alaska would be faced with the burden of increased tariffs—a burden that would not be lifted under the procedure followed by the Board.

Therefore, the Board was asked to justify its refusal to suspend the proposed increased rates until the objectors to those rates could be heard. The Board's justification was that, under existing law, the Board can suspend proposed increased tariffs for no longer than 120 days, or 4 months, and that 4 months is too short a period to complete hearing procedures.

It must be said that Alaskans are not sympathetic to this justification. In the first place, the Board could complete hearing procedures in many controversies within the 4-month time period. In the second place, the suspension of rates even for 4 months would allow time for at least a partial development of the legal issues and the facts. There can be no doubt that Board rulings, after even a partial development of the issues and the evidence, would provide a sounder basis for decision than ex parte procedure can afford.

In view of the Board's statements on this matter, it appears advisable to broaden the Board's authority to suspend proposed tariff increases. The bill introduced today would allow the Board to suspend such increases for 7 months, instead of for the 4-month period now permitted. For easy reference, the bill would amend section 845 of title 46, United States Code. The 7-month period corresponds to the period of suspensions which the Interstate Commerce Commission may enforce under paragraph 7, section 15, of title 49, United States Code. The bill introduced today will add desirable uniformity in the powers of two leading regulatory agencies whose activities affect transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 804) to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## YU LIAO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Yu Liao.

It is my practice to introduce very few private bills and then only when the recipients are most deserving and where no real possibility of administrative relief appears available to them.

Mr. Yu Liao was born in Hengsan, Hunan Province, China, in 1921 and came to the United States as a student in 1948. He is the librarian at the University of Idaho and Dr. D. R. Theophilus, president of the university, has high praise for him as a person and an efficient employee.

Mr. Yu Liao cannot return to his homeland, which is under Communist control, and he has no family or ties in Taiwan. He is loyal to our country and its institutions and, at the earliest opportunity, wishes to become a citizen. I share his hope that his dream will become a reality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 805) for the relief of Yu Liao, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSION OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to make permanent the National Wool Act of 1954, which expires on March 31, 1962. This law was originally enacted, with strong bipartisan support, on a trial basis. It was extended in 1958.

There is now before the Senate a bill to extend the act for 3 years. But because of the success of this program and because of certain outstanding features of the act, which I will outline, I now urge that this law be made permanent.

The act provides for an incentive price for shorn wool to be established at such a level as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be necessary to encourage an annual production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool. The payments under the program are limited to duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures up to 70 percent of such collections.

Wool has always been an important commodity in our national security, especially in times of national emergency. Our tenuous international situation makes it extremely important to have a vigorous domestic wool industry. Also, in large areas of our country, sheep raising is a major enterprise, which bolsters many of our local communities, particularly in the intermountain West.

The 1954 Wool Act has the following outstanding features to commend it:

First, it is self-financing. Seventy percent of the wool duty revenues are used to pay the costs of supports to producers. The remaining 30 percent are paid into section 32 funds for other agricultural commodity supports.

Second, it does not adversely affect our foreign trade. It does not require raising tariffs to protect domestic grow-

ers' prices against the lower prices of imported wools.

Third, it prevents the Government from being in the wool merchandising business. CCC wool stockpiles reached a peak of 523 million pounds in September 1946, under former loan programs begun in 1943, and a peak of 150 million pounds in May of 1955, under loan programs begun in 1952. These huge surpluses have now disappeared under the National Wool Act.

It is necessary that this bill be acted on as early as possible in this Congress, so that the woolgrowers can make their plans for next year and obtain the necessary financing from loan agencies to carry on their operations. In fact, they actually have to plan almost 2 years ahead. This is because they have to buy their replacement breeding stock 1 year for the following year's production. And it is important that the act be made permanent so that woolgrowers can make proper long-range plans for their industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 807) to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 703 of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 910, 72 Stat. 994; 7 U.S.C. 1782), is amended to read as follows: "Such price support shall be limited to wool and mohair marketing on or after April 1, 1955."*

## NATIONAL PARKWAY THROUGH SOUTHERN UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to authorize the creation of a national parkway through southern Utah. The proposed parkway would connect the complex of national parks and monuments in southwestern Utah with the Glen Canyon Recreation Area and national monuments in southeastern Utah.

At the present time, the people of America are being denied, except at great inconvenience and hardship, the opportunity to see some of the most spectacular and majestic country in the world. Where 1,187,000 people visited Grand Canyon National Park during 1960, only 6,500 visited Natural Bridges National Monument, only 1,100 visited Rainbow Bridge National Monument, and only 2,800 visited Hovenweep National Monument, all in southeastern Utah.

Compared to the vast number of visitors at Grand Canyon, the 102,500 visitors at Capitol Reef National Monument, 272,000 at Bryce Canyon National Park, 115,800 at Cedar Breaks National Monument, and even the 575,800 visitors at Zion National Park seem relatively

small. Yet, these areas offer as much, and even more, to the American public as does Grand Canyon. If the proposed southern Utah parkway is built, many thousands more visitors will see the unique and spectacular scenery of that area.

## PARKWAY WOULD BE A NATIONAL PARK IN ITSELF

No matter which route were to be selected through southern Utah, it would open up a veritable wonderland of nature. The parkway itself would be virtually a national park in its own right, traversing, as it would, areas which can only be described as fantastic.

In addition to making a spectacular area accessible, the parkway would also open up the vast Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, extending up the Colorado River 186 miles. There are three sites on the west side of the river, in addition to the two immediately above the dam, which could be served by the parkway. The same may be said for two of the five sites along the east side of the river.

The sites along the west moving from south to north are Hole in the Rock, Oil Seep Bar, and Bullfrog Creek. On the east are the Shock Bar and White Canyon sites. Some of these are now accessible only from the air.

This great national recreation area is being turned over to the National Park Service for administration beginning this year. President Eisenhower budgeted \$839,000 for this area for the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

## PATTERNED AFTER EASTERN PARKWAYS

The Southern Utah Parkway would be patterned after the 478-mile Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia and North Carolina, and the 450-mile Natchez Trace Parkway in Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi. In addition to these parkways, there are 11 others on the parkway system, ranging in length from 3 to 72 miles. There are 1,138 miles on the entire national parkway system. Most of the small parkways are in the Washington, D.C., area. It is interesting to note that all of the parkways are in or south of Maryland and in or east of Mississippi. There are none west of the Mississippi River.

Under present law, Congress appropriates \$16 million yearly for national parkways. On the basis of current authorizations, all existing national parkways will be completed by 1971.

## FEASIBLE ROUTES AVAILABLE

I understand that there are at least four feasible routes across southern Utah, any one of which could serve as a parkway route. All would require a bridge across the Colorado River, where only ferry service at one location now exists. There are at present no improved roads traversing this magnificent area. The only good road to the north is State Highway 10, connecting Salina and Price, which is a 400-mile trip compared to the estimated 180-mile parkway. To travel between the two areas via the southerly route, one must go about 370 miles. This route goes to Tuba City and across Arizona through the Navajo Indian Reservation. This latter

road still affords some rugged going although it is being improved under recent legislation, which I was happy to support. The only route in between, which the average tourist would dare to venture upon, is State Highway 24 connecting Loa, Bicknell, Torrey, and Fruita with Hanksville and Green River. A major segment of this road is graded, but it is well to the north of my proposed parkway. It involves a diversion of over a hundred miles for the traveler wishing to visit the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in southern Utah.

#### FULFILLS A DREAM

The parkway would fulfill a great dream of mine, for which I have worked for years, a great scenic loop road in southern Utah. Not only would it be a delight to the American people in general, but it would greatly promote tourism, and enhance economic activity in many of our southern Utah towns, some of which have had serious population losses because of lack of economic opportunity.

As part of my efforts to fulfill that dream, I successfully sponsored an amendment to the 1956 Highway Act, making possible the Cove Fort to Denver interstate highway through central Utah. In 1960, I joined to support the Case of South Dakota-Allott amendment to fund the Denver to Cove Fort highway for the first time. This increased Utah's share of interstate highway funds by \$8 million or more yearly, beginning in fiscal year 1962. To further implement this dream, I led the effort to get State Highway No. 54 across Bryce Canyon National Park underway, and pushed added appropriations for State Highway No. 24 through Capitol Reef National Monument. In this same spirit, I sponsored an amendment in 1956 to raise Utah's forest highway annual allotment from \$750,000 to \$1 million and later backed an amendment boosting it to \$1,100,000. Similarly, I successfully sponsored and supported amendments increasing appropriations for roads in national parks and for national parkways, which have brought unheralded road development in Utah's national parks and monuments.

I have inserted provisions in the parkway bill, designed to protect all public land users to the maximum possible extent.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will approve the southern Utah national parkway bill, both for the good of America and for the people of Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 808) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a national parkway in the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of*

*America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to establish and maintain, within the State of Utah, a national parkway (including recreational areas, traffic interchanges, bridges, service roads where ingress and egress from private property would otherwise be denied because of the parkway, and such other structures as the Secretary may deem desirable) connecting the national parks and monuments in the southwestern part of Utah and the national recreational areas and monuments in the southeastern part of Utah.*

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of establishing the parkway authorized by the first section of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, such land and interests in land (including structures and improvements thereon), as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) Administrative jurisdiction with respect to Federal land and interests in land required by the Secretary in order to establish the parkway authorized herein may be transferred from the administering agency to the Secretary under terms acceptable to the agency and the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, to connect with the parkway such roads and trails as may be necessary for the protection, administration, or utilization of any adjacent or nearby national forest, and the resources thereof. The Forest Service and the National Park Service shall, insofar as practicable, coordinate and correlate such recreational development as each may plan, construct, or permit to be constructed, on lands within their respective jurisdictions which, by mutual agreement, should be given special treatment for recreational purposes.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the parkway established pursuant to this Act, the Secretary may issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way over, across, and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands, for such purposes and under such nondiscriminatory terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

SEC. 5. The parkway authorized to be established pursuant to this Act shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, be administered by the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

#### WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.

The Commission would be composed of members of Federal departments with a substantial interest in water resources development, representatives of the States of Indiana and Illinois and a representative from the Wabash Valley Interstate Compact Commission.

The Commission will:

First. Serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State

and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in the Wabash Basin.

Second. Prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, integrated joint plan for water and related land resources development in the Wabash Basin.

Third. Recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects in the Wabash Basin.

Fourth. Foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the Wabash Basin.

In order to carry out these duties the Commission is authorized to engage in such activities and to make such studies and investigations as are necessary or desirable.

The need for this Commission is apparent when we consider the many different organizations and interests on the Federal, State, and local levels which have some part in controlling and developing the waters of the Wabash River and its tributaries. On the Federal level there is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Corps, the Public Health Service, the National Parks Service, and others. On the State and local levels there are State agencies, township committees, and local groups.

The bill attempts to bring together in the Commission all of these interests in order to develop a well-integrated and comprehensive plan for the utilization of water resources in the Wabash River Basin.

The type of plan provided for in this bill has been prepared in the past for certain areas of the United States and has been found to be of great value in the formulation and selection of projects for construction. Examples of these studies are the comprehensive reports on the New York-New England region, the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins in southwestern United States, the Columbia River, the Missouri River, the Mississippi River, and the Ohio River.

Three national advisory commissions on water resources have recommended the type of commission established by the bill. The first such recommendation was made by the Committee headed by President Herbert Hoover. The other two Water Resources Commissions were established by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

Indiana has suffered from the ravages of floodwaters because of the lack of coordination and the stop-and-start history of our flood-control efforts. In recent years the monetary damages from these floods have amounted to \$140 million. These damages could have been prevented had there been a well-coordinated, planned effort of flood control which would have moved ahead 10 or 15 years ago.

It is time that Indiana moved ahead and started developing an adequate and comprehensive plan of flood control for the Wabash Basin. The Commission established by this bill will give us the start we need.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 811) to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

#### STATE TAXATION OF INCOME OF NONRESIDENT INDIVIDUALS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to State taxation of the income of nonresident individuals.

The operative part of the proposed amendment reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power to establish uniform laws prescribing the terms in conformity with which the States shall be permitted to levy and collect taxes on the income of nonresident individuals.

This proposal is the same as Senate Joint Resolution 140 of the 86th Congress, which I had the honor of introducing.

By way of background, this proposal was drafted after the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments held hearings on two other proposals—Senate Joint Resolution 29 and Senate Joint Resolution 67 of the 86th Congress—on this same subject.

The hearings on these joint resolutions brought into bold relief the fact that the several States are making a veritable jungle out of what can best be described as interstate taxation. Some States are literally taxing everything they can get their hands on and some things they cannot.

If the matter were not deadly serious for the victims, it would be almost comic. For example, some States are levying and collecting income taxes on airline pilots who fly over but do not land within their territory. This is absurd. If all States followed this example, an airline pilot might have to pay 20 or 30 State income taxes each year.

I will grant that this is an extreme case, but there are numerous inequities which afflict a huge number of citizens who live in roughly 20 States, and who work across State lines in another State. For example, there are more than 200,000 citizens and residents of Connecticut and New Jersey who work in New York City and who are subject to the New York State income tax. They must pay this tax in addition to a full tax load in either Connecticut or New Jersey.

In my view, New York may be entitled to collect some taxes from them for services rendered. Yet, because of provisions in the New York law, these unfortunate individuals pay up to 45 percent more than New York residents on the same income.

Furthermore, they probably would not have to pay any New York tax if Connecticut and New Jersey, like Massachusetts, had an income tax which was applicable to nonresidents, including New Yorkers. Adoption of such taxes would result in mutual credits for income taxes paid in the State of residence.

At the moment, adoption of such a tax is the only defense for States which do

not have an income tax. It is defense by retaliation, and it has been rejected, at least, for the moment, by Connecticut and New Jersey.

Because of the inequity of the situation—and perhaps because of the possibility of retaliatory legislation by Connecticut and New Jersey in the future—Governor Rockefeller tried last year to persuade the New York Legislature to adopt changes in the New York Tax Code to equalize deductions by out-of-Staters. Even this partial relief was turned down by the New York Legislature.

I understand that Governor Rockefeller is again attempting to persuade his legislature to accept his proposal. I certainly hope he is successful.

Needless to say, if adequate and equitable relief is not furnished by such States as New York, all States which have not already done so will be forced into adoption of income taxes applicable to nonresidents.

In the end, because of mutual credits, this will result in massive bookkeeping, but very little tax money for any State.

There is a similar problem with respect to State taxation of out-of-State corporations. However, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, the Congress has power to deal with this problem.

Unfortunately, Congress has no power to regulate interstate taxation of incomes of private individuals. This problem can only be solved by a constitutional amendment.

Personally, I favored the approach which is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 29 and Senate Joint Resolution 67 of the 86th Congress, and which would, in effect, ban taxation of incomes of nonresidents. However, even if both Houses of Congress adopted such an amendment by a two-thirds vote, which is most unlikely, there is not much hope that three-quarters of the States would ratify it, since, roughly, 30 States now have taxes which apply to nonresidents.

The joint resolution which I am introducing today would not ban taxation of incomes of nonresidents, but, rather, it would empower Congress to eliminate the inequities in such taxation.

It would forestall the 20 States which do not have an income tax from adopting one for purposes of retaliation and self-defense.

It would eliminate such inanities as taxation of pilots flying over a State.

It would get the several States out of the jungle into which they have gotten themselves in their wild scramble to lay hands on taxable income.

It is my hope that we can have hearings on this joint resolution soon. I believe it is a sound approach to a most serious problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to State taxation of the income of nonresident individuals, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### BRAVE LITHUANIA—A SEVEN-CENTURY QUEST FOR FREEDOM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

Mr. President, on February 16, 1961, the Lithuanian-Americans will commemorate the 708th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom in 1253 and the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania in 1918 following the First World War.

The Communist exploitation of this great people and her neighbors in Estonia and Latvia is so shocking that it warrants the concern of freemen everywhere.

The quest for freedom of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors goes back many centuries.

In the 13th century, Mindaugas united the Lithuanian tribes to meet expanding German pressure, and in 1253, by the authority of Pope Innocent IV, he was crowned the first and only king in Lithuanian history. His assassination in 1263 brought a return to paganism.

Torn between alliance with Russia and Poland and family rivalries, by 1413 Lithuania had moved into union with Poland—they had a common parliament by 1569—as both countries sought to rid their lands of the German Teutonic order.

Late in the 18th century, however, Russian rule arrived and, as a result of the carving up of Europe by the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Russian czar became not only the King of Poland but the Grand Duke of Lithuania. Russian oppression grew tighter in the late 19th century as Lithuanian newspapers, journals, and books were prohibited in the native tongue. Russian was the only language taught in the schools. However, the spirit of freedom could not be subdued and Lithuanian newspapers were smuggled across the border and into homes throughout the little land.

A growing quest for freedom and a penchant for independence resulted in a Congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates meeting at Vilnius in September 1917. The council of 20 which resulted from these sessions, proclaimed an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918. As the German troops retreated westward and the Red army followed in its wake, the inevitable Communist regime proceeded to entrench itself. Soon the Polish army under Pilsudski pushed back the Communists and by 1921, after a period of wavering control by outside power, and with part of her boundary still uncertain, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations.

The uncertain status of the Lithuanians is well illustrated by the ease with which first the Germans and then the Russians included her in their sphere of influence by secret protocols to the German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact of 1939.

On June 15, 1940, an ultimatum to form a friendly government and immediate occupation by the Soviet army de-

cided the issue. Within a month, a phony election with handpicked candidates resulted in a unanimous request to incorporate Lithuania in the U.S.S.R. It is estimated that on the night of the occupation over 30,000 Lithuanians—mostly the educated ones and the leaders—were deported to Siberia. Others were executed on the spot.

Then with the attack on Russia came the German invasion and its purges and exterminations. Following their retreat, a second Soviet occupation occurred in 1944. In the next 4 years, almost 300,000 Lithuanians were uprooted and deported—many with the agricultural collectivization of 1949.

In their rise and fall, Estonia and Latvia have followed a similar course: Exploitation by both native and foreign oppressors; cabinet instability and a multiplicity of political parties; and eventual incorporation into the Soviet Union as the fall of the Iron Curtain clanked shut because of an army of occupation, rigged elections, and the mass deportation of political prisoners. Such has been the sad and trying history of these gallant and spirited peoples.

This attempted suppression of human freedom justly deserves the attention of the President and the Senate of the United States and all the free peoples who participate in the United Nations. Soviet troops should be withdrawn; political prisoners and others who have been exiled and imprisoned should be returned to their homes; and free elections should be held under United Nations supervision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in full at this point in the RECORD and that it lie at the table for 1 day for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets (a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, (b) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia under its supervision.

#### OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE— AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE ARTS—ADDITIONAL CO- SPONSOR OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 31, 1961, the name of Senator LONG of Missouri was added as additional cosponsor to the bills S. 741, S. 742, S. 743, and S. 744, relating to the arts, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on January 31, 1961.

#### ADDITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 783) to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park, the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], may be added as a cosponsor.

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

#### DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS IN THE ARTS—ADDI- TIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 785) to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] may be added as a cosponsor.

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

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONVEN- TION ON THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Committee

on Foreign Relations will hold hearings on the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—on Tuesday, February 14, at 10 o'clock in the committee room, No. 4221, New Senate Office Building. The hearings will be public and if necessary will resume on Wednesday, February 15, at the same hour.

The principal witnesses will be Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. George Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTI- CLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

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

By Mr. WILEY:

Address by him broadcast over Wisconsin radio station on the weekend of February 5, 1961.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Excerpts from speech delivered by him before National Cotton Council of America, Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tenn., Tuesday, January 31, 1961.

#### LIBERALIZATION OF PUBLIC FACIL- ITIES LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am pleased that President Kennedy has taken action to liberalize the public facilities loan program.

In his press conference on February 1, the President announced that the unrealistic restrictions on the program will be removed. I have tried on three occasions to obtain passage of legislation which would make this program more effective in aiding communities in the construction of needed community improvements. These measures were consistently opposed by the Republican administration. I did not reintroduce my bill this session, in the hope that the President would take the necessary administrative action to expand the program.

Our population is rapidly becoming more urbanized, thus increasing the pressures on public facilities of all types. It is estimated that the number of rural households will decline by 900,000 in the next decade. Such a drastic shift in population to the urban areas will compound the difficulties already facing cities and towns throughout the country. A helpful attitude on the part of the Federal Government can be of much assistance in solving the problem of overtaxed public facilities.

Before the President's announcement last week, the community facilities loan program was limited to cities under 10,000 in population and loans were made for the construction of water and sewer systems only. It was useful to the smallest towns with the worst credit ratings, but did not touch the problems of the majority of our communities. The President's order removes the population restriction and makes the loan program available to all communities, regardless of size. It also removes the restriction limiting the program solely to

water and sewer loans. The reduction in the interest rate will also be an important factor in assisting financially overburdened local governments.

Since the loan program went into operation, 594 applications have been received, of which 353 were approved; 54 communities in Arkansas have received assistance under the program. One of the most important Arkansas loans was that which cleared the way for construction of the bridge over the Mississippi River near Helena.

I am sure that there will be much greater interest in this program now that the restrictions have been removed. In addition to supplying long-needed help in removing the local public works backlog, the expansion of this program should have a beneficial effect on the Nation's economy. I am sure that it will have a substantial psychological effect on the construction industry at once, although it will, of course, take some time for the direct effects of the expanded program to be felt on the economy.

Only \$60 million remains available for this loan program before the authorization limit is reached. With the renewed activity which the removal of the restrictions will bring about, the authorization limit will probably be reached shortly. I hope that the administration will seek to have the authorization increased, and I will certainly do everything I can to secure favorable congressional action on such a request.

The President's forceful action will go a long way toward making the program more effective in assisting communities in solving their public works problems. This action is, I think, indicative of the spirit of the new administration.

#### ICA RULING JEOPARDIZES GREAT LAKES TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, late in 1960 administrative action was taken to cut down the gold flow out of the country. Included in the efforts was an action through ICA to cut back subsidies for shipment in foreign-flag vessels of commodities under its programs.

In areas where both foreign-flag and U.S.-flag vessels service the needs of the country, this cutback may have proved workable.

In practice, however, very serious problems have arisen—particularly as these relate to trade and commerce in the Great Lakes and through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

If allowed to go into full effect, the directive threatens to seriously dislocate, and to a large degree "kill off," trade and commerce.

The reason for this is that about 40 foreign flags service the Great Lakes, as compared to only 1 American line.

This would jeopardize the economy, jobs, flow of trade and commerce, traffic services to businesses and industries, and jeopardize the United States and Canadian investments in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Following the order, I contacted the White House, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and the ICA, to urge a revision of the directive, providing either first, a blanket exemption of lakes traffic; or

second, that the order be held in abeyance until a thorough hearing could be held on all the ramifications which the order would have upon trade and commerce in the region.

Unless some action is taken along this line, it may have serious consequences for the whole lakes region—many areas of which are now suffering from economic setbacks.

In response, ICA has offered the following compromise:

First. A hearing to be held of interested parties affected by the order as soon as convenient.

Second. In the interim, all reasonable requests to be granted for exemption of contracts under consideration that may be jeopardized by the order.

Great Lakes interests are now preparing to present their case to ICA. Because of the far-reaching impact which this order could well have upon the economy of the upper Midwest, as well as that of the country, however, I believe this warrants the attention of Congress.

At this time I request unanimous consent to have the following items printed at this point in the RECORD: First, a copy of the ICA regulation; and second, responses of port directors, mayors, and others, concerned with the trade and commerce on the lakes, on the adverse impact which the order would have upon traffic.

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

#### ICA POLICY RE OCEAN SHIPPING ICA-FINANCED COMMODITY PROCUREMENT

1. In further implementation State Department instructions dated December 5,<sup>1</sup> following policy approved concerning ICA payment ocean shipping costs ICA-financed commodities: Ocean shipping costs of all commodities, materials and equipment procured from MSP program funds shall be eligible for ICA financing only if transported on U.S.-flag vessels, except where foreign-flag vessels are required to assume timely delivery of merchandise and provided that such exceptions received prior approval from ICA, Washington. Pursuant to present legislation, Public Law 664 (Cargo Preference Act) at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of goods financed by ICA will have to continue to be shipped on U.S.-flag vessels.

2. Host country may thus continue to ship on non-U.S. bottoms up to 50 percent of the gross tonnage of goods financed by ICA, but ICA will not finance ocean shipping costs such shipments except as noted above. Host country, therefore, will have to use own resources to meet such costs.

3. New policy applicable goods covered by PA's, PA/PR's, PIO/C's and PIO/T's to be issued on or after February 1, 1961, except as regards PIO/C's to be issued to fund lump-sum contracts already in being. Until such time as ICA Regulation 1, section 201.7, formally amended, language incorporating new policy paragraph 1 above to be included appropriate procurement documents prior signature and issuance.

MILWAUKEE, Wis.,  
January 31, 1961.

ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.:

International Association of Great Lakes Ports and the port of Milwaukee have ur-

<sup>1</sup>Reference memo: ICA Small Business Memo No. 60-10, dated Dec. 12, 1960.

gently requested the International Cooperation Administration to reconsider and postpone its order effective February 1, 1961, which provides that U.S. Government will no longer pay ocean freight costs on U.S. foreign aid cargoes moving in non-American vessels. As we interpret the order, it may for all practical purposes remove Great Lakes ports from present participation in handling foreign aid cargoes. More than 40 ocean steamship lines serving Great Lakes are foreign-flag services. Only one regular service, American Export Lines, is American-flag subsidized service. In addition to threatening the principal general cargo volume of Great Lakes ports, and especially agricultural commodities, it is our opinion that ICA order may defeat congressional policy and intent in requiring St. Lawrence Seaway to be self-liquidating by toll charges on cargo and vessels using seaway. If ICA order dries up substantial portion of outward general cargo volume from the Midwest, it will simultaneously shrink toll revenues to U.S. and Canadian Governments required to assure self-liquidation St. Lawrence Seaway. We emphasize also that Government may suffer heavy added costs in inland freight charges, unless Government aid cargoes move to nearest Midwest port of exit. Large economies have been realized to Government recipient nations and commercial shippers by using nearest Midwest port of exit. Diversion of Government aid cargoes to seaboard may also shrink steamship services with resulting detriment to commercial shippers as well as to ports. As you know, large public and private investments have been made in lake region for new general cargo terminals and port improvements. Federal Government making large expenditures for seaway, connecting channels, and deepening lake ports. All such investments, public and private, will be jeopardized if normal expectations of participating in foreign aid cargo movements are nullified. ICA order apparently runs contrary to congressional declaration of 50-50 ICA use, and while it may benefit American merchant marines, it may also jeopardize international relationships in critical period of world tension. Great Lakes region and ports are urgently requesting reconsideration of this order; clarification of its effect on Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway traffic; and opportunity for representatives of Great Lakes region and this association to confer with ICA and if necessary with Secretary of Agriculture. Respectfully urge that you use your influence to seek reconsideration and deferment of ICA order pending complete study its effect on Great Lakes seaway operation and international relationships. Thanks your consideration.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
LAKES PORTS,

H. C. BROCKEL,  
Chairman, American Section.

GREEN BAY, Wis.,  
January 31, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram sent International Cooperation Administration this morning: "Advised only today of order effective tomorrow which on the basis of U.S. Government withdrawal from payment of freight costs except in American bottoms will completely deprive Great Lakes ports of participation in movement of foreign aid cargoes. These cargoes principally produced in Great Lakes area must under this directive move to tidewater ports where American flag vessels will be available the 40 steamship lines serving the Great Lakes with one single exception being foreign flags. Imposition of such restrictions disastrous to Great Lake ports. Urge reconsideration and postponement of

order and if necessary conference concerning matter with Lake ports representatives. Please advise."

This is development of most threatening nature to entire State. Your most effective assistance earnestly solicited.

BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF  
HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,  
JOHN F. SAINSBURY,  
*Port Director.*

KENOSHA, WIS.,  
January 31, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

Copy wire to ICA: "Request immediate reconsideration of order effective February 1, 1961, that U.S. Government no longer pay ocean freight costs on title 3 goods moving on vessels of foreign flags. Effect of this will practically dry up overseas commerce on Great Lakes. Tremendous Federal and Canadian investments in St. Lawrence Seaway will be jeopardized. Very heavy investments of municipal port authorities and private operators will be wasted and international relations with Canada and our other foreign friends will deteriorate. This financial loss may be greater than savings on gold reserves."

Please exert influence for suspension until this matter can be reconsidered.

KENOSHA BOARD OF HARBOR  
COMMISSIONERS,  
W. CASEY SCHMITZ,  
*Chairman.*

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,  
January 31, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Great Lakes Commission with concurrence of U.S. Section International Association of Great Lakes Ports respectfully seeks your support for request for reconsideration ICA order halting U.S. payment ocean freight cost on aid cargoes moving in non-American vessels. Commission telegram today to ICA expresses concern order may adversely affect exports via regions ports many of which include substantial investment of State and/or municipal funds and which presently have regular services primarily by foreign vessels. Fear order will unfairly deprive lake ports rightful share exports under aid program originating in Great Lakes area and Midwest. Respectfully request your aid in staying order effective February 1 and obtaining reconsideration with opportunity for further representations by region.

MARVIN FAST.

SUPERIOR, WIS., January 31, 1961.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to exercise your office to stay and rescind February 1 order of International Cooperation Administration in its detrimental application to payment ocean freight on relief cargo carried by the vessels of foreign register. Effect of order will be staggering irrecoverable blow to the anticipated economic value of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway in this distressed area. Will completely counteract all our past efforts toward future development.

M. HAGEN, Mayor.

GREEN BAY, WIS., January 1, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Today we wired International Cooperation Administration urging reconsideration and postponement of order effective February 1 that will completely deprive Great Lakes ports of participation in foreign-aid cargoes and suggested a conference with lake ports

representatives. Your assistance in preventing the order from becoming effective is respectfully solicited.

R. C. BRETH, Secretary.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,  
February 1, 1961.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

The Milwaukee Overseas Ship Agents Association representing steamship lines serving the port of Milwaukee and engaged directly in foreign commerce urgently and respectfully solicit your good efforts to recommend a deferment of the ICA order effective February 1 pending complete study of its effect on the St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes.

ANTHONY VITALE.

RACINE, WIS.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,  
Washington, D.C.:

Has been brought to our attention the very serious situation that may develop with consequences international and relating to our Great Lakes ports' incomes, will you strongly recommend as urgent to the International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., that your port and city of Racine through your offices, reconsiders order effective February 1, 1961, providing that U.S. Government will no longer pay ocean freight costs on U.S. foreign aid cargoes moving in non-American vessels. It seems to me that now on our commission is the time to rally to the cause of the international situation of our American Government, rather than tearing this apart or casting it asunder, and we hope you will see the virtue of acting on this to have this order changed, and will appreciate your immediate and most effective effort and will appreciate your so advising this office.

Respectfully,

F. M. YOUNG.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator refer to the order requiring that all shipments be in U.S. bottoms, or ships?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the Senator from Wisconsin in his protest. What the order means simply is that shipping on the Great Lakes in many areas will be stopped entirely, insofar as any foreign commerce is concerned.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his comments. I have worked on this matter for days. The result is that there has been an agreement to have hearings in which the parties interested can be heard. I think it is probable that in the hearings there will be developed evidence of what injury will result from this regulation. It will mean injury not only to shipping, but injury to the U.S. Government. It will mean loss of revenues. It will mean that the Government will have to pay for the interest on bonds issued for construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

#### EXPANDING TRADE AND COMMERCE THROUGH THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence development program offers one of the greatest opportunities in U.S. history for stimulating the economy

of the upper Midwest and the Nation. How? By providing a less expensive, deepsea water route to the ports of the world for the products of our farms and factories.

Now that the seaway is completed, however, I believe it would be a great mistake to forget about it—to assume the attitude that progress "will take care of itself," and that the desirable volume of trade and commerce will automatically find its way through the waterway.

By experience, we have learned that this almost never happens.

The American people have a \$140 million investment in the waterway. Unless the project is made to "pay off" this will mean loss to the taxpayer. A far greater loss, however, would be that of failing to take advantage of the new economic opportunity offered by the waterway.

I have long felt that a vastly expanded effort is needed to encourage a larger flow of trade and commerce.

I sincerely hope that members of the Appropriations Committee will sympathetically consider this matter when the appropriations bill comes up for consideration.

Recently, I was privileged to receive a letter from Marvin Fast, executive director of the Great Lakes Commission, conveying the views of the commission, on the need for greater efforts to expand traffic through the seaway. I request unanimous consent to have the letter and a release from the Great Lakes Commission printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GREAT LAKES COMMISSION,  
ANN ARBOR, MICH.,  
February 2, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the direction of the Great Lakes Commission this endorses expanded traffic developmental activity by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and respectfully recommends action by the Congress to increase funds for this purpose as urged recently by the Corporation's advisory board.

For your information this recommendation also was transmitted to the President, Secretary of Commerce and Bureau of the Budget in communications dated January 27, 1961.

In supporting an expanded traffic developmental program by the Seaway Development Corporation the commission—which is a joint and official agency of seven Great Lakes States—stresses the self-liquidating nature of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In the commission's view compliance with this requirement of self-liquidation requires traffic developmental activities by the Corporation not possible under present budget policies. The commission therefore recommends additional funds for such activities so as to permit the Corporation to assist in the achievement of the maximum usage of the seaway's navigation facilities on which self-liquidation depends.

Expansion of traffic developmental activities by the Seaway Development Corporation also is suggested by additional considerations. We note, first, the importance of stepping up efforts to increase U.S. exports and the country's trade surplus as a means of reducing the outflow of gold resulting from the present deficit in the balance of payments.

We point out in this connection that the seaway was intended to create new exports, commerce which would not move in the foreign trade of the United States without the seaway. It therefore would appear to be especially in the national interest at this time to promote such new trade and, it follows, to permit the Seaway Development Corporation to engage in traffic development to a greater degree. Secondly, the cost of developmental activities ultimately will not be borne by taxpayers but, because of the seaway's self-liquidating feature, by those paying tolls for its direct benefits.

Copy of the enclosed release, which contains the full text of the commission's letter to the Secretary of Commerce, also is being sent to Members of Congress from the Great Lakes area.

In view of your special interest in the seaway and the Great Lakes we hope you will find it desirable to give this recommendation your special attention. Your support of increased funds as recommended by the commission will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN FAST,  
Executive Director.

The Great Lakes Commission today announced it has recommended the Federal Government provide increased funds to expand the traffic developmental program of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Marvin Fast, executive director of the commission, in releasing the text of the commission's letter to Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, said the commission's recommendation also has been submitted to the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

The commission's letter stated present Federal budget policies do not permit the desired level of traffic development activities by the Seaway Development Corporation. Fast added that such programs have been extremely limited, almost nonexistent, under the present policy. Noting the statutory requirement that the seaway is to be self-liquidating, the letter said additional funds for such activities are needed to permit the Corporation to assist in the achievement of the maximum usage of the seaway's navigation facilities on which self-liquidation depends.

As further reasons for enlarging the Corporation's traffic developmental program, the commission mentioned the present efforts to increase U.S. exports as a means of reducing the outflow of U.S. gold. "The seaway," the commission said, "was intended to create new exports, commerce which would not move in the foreign trade of the United States without the seaway. It therefore would appear especially in the national interest at this time to promote such new trade, and, it follows, to permit the Seaway Development Corporation to engage in traffic development to a greater degree." The commission also pointed out that all of the cost of the developmental activities ultimately will be borne not by taxpayers but by users of the seaway paying tolls for its direct benefits.

Fast explained the present restrictive policy of the Federal Government is based on its view that tax funds should not be used to promote the seaway in competition with other alternative routes. "That policy," said Fast, "is based on two fallacies. First, it overlooks a major purpose of the seaway—which is to create new export opportunities for industry and agriculture in the Great Lakes area and entire Midwest. Second, it overlooks the seaway's self-liquidating feature, which means the cost of traffic developmental activities will be recovered from toll revenues."

Fast indicated the Eisenhower budget for 1962 submitted to Congress last month continues the present restrictive policy. He said only \$11,000 was received for promotion of the seaway, even though it is understood

a substantially larger sum was requested by the Corporation at the recommendation of its advisory board. The commission's action now, according to its executive director, is an effort to obtain a change in Federal policy under the Kennedy administration.

The Great Lakes Commission is a joint State agency with advisory responsibilities on Great Lakes developments and programs. It includes as members all of the Great Lakes States except Ohio.

The text of the commission's letter of January 27 to the Secretary of Commerce is as follows:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the direction of the Great Lakes Commission this endorses expanded traffic developmental activity by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and respectfully recommends support by the Department of Commerce for increased funds for this purpose as urged recently by the Corporation's advisory board.

"In supporting an expanded traffic developmental program by the Seaway Development Corporation, the commission—which is a joint and official agency of seven Great Lakes States—stresses the self-liquidating nature of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In the commission's view compliance with this requirement of self-liquidation requires traffic developmental activities by the Corporation not possible under present budget policies. The commission therefore recommends additional funds for such activities so as to permit the Corporation to assist in the achievement of the maximum usage of the seaway's navigation facilities on which self-liquidation depends.

"Expansion of traffic developmental activities by the Seaway Development Corporation also is suggested by additional considerations. We note, first, the importance of stepping up efforts to increase U.S. exports and the country's trade surplus as a means of reducing the outflow of gold resulting from the present deficit in the balance of payments. We point out in this connection that the seaway was intended to create new exports, commerce which would not move in the foreign trade of the United States without the seaway. It therefore would appear to be especially in the national interest at this time to promote such new trade and, it follows, to permit the Seaway Development Corporation to engage in traffic development to a greater degree. Secondly, the cost of developmental activities ultimately will not be borne by taxpayers but, because of the seaway's self-liquidating feature, by those paying tolls for its direct benefits.

"Favorable consideration by the Department of Commerce of this recommendation will be appreciated by the commission.

"Sincerely yours,

"MARVIN FAST,  
"Executive Director."

#### CENSORSHIP

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago today the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision which is viewed with grave misgivings by many Americans. The decision upheld a Chicago ordinance requiring the licensing of movie films by a police censor board before they can be exhibited. Four members of the Court strongly dissented.

Because of the potential impact this decision could have on the first amendment to our Constitution and because of the potential impact the decision could have on all the news media—television, radio, and newspapers—I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 27 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### NO LICENSE FOR CENSORS

Americans concerned with keeping the Bill of Rights in good repair will view with grave misgiving the Supreme Court's decision this week upholding film censorship in Chicago.

As on many civil liberties issues, the Court split 5 to 4, with Justice Clark writing the majority opinion, in which Justices Frankfurter, Harlan, Whittaker, and Stewart concurred. They upheld the authority of Chicago's police censor board to require that every moving picture be submitted to it for licensing before being exhibited to the public. A local ordinance authorizes the censors to ban showings for reasons of obscenity, immorality, portrayal of depravity, or violence, incitement to riot, and the like.

A community's power to punish obscenity, and especially its power to protect young people from filth, was not at issue in this case. The question was solely whether a community can exercise this power through the particular means of prior censorship. The Court majority ruled in effect that it doesn't matter much how this authority is exercised. Established constitutional doctrine permits the restraint of free expression for certain limited and valid reasons, such as protection against obscenity, and so the majority held that there is no "absolute freedom to exhibit, at least once, any and every kind of motion picture."

But this is a misleading way to state the issue. Actually the manner in which restraints on free expression are applied does make a great deal of difference, and prior censorship has always been one of the most abhorrent. When every film, every book, or every newspaper must be submitted to a censor, the censor's standards rather than those of free individuals tend to dominate or to throttle expression. Furthermore, as Chief Justice Warren pointed out in his dissent, joined by Justices Black, Douglas, and Brennan, a censor's decisions are much less likely to be governed by respect for due process and all the safeguards of individual rights than are those of a court.

The Clark majority endeavored to make clear that in sanctioning film censorship it is not saying anything whatever about censorship of books, newspapers and other means of expression. But Justice Warren makes the point that there is no sound ground for distinguishing between free expression in films and free expression in print. Curbs applied to the one may with equal reason be applied to the other. It is essential, therefore, that any restraints be fully justified by real danger to the community, and applied with full respect for due process of law.

It is interesting that Justice Brennan joined the dissenters in condemning censorship, because it was he who wrote the Court's majority opinion in the Roth case upholding the power to restrain free expression for the purpose of punishing obscenity. The principles he set forth in that case remain controlling. He said that subject matter "utterly without redeeming social importance," which would include obscenity, does not enjoy constitutional protection, but other utterances do. And he made the standard of obscenity a relatively flexible one, to be measured by common understanding and practices, the general community attitude and tone.

Thus Justice Brennan believes that the community can protect itself against obscenity, but not by the method of subjecting all works in a given medium to prior censorship and licensing. Surely that is the rule of commonsense. What it means is that the power to limit free expression shall rest with the courts and not with policemen; that it

will be exercised sparingly, with restraint and full regard for due process of law; that it will be applied to offenses actually committed rather than to potential abuses.

#### WE MUST END ARMS RACE, SECURE A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the year ahead what America does may well determine the fate of the world.

Golden opportunity awaits, side by side with the impending disaster of nuclear catastrophe. I assert that positive, intelligent action can make this an age of hope fulfilled.

For more than a decade, the world has teetered on the edge of disaster. Vast arsenals of the most devastating weapons ever devised by man have been stockpiled by major powers. This futile arms race must be stopped. History of the 20th century to this good hour demonstrates that armaments races between nations led to World Wars I and II. We must end the armaments race with the Soviet Union and Red China by definite agreements, with adequate safeguards, before the most terrible of all wars—perhaps the final war—is precipitated.

Mr. President, today there is reason to hope that the oppressive tension that grips the world will at long last be lifted.

Behind the bluster and bombast of Soviet leaders, I firmly believe, lies an earnest desire for a halt to the arms race.

We all know well that it has always been the wish of our people and leaders to live in peace, to devote our wealth and energy not to weapons of destruction but to those causes which will promote the spread of peace and plenty throughout the world.

We must find a common language with our antagonists to reach what I hope is the common goal of disarmament and a reduction of cold war tension.

President Kennedy has firmly stated his goals to be an early successful conclusion of nuclear test ban negotiations and a beginning toward effective disarmament, plus adequate safeguards.

It is for us, as Senators of the United States, to help him in his efforts.

Indeed, we must not fail. The longer we wait, the greater become the possibilities of a war no one wants.

Mr. President, nuclear weapons have made war obsolete as an instrument of national policy. The horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki make this abundantly clear.

Man has outgrown war. Science has made it both impractical and impossible, if mankind is to endure on this planet.

According to informed scientists, America today has stockpiled more than 1,000 hydrogen bombs and could readily produce 50,000 more. There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union does not possess an equal arsenal and an equal potential.

Each hydrogen bomb is capable of wiping out an entire major city.

These are sobering statistics, Mr. President. What more is needed to wipe the thought of war from anyone's mind?

But there is more. Developments in chemical and bacteriological warfare add a new dimension to any conflict, a di-

mension as terrible to contemplate as nuclear holocaust. Further, we—and the Soviets—possess silent, undersea striking forces capable of raining death from great distances, and swift overhead missiles capable of reaching their targets from thousands of miles away in less time than it takes any of us to drive home at night.

In the near future, Red China will possess nuclear arms. France already has nuclear capability. In fact, nuclear capability appears within reach of many small nations. It is no longer a monopoly of powerful nations.

It is clear, Mr. President, that time is running out. Only prompt, positive action can stem the onrush toward a garrison world. Students of history know that from the turn of the century to this good hour every armaments race on the part of one great nation against another, or group of nations against others, has eventually led to war.

We, as Senators of the United States, probably will have the opportunity to help speed the world toward the day when fear of nuclear war is a thing of the past.

But if we and the world fail now there is no telling what fantastic limits the arms race might reach or what fantastic new weapons of destruction might be developed.

Nor do we know if the opportunity will ever come again to halt the terrible race toward war.

#### LUNCHEON HONORING FORMER SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 19, 1961, it was my pleasure to attend a luncheon in honor of our good friend, former Senator Theodore Francis Green. This luncheon was given in recognition of Senator Green's devoted service over the years in the best interest of the nationality groups. The groups present at the luncheon brought for Senator Green, as remembrance of the occasion, several valuable and meaningful souvenirs with a special significance in that they related to dates and events in his lifetime. It was said however, and I agree, that "the real gift is the love and devotion for Senator Green of all of our nationality groups who have worked for so long under his leadership."

Following these presentations, Mr. Rusk, the Secretary of State, addressed the group. Because of the importance and timeliness of his message, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK

We honor Senator Green today for several reasons: For his many effective years of public service, for his leadership as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and particularly, in the presence of this company, his work on behalf of the nationality groups.

Americans of first or second generation immigrant origin today number more than 35 million.

They are men and women whose families came to this country because they believed in freedom—because they wanted to find new liberty, and new opportunity.

The fact that America is a land of people from every corner of the earth—the fact that here all are citizens alike, no matter of what origin—is one of the great truths that we have to speak to the world.

In the present struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of dictatorship, this is a fact that stands out strongly for our cause everywhere.

From whatever country they have come, they are now Americans who can testify that under the Constitution of the United States they have found an opportunity to play a full part in self-government—and that is one of the most important things which we have to say to the world today.

The general notion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is more than a slogan of revolutionary America—it is a scarlet thread of long-range American policy and operation.

Our nationality organizations and our foreign language press have done an excellent job in telling the world what America means, and we honor them for that. Some have told the story to relatives in other lands through their letters; others by the personal example of the leadership which they have achieved in the affairs of our country.

In addition, through travel abroad, many of you have become personal ambassadors. About one-third of all visas issued to American visitors to Europe are currently issued to persons of foreign birth—persons who, on their visits, have direct family contacts through which they can and do spread the story of America, in a much more personal and effective way than this can be done by any official agency.

In all of this, we are indebted to you of the nationality organizations and to your press for helping to maintain and improve the picture of American democracy abroad.

There are other ways in which you have helped.

You have kept alive the knowledge of foreign languages, which our country so much needs.

You have helped to strengthen our knowledge of other cultures, and to broaden our fellowship with men and women on other shores.

You have often been the first to perceive the special problems which the United States has faced in its relations abroad, and to help our leaders here at home to understand those problems.

You have helped new immigrants to find a ready welcome and an opportunity to participate in the public life of our country much more quickly than they might otherwise have done.

For Senator Green, the idea that all are equal regardless of national origin, race, or creed, is not only a principle of constitutional law; it is a truth which he feels in his heart, and on which he has based his public life.

I am delighted that he is to continue in a permanent and close connection with the Committee on Foreign Relations, which he has led so well. We need him in Washington, and I hope he will always maintain that same close relationship with the Department of State from which we have drawn much wisdom.

His devotion to the cause of freedom everywhere in the world dates from the days of Woodrow Wilson, of whose concepts he has been an ardent and consistent supporter—and his name is known in every country to which American idealism has penetrated.

We salute him as a great Senator, a great friend of the nationality groups, and a great American.

## FOOD FOR PEACE COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on October 31, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy, then the Democratic nominee for President, appointed a six-member group to study new ways of using our farm abundance overseas for the relief of the hungry for economic development. Having for many years been of the firm conviction that our farm abundance should be treated as a blessing rather than a curse, and that this God-given abundance should be used in a more positive fashion to help the people of other nations—especially those in the underdeveloped countries—I was, therefore, greatly honored when President Kennedy appointed me to this group. Chairman of our committee was the distinguished Murray D. Lincoln, president of CARE and president of the Nationwide Mutual Insurance Cos. Other members were Donald Murphy, director of editorial research, Wallace's Farmer; George Forell, professor of systematic theology at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary; William Benton, former Member of the U.S. Senate from Connecticut and chairman of the board of Encyclopedia Britannica; and Mrs. Mary Lasker who has been an active supporter and leader in health research programs.

On January 19, our committee submitted its report to President Kennedy. Because of the widespread interest in our report and in this whole subject of food for peace, I am asking unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The concept and philosophy upon which our report is based is summarized in the report in these words:

Food, to satisfy hunger, and fiber, to clothe the needy, are the most elementary necessities, without which man is incapable of moving on to higher forms of satisfaction and fulfillment.

U.S. agricultural productive capacity is the Nation's most precious treasure, the result of favorable climate, the industry of our farmers, the achievements of our science and technology. The production of food and fiber is what we do best in the world.

It is the aim of the United States to put this agricultural capacity to the fullest use to meet human need, and promote human advancement and development, both at home and abroad.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

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

### THE FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

(A report of the Food for Peace Committee appointed by Senator Kennedy, October 31, 1960, submitted by the committee to the President-elect, January 19, 1961.)

#### FACTUAL SURVEY

##### World food needs

The average daily calorie consumption is adequate in European countries, and more than adequate in some of them; but calorie intake throughout the Far East is well below the necessary level, and not up to acceptable standards in western Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Moreover, serious dietary deficiencies exist even in some countries where the daily average calorie intake is substantial. Hundreds of millions of people subsist on diets short of energy value, lacking in proteins and fats and oils.

Per capita food production in the underdeveloped countries has fallen since the years before World War II. Agricultural output in these countries is in a grim race with rising population. Over the next 10 years, it is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that food production per capita in the underdeveloped countries will increase by only one-third of 1 percent a year. This means that these countries cannot possibly feed their people adequately by their own efforts alone.

#### Importance of U.S. farm exports

Exports of farm products in 1960 were about 11 percent of the total value to the farmer of all his sales, domestic and foreign. Compared to farmer net income (\$11.6 billion in 1960) exports were of course much greater. Exports in fiscal 1960 were equivalent to about 65 percent of the total value of farm surpluses held by the CCC on June 30, 1960.

Cash value to farmer of all sales in 1960: \$34 billion.

Dollar value of all U.S. farm exports—fiscal 1960: \$4.5 billion.

Dollar value of CCC holdings, June 30, 1960: \$7.2 billion.

#### How U.S. farm exports are financed

U.S. agricultural exports valued at a total of \$4.5 billion in fiscal 1960 were the second highest annual total on record:

(a) Dollar sales: Of this total \$3.1 billion went for a dollar return. The greater part of our dollar sales are straight commercial transactions, without Government aid; a lesser part, ranging from 30 percent to 40 percent in recent years, is sold with Government assistance in the form of Government credit or Government subsidies. Such subsidies, either in cash or payment in kind, are provided to the exporter to enable him to offer certain of our products at competitive prices in the world market.

(b) Special export programs: Of total U.S. exports of \$4.5 billion in fiscal 1960, \$1.4 billion, or 31 percent, was financed through special programs, mostly under Public Law 480 and the Mutual Security Act. For this \$1.4 billion we did not get dollars in return. Some of it was sold for inconvertible currencies, and some of it was in the form of grants. The local currencies acquired by the United States from these transactions is expendable only in the country of issue and only in ways authorized by U.S. law and agreed to between the United States and the foreign government concerned.

The various special programs that went to make up this \$1.4 billion total in fiscal 1960 are as follows:

1. Foreign currency sales under title I of Public Law 480: This is the largest of the special programs, accounting in fiscal 1960 for 18 percent of total U.S. farm exports. Sales agreements specify, among other things, what is to be done with the local currency proceeds. Most of these agreements are for no more than a year's duration although the agreement with India, signed on May 4, 1960, was for 4 years. By and large, these sales do not interfere with commercial exports of the United States or other countries.

2. Foreign currency sales under the Mutual Security Act: This act requires that a certain amount (currently \$175 million) of the MSA appropriation be used to buy U.S. farm surpluses and sell them to foreign countries for local currencies which are then used, by agreement, to further mutual security programs. In spite of precautions, a certain portion of these sales inevitably replace commercial U.S. exports.

In fiscal 1960, disposals under the Mutual Security Act accounted for 4 percent of total U.S. farm exports.

3. Emergency relief operations—title II of Public Law 480: These are not sales but grants or donations of CCC stocks to meet emergencies, such as famines or disasters, and to provide supplies for institutions and school lunch programs.

In fiscal 1960, these grants totaled 2 percent of total farm exports.

4. Donations—title III of Public Law 480: CCC stocks are donated to voluntary U.S. relief, welfare, or religious agencies operating abroad, or to intergovernmental relief organizations such as UNICEF, for feeding needy people in foreign lands. Shipments under these programs went to 92 countries last year.

In fiscal 1960, these shipments represented 2 percent of total farm exports.

5. Barter—title III of Public Law 480: Under the barter program the CCC swaps its stocks, acting through private traders, for the value equivalent in strategic materials for the U.S. stockpile, or for materials needed in offshore defense construction or military assistance. This program is heavily criticized, as the bartered farm products often interfere with regular dollar markets, and U.S. stockpiles of strategic materials have just about reached the limits of conceivable usefulness.

Total exchanges under this program in fiscal 1960 were 3 percent of all farm exports.

6. Long-term credit sales—title IV of Public Law 480: Under this provision the United States may sell farm surplus for dollars on a long-term credit basis with a period of up to 20 years for repayment. No sales have yet been made under this authority, which has existed for a year and a half.

*What is the volume of our exports under the special programs?*

In the 5-year period ending June 30, 1959, exports under these special programs accounted for 35 percent of our total farm exports; 1960 was the first year since 1956 that they fell below a third.

In terms of specific commodities, over the past 6 years ending June 30, 1959, these programs accounted for 75 percent of our total exports of wheat, 59 percent of our total exports of rice, 57 percent of our total exports of vegetable oils, and 36 percent of our total exports of feed grains and 35 percent of our exports of cotton.

#### Where are our exports going?

Dollar exports: In 1958-59 eight countries took three-fourths of our dollar exports. These countries were: United Kingdom, Canada, Belgium-Luxembourg, West Germany, Netherlands, Japan, Venezuela, and Cuba.

Latin America, in that year, got \$417 million, or about 17 percent of our dollar exports; Europe got \$1.2 billion or about half; all of Asia, including the Near East, \$450 million or about 19 percent; and all of Africa got the least, \$45 million, about 2 percent.

Special exports: Europe as a whole still takes about 40 percent of our special program exports, with Asia taking another 40 percent and Latin America and Africa together taking only a little better than 10 percent. The big recipients in Europe are Spain, Yugoslavia, Italy, Poland, and France. In Asia they are India, Korea, Pakistan, and Taiwan.

*What is being done with the local currency proceeds under the special programs?*

The CCC is reimbursed in dollars by congressional appropriations for the value of the commodities sold for local currencies, plus the value of shipping costs. Under Public Law 480, the local currency received from sales is placed in a U.S. account in the foreign country to be disbursed in accord-

ance with the agreements. Various agencies of the U.S. Government are responsible for various kinds of expenditure; the Department of Defense for military purchases, the ICA and DLF for loans to the local government, etc. The Bureau of the Budget has to approve any use of these funds for U.S. agencies' expenditures—such as embassies, etc. Local currencies collected under the MSA Act—a small percentage of the total—are handled differently, as counterpart funds.

Out of \$3.5 billion worth of local currencies collected under Public Law 480 by April 1, 1960, only \$1.4 billion has been disbursed. Collections, of course, run well behind shipments. Total shipments on that date were \$4.8 billion.

The two major uses of the local currencies are economic development loans to the foreign country and military procurement.

As of April 1, 1960, \$293 million of local currency proceeds had been allocated to military procurement for the common defense, mostly in the countries of Korea, Pakistan, and Turkey, with Taiwan a poor fourth. To this should be added \$115 million for the housing of military families overseas. On the same date, \$741 million of local currencies had been disbursed to foreign governments under loan agreements for economic development. The ICA administers these loan agreements.

Of this \$741 million, the Far East got \$112 million; the Near East and south Asia, \$234 million; Europe, \$275 million; Latin America, \$120 million; Africa, nothing. The biggest country recipients—all over \$50 million—were Japan, India, Israel, Italy, Spain, Yugoslavia, and Brazil.

The largest share of these disbursements (\$315 million) goes for development of industry and mining, including sizable disbursements in Yugoslavia, Israel and India for power generation and distribution. Agricultural development projects, including irrigation, account for \$171 million. Health and sanitation purposes claim the smallest amount, \$10.8 million, and educational purposes claim little more—\$15 million—with substantial expenditures for education only in Yugoslavia and Spain. Transportation, community development and miscellaneous purposes account for the rest, \$230 million.

Other purposes for which the local currencies are used account for relatively minor sums. They are (1) activities for developing export markets for U.S. agriculture, \$27 million; (2) purchases of goods for other friendly countries—three-way deals—\$54 million; (3) grants for economic development purposes, \$68 million (in five countries only—Ceylon, Greece, India, Pakistan, and Yugoslavia); (4) loans to private businesses, mostly American firms, \$66 million. (All figures as of April 1, 1960.) The balance is used for the payment of the expenses of U.S. agencies abroad, and the CCC is reimbursed from the appropriations of the agency concerned.

*Things that can be done now by administrative action under existing law to improve the program*

I. Change in conception and philosophy: The conception, the philosophy, and the nomenclature of "surplus disposal"—disposal of unwanted food, feed, and fiber—to this day underlies and permeates U.S. legislation and the outlook and activities of the Department of Agriculture, imposing limitations upon full use of our agricultural capacity to meet human need, as well as conscious or subconscious feelings of guilt and frustration upon the Government, and, indeed, all Americans. It is of fundamental importance to work toward a national food policy which recognizes the following:

Food, to satisfy hunger, and fiber, to clothe the needy, are the most elementary neces-

sities, without which man is incapable of moving on to higher forms of satisfaction and fulfillment.

U.S. agricultural productive capacity is the Nation's most precious treasure, the result of favorable climate, the industry of our farmers, the achievements of our science and technology. The production of food and fiber is what we do best in the world.

It is the aim of the United States to put this agricultural capacity to the fullest use to meet human need, and promote human advancement and development, both at home and abroad.

In adopting this conception, we will be concerned about nutrition and the fact that we are not producing enough of certain agricultural commodities (oils and fats, meats, butter, nonfat milk, soybeans, peas, etc.) as are needed to sustain adequate diets either for our needy in the United States or for the needy abroad.

To realize the aim of the United States, as stated above, and at the same time secure a fair return to the farmer, it will be necessary to bring about shifts in production from wheat and corn into the oils and fats and protein foods needed for a nutritional diet.

II. Increasing the food available to the needy in the United States: Any consideration of "Food for Peace" must be prefaced with the emphatic statement that all steps possible should be taken to improve and extend the feeding and clothing of the needy in the United States, for law, justice, and public opinion give these clear priority.

The special task force named by President-elect Kennedy to draw up a program of action to assist people in economically distressed areas of the United States has recommended, in part I, section 1, of its report, certain specific actions. Virtually all of these things may be done by administrative action under existing law, although in some cases new interpretation of the law may be required. We urge that these recommendations be implemented without delay.

III. Increasing the use of food for peace abroad:

1. Shipment under long-term loans, repayable in dollars over 20 years with low interest rate:

The 86th Congress added in the summer of 1959 a new title IV to Public Law 480 authorizing such loans (in addition to local currency sales under title I and grants under titles II and III). Not a single agreement has been concluded under this provision owing chiefly to two things:

(a) The Bureau of the Budget has refused to authorize the Department of Agriculture to seek from Congress reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for funds committed long term under title IV even though requests for reimbursement are invited in the law itself. This being the case, loans under title IV would only tie up and reduce CCC funds for 20 years.

(b) The National Advisory Council has looked with disfavor on long-term loans on consumer goods and obstructs such loans on agricultural commodities under title IV.

It is not certain how eager foreign countries are or would be to contract dollar loans under title IV; but inasmuch as there are in some countries mounting objections to further local currency purchases under title I and grants under title II, it could be that operations under title IV would become important if obstructions were removed.

It is recommended, in connection with the revision and extension of Public Law 480 which must occur this year, that title IV be amended to extend the repayment period to 40 years, specify an interest rate of 2 percent, and to accept payment in dollars, goods, or services.

2. Food in direct payment for labor on public works or economic development projects: Economic experts have long urged that surplus foods be granted to the governments of underdeveloped countries for direct payment in kind to labor working on dams, roads, ports, and other public works projects contributing to the development of these countries.

The 86th Congress authorized this in the summer of 1959 as an amendment to Public Law 480, but it remains a dead letter for several reasons:

(a) The provision was limited in point of time, and expires on June 30, 1961. This time limitation makes operations under the provision unattractive to some governments who are understandably reluctant to embark upon programs of doubtful continuation. Assurances that the new administration will seek removal of this time limitation might encourage expanded operations at once. Removal of the time limitation in subsequent legislation could very well result in an enormously useful program.

(b) The administration has issued instructions to the field, regarding the use of this provision, which were so stringent and constricting as to assure its nonuse. New instructions to the field are necessary.

(c) Under the law the International Cooperation Administration may not use its dollar funds in connection with public works projects, although it may sell some food or fiber for local currency to acquire simple tools and implements. This should be changed in a revision of Public Law 480.

(d) Apparently no effort has been made by our Government to combine food payments under this provision with economic development projects financed by the Development Loan Fund, or the International Development Association. Some effort and coordination here might produce spectacular results.

(e) What is needed here is strong top-level encouragement, dedicated enthusiastic people down the line, and proper Government organization and coordination.

3. Government-to-government food grants for school lunch programs: Such programs have been enormously successful in Italy and Japan (these are being "phased out"), Tunisia, and (through CARE) in Egypt, yielding not only great human benefits but political benefits as well. The International Cooperation Administration has declined to extend these programs to other countries on the following grounds:

(a) The minimum requirements for school lunch programs are bread and nonfat milk. Cheese, soybean oil, dried peas, and the like are, of course, desirable additions, and any one of them might in case of necessity substitute for nonfat milk. Under existing agricultural policies we are not certain that any of these commodities except wheat (for bread) will be in official surplus and available. Even a continuous surplus of nonfat milk is uncertain. There is, therefore, a legitimate reluctance to initiate programs without being certain of being able to follow through on them. This obstacle to expansion of the school lunch programs abroad can, of course, be removed by policies and arrangements which will assure sufficient quantities of the necessary commodities on the shelf to supply the prospective needs.

(b) Another obstacle is the fear that countries aided in school lunch programs will take them for granted as a permanent handout without effort to take them over and continue them with their own resources. The administration has declined to initiate programs without hard and fast phaseout arrangements. Phaseout and takeover arrangements are ultimately important, but they have been given such undue emphasis by the administration as to stunt the program. There is no question that the school

lunch program could be expanded with great human and political benefits. Here, again, top-level directives and enthusiastic, competent, dedicated staff down the line are the essence of the problem.

(NOTE.—It should be emphasized here that both with regard to the school lunch program and the public works program (see 2, above), there is considerable opportunity for the proposed Youth Peace Corps. Simple problems such as steady delivery or operating simple machinery, mixing powdered milk or opening cans or assuring sanitation on school sites assume enormous significance in many backward countries. A Youth Peace Corps might be exceedingly useful.)

4. Expanding the operations of the voluntary agencies: Simply through administrative action the relief and welfare programs carried on in foreign countries could be considerably expanded. These operations are at present greatly restricted by phaseout and other requirements. At the present time 20 U.S. voluntary agencies plus UNICEF and the U.N. Relief and Works Administration distribute foodstuffs in 99 countries and dependent areas. Largest distributors are Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. These 22 agencies have handled nearly 2 billion pounds of foodstuffs per year with a dollar value of nearly \$200 million. This could be increased substantially with simple changes in regulations. It is estimated the agencies could handle in the neighborhood of 5 billion pounds per year by relaxing the phaseout restrictions laid down by the Francis committee.

These food programs yield enormous returns not only in strong and healthy bodies but also in friendship for the United States.

5. National food reserves: In 1957, Senator HUMPHREY introduced a resolution into the 1957 session of the United Nations General Assembly, calling for international cooperation to help food-deficit countries establish and maintain national food reserves and to build the necessary storage facilities, and it was passed. Since then, however, the administration has made no move to provide U.S. action which is essential to implement it.

It is generally recognized that because of lack of foreign exchange the food deficit countries most in need are unable to build national food reserves from purchases, and that if these are to be established, it will have to be done by means of food grants from the surplus producing countries.

There are, of course, many advantages to minimum national food reserves in chronically food deficit countries (especially India, Pakistan, Korea, Turkey, Egypt, and Brazil). Without reserves, markets in these countries are frequently upset by the operations of speculators who drive up prices mercilessly, causing great hardship and starvation. Also, in case of famine or other disaster, there are great delays in bringing in relief stocks from thousands of miles away.

From the point of view of the United States it would be of advantage to help food deficit countries create and maintain national food reserves because of the high storage charges in the United States. Grants for national food reserves would, of course, be largely a one-shot operation, but it might help at once to relieve the storage position and reduce storage costs in the United States.

There is no specific provision in Public Law 480 for grants to foreign countries for the purpose of building up national food reserves. Nevertheless, the President possesses adequate authority under existing law to help a number of countries make a good start toward building adequate food reserves. Subsequently it will be desirable to acquire specific authority in a revision of Public Law 480.

#### New legislation required

1. Immediate: Immediate additional authorization is needed for local currency sales of surplus agricultural products during the calendar year 1961 under title I of Public Law 480, and these funds should be requested independently of the thorough revision of Public Law 480 which should be requested of Congress later in the session.

The last extension of Public Law 480 authorized \$1.5 billion a year for title I sales for the two calendar years 1960 and 1961. The program has moved along rapidly, however, and of the total authorization only a small amount is now uncommitted. Remaining funds will be committed or in negotiation before the end of February, and unless additional authorization is enacted before that time, negotiation of some programs of substantial size will probably have to be delayed.

Secretary Benson has sent to Congress a request for an additional \$1.1 billion authorization for 1961. This figure, however, should be carefully reconsidered; it may very well be too small to accommodate transactions even now in prospect, much less those which might appear as a consequence of new administration. Upon evidence available, it appears the supplementary figure should be at least \$2 billion for the remainder of calendar 1961.

2. Some time during the current session of Congress: Public Law 480 will necessarily come before the Congress for extension at the current session. Some of its most important financial authorizations (including that under title I) expire on December 31, 1961. A thorough revision of Public Law 480 to transform it from a surplus disposal act to a food-for-peace act is recommended. The revised Public Law 480 should make provision, among other things, for the following:

(a) A new statement of purpose which will transform what is now a surplus disposal act into a food-for-peace act designed to use American agricultural capacity to the fullest practicable extent to meet human need the world over and to promote world economic development.

(b) Centralized coordination and direction of the food-for-peace program.

(c) Authorization for a 5-year program. This is imperative if we are to have an effective food-for-peace program. Foreign governments must know several years in advance what they can count on from us if they are to plan ahead their own economic development; and it is also imperative if the United States is to bring about the necessary shifts in domestic production so it will have the right kinds of stocks on its shelves to meet the needs of the program.

(d) Authorization for title I sales at the rate of \$3 billion a year. During the calendar years 1960 and 1961 title I sales are running at the rate of between \$2 and \$2.5 billion per year, and there are considerable potentialities for expansion.

(e) Authorization of emergency assistance under title II, through grants of surplus agricultural commodities, over a period of 5 years, at a rate not exceeding \$500 million a year, to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other emergency relief requirements. Authorization should also be added to make grants of such commodities to assist friendly nations in establishing, expanding, or carrying out programs for the relief of chronic hunger and malnutrition.

(f) Title IV should be revised to extend the repayment period for long-term supply contracts to 40 years, and the interest rate should be specified as not exceeding 2 percent per year, repayment to be accepted in dollars, goods or services.

(g) Grants of surplus agricultural commodities over a period of 5 years to help food deficit countries, under agreements, build up and maintain minimum national

food reserves (in accordance with the U.S.-sponsored resolution adopted by the United Nations on February 20, 1957).

(h) The negotiation of agreements with friendly countries to establish in such countries binational, nonprofit foundations to foster and promote research, education, health and public welfare, and to grant to such foundations unexpended local currencies which accrue to the United States as repayments of principal or payment of interest on local currency loans heretofore made by the United States under Public Law 480 or made hereafter under the Food for Peace Act.

(i) General authorization to the President, without restriction, to use or dispose of foreign inconvertible local currencies accruing to the United States under Public Law 480 operations in order to accomplish the following:

1. Maximum savings in U.S. dollar expenditures abroad;

2. Maximum practicable support of programs in foreign countries agreed to by the United States; and

3. Full support of the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

The steady accumulation of large amounts of inconvertible foreign currencies is placing great and increasing burdens upon U.S. foreign relations and holds potentialities which are highly dangerous. The numerous restrictions imposed by Congress upon the use or disposition of these currencies prevents their most effective use either for saving dollar exchange or for promoting U.S. objectives abroad. A number of highly competent surveys of the problem of local currencies have been made in recent years, and they all reached the conclusion that great executive latitude is required. It is important for the Government, the Congress, and the American people to recognize that these local currencies are assets that are usable only in the countries of issue, with the agreement of the countries of issue; that they are not substitutes for dollars; and that they should not be subjected to the appropriations process.

#### U.S. policy toward food distribution by the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization

The U.S. delegation to the United Nations submitted a resolution to the General Assembly in the fall of 1960, subsequently passed, which (1) requires the FAO to consider methods by which present programs for moving surplus food can be improved, and (2) calls on the FAO to study what new techniques can be developed to add to the uses of surpluses. The FAO findings and recommendations are to be reported to the United Nations Economic and Social Council in June 1961.

The FAO Council has already taken action to gather a small group of independent experts to assist in the task, to arrange for consultations with other groups, and has established an Advisory Committee of 13 FAO member nations, including the United States, to advise the Director General on his report to ECOSOC. This group of independent experts is to meet in late January of this year, and the Advisory Committee in late March or early April.

The United States, having initiated this activity, has no policy. It is necessary to develop one without delay.

There are two possibilities: (1) to make the FAO merely a clearinghouse with regard both to surpluses and the needs of other countries, or (2) to launch the FAO on a positive action program in certain countries, such as the Congo, where bilateral operations are difficult or impossible.

#### The Clearinghouse Approach

Under the clearinghouse approach, FAO would become a focal point for (1) advising recipient countries of the different pro-

grams under which commodities are available from recipient countries, (2) helping recipient countries frame program requests, (3) advising supplying countries of changes needed in program policies or operations to make them more effective, (4) a continuing analysis of surplus availability and needs and (5) supplying technical assistance to recipient countries with respect to transportation, storage, and distribution problems. One of the major considerations in the activity would be to insure that special programs did not encroach on established commercial trade. This is purely an advisory function.

#### The Positive Action Approach

Supplying countries would notify the FAO of the amounts and kinds of commodities they were prepared to deliver for stated forward periods. These stocks would remain in supplying countries under their control. Recipient countries having emergency food needs resulting from such events as crop failures, earthquakes, civil disturbances, or having severe, chronic malnutrition problems, and preferring to deal with a multilateral system, would apply to FAO. Agreements would be negotiated between the FAO and the recipient countries, and would include such terms as commodities, amounts, delivery schedules, and so forth. FAO would match these needs against supply commitments and decide which supplying country or countries should fill the needs. Upon order from FAO, the supplying country would be responsible for shipping commodities to the recipient country. Thus the supplying country would not only donate the commodities, but would pay costs of transportation. The commodities would be donated free of charge to recipients. FAO would provide supervision and end-use checks in the receiving countries. Other supplying countries would be invited to commit supplies for use under this program, but participation by other countries should not necessarily be a condition for the United States supporting the FAO approach.

At an early date the United States could make known that it is prepared to furnish a fixed amount of commodities, for example, \$100 million worth for a 3-year forward period. Commodities which the United States could make available regularly during this period would include wheat, wheat flour, corn, cornmeal, and intermittently, depending upon CCC inventory conditions, nonfat dry milk, butter, cheese, rice and vegetable oils.

These operations would be the responsibility of a new commission within FAO. The commission would require staff help in Rome and in the field. The head of the commission would report only to the Director General on high policy matters. The Director General and the Commissioner would be advised by an advisory committee of FAO member countries representing both supplying and receiving countries.

The FAO approach would supplement present food distribution efforts. It would give a relatively simple action role to FAO which, if handled successfully, can be supplemented with other activities at a later date. Third, it would not lay down a cost share rule for other supplying countries. The surest way to kill any FAO action role is to fix a percentage contribution required of other countries of the world.

We strongly recommend that the United States support in the United Nations the positive action approach to food distribution through the Food and Agriculture Organization.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Our recommendations are of two kinds: First, those having to do with changes in policy, administration, and legislation to improve the existing programs, most of which are explored at length in the body of our

report; and, second, those suggesting additional measures to support and enlarge the food-for-peace concept in a national and international context.

#### I

1. Change policy emphasis from surplus disposal to world food needs: The present food-for-peace program remains, in its basic philosophy, a program for the disposal of unwanted U.S. surpluses. Consequently, the achievements of the food-for-peace program have been obscured and its possibilities have not been fully exploited. A new approach is needed—an approach which will emphasize that two-thirds of the world population is suffering from inadequate diet, malnutrition, and in some cases from outright starvation; that the United States is the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in world history; that adequate diet is essential to the prompt stabilization of new governments and new nations and a necessary foundation stone for their future economic development; in short, that America's agricultural productivity properly used is of basic importance to our whole foreign policy.

Such a new approach will not only help to solve the problem of our present surpluses but also will demonstrate that in many foodstuffs, particularly proteins, we have deficits rather than surpluses.

The most important single recommendation of our committee is that our Government should make this deliberate change in the emphasis and direction of our food-for-peace program. Inevitably this will require adjustment in production and marketing policies. Ultimately, however, such adjustments may well have the effect of expanding commercial markets overseas for a wider range of American agricultural products.

2. Improvements in the administration of food-for-peace programs: We recommend the following administrative measures to increase the outflow of agricultural products under the food-for-peace program. These measures can be undertaken without additional legislative authority or without changes in existing authority.

(a) The Government should utilize the authority vested in it by title IV of Public Law 480, adopted in 1959, authorizing transfers of surplus agricultural commodities under long-term loans repayable in dollars with low interest rates for periods up to 20 years. Present obstacles to the exercise of this authority should be overcome, and the program should be initiated as soon as possible.

(b) The Government should exercise the authority conferred by an amendment to Public Law 480 in 1959 to make grants of surplus commodities to underdeveloped countries for direct payment in kind to labor engaged on public works projects within the countries. This authority has hitherto not been exercised. It might very well stimulate, through the use of our food, major improvements in the local countries such as dams, roads, and ports, which would contribute materially to their economic growth.

(c) The Government should extend school lunch programs overseas. The feeding of school children at their schools is one of the most efficient ways to supplement inadequate diets and to improve health in the underdeveloped countries.

(d) The Government should help establish minimum national food reserves in countries suffering from chronic food shortage, as recommended by the United Nations General Assembly. Even in the absence of authority to provide food on a grant basis for the establishment of food reserves, much can be done under existing authority to help create such reserves.

3. Expanding the operations of the voluntary agencies: American voluntary agencies have played a great part in the distribution of agricultural commodities overseas. The

Government should remove all unnecessary obstacles to their operations. In particular:

(a) The Government should make firm supply commitments to the voluntary agencies for longer time periods.

(b) The Government should modify present restrictions requiring programs to be planned so that they will terminate in a specific and limited period of time. In areas of the greatest need "phase out" restrictions are a handicap to setting up and carrying on useful programs.

(c) The Government should process certain agricultural commodities to permit their more efficient use by the voluntary agencies. Particularly, we would recommend the processing of soybeans to provide fats and oils for voluntary distribution, and the processing of cotton into textiles for use as sheets, pillowcases, and other items in hospitals and charitable institutions overseas.

Furthermore, open market purchases should be made where necessary in support of voluntary programs.

4. Legislative measures: We recommend the following legislative measures:

(a) Immediate authorization of at least \$2 billion for the balance of calendar 1961 under title I of Public Law 480.

(b) Public Law 480 should be extended for a 5-year period. It will expire, at least in its most important provisions, on December 31, 1961. Total authorization under title I of the extended act should be at least \$3 billion a year instead of the present \$1.5, and under title II, \$500 million a year.

(c) Public Law 480 should be revised not only to include larger authorizations, but to improve the concept and the administration of the program. In particular, the bill should expand the loan authority to permit 40-year loans for the purchase of agricultural commodities; it should provide specific authority to grant agricultural commodities to establish national food reserves; and it should confer authority to create binational foundations for the use of local currencies in health, educational, and other activities; and it should contain full authorization to the President, without restriction, to use, manage, and dispose of local currencies accumulating under the program in order to save dollars and make the fullest contribution to the foreign policies of the United States.

5. Food distribution through the U.N.: We recommend that the United States seek the establishment under the FAO of a food-distribution agency to operate in areas where bilateral approaches are difficult or impossible. Such an agency could draw supplies from surplus countries and direct them to deficit areas. It should not, of course, duplicate or interfere with satisfactory national operations in the field. At the outset, its concern would be primarily with areas which are particularly the responsibility of the United Nations, such as the Congo. Later on its activities might be expanded to fill any obvious gaps in the nation-to-nation programs.

In addition, the FAO should continue to expand its present function as a clearinghouse for statistical information of food needs and food surpluses.

6. The food-for-peace director: The food-for-peace program necessarily involves both the Agriculture Department and the State Department, the former being responsible for the food supply and the latter for international relationships. It would be unwise, in our opinion, to attempt to place entire responsibility for the food-for-peace program in either of these two major departments. In addition to State and Agriculture, other departments and agencies are involved in the program, including the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department.

To insure that the program functions vigorously, therefore, it is necessary to have

a central point of responsibility and initiative. We are pleased to note that the President-elect has recognized this in the appointment of a Food for Peace Director. In our opinion this officer should continue to be responsible to the President and serve as his principal adviser and agent in connection with the food-for-peace program. The Food for Peace Director should be responsible for establishing policies, for determining the requirements in overseas areas for food and fiber under the program, for expediting the fulfilling of these requirements, for coordinating the operations of the program, for collecting and publishing information and data on the program, and for reporting on it to the President. The Food for Peace Director should have sufficient staff to carry out these functions, and direct access to the President when required.

It will be appropriate to consider the re-allocation of statutory powers and authorities only after some experience of the program under the new Director. At the present time we are not prepared to make recommendations on the rearrangement of statutory powers and responsibilities.

## II

1. National Advisory Committee on Food for Peace: We recommend that the President appoint a National Advisory Committee on Food for Peace. This would be a committee of citizens representing the major voluntary organizations in the areas of education, overseas distribution and technical assistance, labor, religion, business, agriculture, and the cooperative movement. It would be the function of this committee to review the program from time to time, to make recommendations of policy to the President, and to enlarge public understanding of the importance of the program.

2. World Food Conference: There is great need for world education and world understanding of nutritional needs and food production problems. It is particularly important that the newly developing areas do not neglect the agricultural side of their economic programs and at the same time that they lift their sights on the nutritional levels of their countries. Furthermore, systems of emergency feeding and distribution to the needy are rudimentary or nonexistent in many countries, and local voluntary organizations need to be created or motivated to take part in these activities.

To stimulate a great international effort in this whole area of food, fibers and nutrition, we recommend that a world food conference be called, bringing together from each participating country not only government representation but also delegates from farm cooperatives and voluntary distribution organizations. This conference might be called by the FAO, and in any case it should be held under its leadership. The initiative for calling such conference might well come from the President.

3. Food-for-peace missions—Africa: We recommend that special missions be sent to a number of countries and regions to explore with governments in these areas the possibility of raising nutritional standards through the use of our agricultural products, expanding their own agricultural production, and improving food distribution. In our opinion, much is to be gained through well-staffed, high-level intergovernmental surveys of this character. A few areas might well be chosen as pilot areas.

In particular, the food needs of Africa, which seem to have been neglected under the current food-for-peace program, demand immediate attention. In India, where a massive food-for-peace program has already been set on foot, a survey of nutritional needs might be useful for forward planning.

Such missions should have their commission and instructions from the President.

They might well be selected and organized by the Food for Peace Director, and include prominent American citizens not in Government, as well as appropriate governmental officials.

## THE COST OF LIVING AND FACTORY EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Pay Buys Less Than in 1955," written by Bernard D. Nossiter, staff reporter, and published in the Washington Post of January 28, 1961, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The article indicates that factory workers with jobs ended 1960 worse off than in 1955 as living costs inched up to another peak last month.

Not only are we burdened with the increasing and very difficult problem of unemployment, to which President Kennedy in his economic message has made such graphic reference, but we are also burdened with the rising cost of living, which, despite wage increases, has continued to increase. The wage increases have failed to keep pace with the rising cost of living, so that the average American worker finds himself a little less better off than he was in 1955.

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

### PAY BUYS LESS THAN IN 1955

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Even factory workers with jobs ended 1960 worse off than in 1955 as living costs inched up to another peak last month. The Labor Department reported yesterday that 4 percent had been sliced over the year from the buying power of the average worker's paycheck.

A combination of steadily rising prices and the business slump are the basic reasons, although snowstorms made the December picture even bleaker.

But more disturbing is the trend over 5 years in the affluent society. Here's what has happened to the purchasing power of weekly take-home or after-tax pay for a married factory worker with two children (the totals are expressed in dollars of the same buying strength that money had during 1947-49):

December 1955	-----	\$63.64
December 1956	-----	64.86
December 1957	-----	61.89
December 1958	-----	64.35
December 1959	-----	65.74
December 1960	-----	63.02

So, the employed workers' pay bought less last month than in any recent year except slump-ridden 1957.

### CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

Normally, the figure rises from November to December because overtime increases, but it fell 14 cents last month. The storms played some part. But so did the latest recession which has brought the heaviest layoffs in the higher paid steel, auto and machinery industries.

The 5-year pattern raises some new questions about the structure of the economy. Some experts think that the repeated slumps and weak recoveries—another way of talking about slow economic growth—can be traced to a lack of demand or buying power from the great mass of consumers. While the figures for factory pay are far from conclusive, they strengthen this argument.

If the plight of factory workers is typical of wage earners generally—the biggest por-

tion of the population—then, this argument goes, the Nation's incomes are badly distributed. Relatively bigger pay increases are needed in the middle and lower brackets to buy the goods that an expanding industry can produce. This theory suggests that idle plants and idle men are the result of an inadequate demand for the Nation's potential output.

### TEN DOLLARS BUYS LESS

As for living costs or consumer prices in December, they behaved about as they have all year. They rose one-tenth of 1 percent above November, largely because of higher meat and housing costs.

The Labor Department's index has edged upward in 10 of the last 11 months and now stands at 127.5. This means a middle-income city dweller pays \$12.75 for goods and services that cost \$10 between 1947 and 1949.

The November to December rise will lift the pay of about 150,000 aircraft, metal, and trucking workers 1 and 2 cents an hour. Their contracts have escalation clauses that tie wages to changes in the index.

### CLIMB UNINTERRUPTED

Last month's prices averaged 1.6 percent above December a year ago. For 1960 as a whole, living costs rose 1.5 percent or a little less than the annual rise over the past 5 years.

But the climb has been uninterrupted. The buying power of the 10-dollar bill of 1955 was trimmed to \$9.05 last year.

In 1960, every major sector of the cost index rose except transportation. Lower auto prices held this component down. The biggest advances, as usual, were in medical care. The climbing costs of hospital insurance outstripped the bigger fees charged by doctors and dentists. Drug prices, under attack by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee began edging down in recent months.

### AMMUNITION FOR KENNEDY

The bigger gains in hospital insurance will provide ammunition for proponents of President Kennedy's medical care plan.

The recession, as usual, has had no effect in lowering living costs. Since the business high point in May, consumer prices have risen at a yearly pace of nearly 2 percent. Food is higher. So are services, the wide-ranging category that includes haircuts, rents and utility prices. While price tags on some hard goods have been trimmed, commodities as a whole have gone up, too.

### DISTRICT ABOVE AVERAGE

In the Washington area, the Labor Department counted food prices only last month. They rose four-tenths of 1 percent from November or twice as much as the national average. From December a year ago, local food was 3 percent more expensive or in line with costs across the country.

Last month housewives here paid more for chicken, beef, veal, eggs, flour, tomatoes, potatoes, and bananas. Oranges were cheaper and so were chocolate bars because those with a sweet tooth got more candy for the same price.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE BURNS CREEK PROJECT IN THE UPPER SNAKE RIVER VALLEY, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as certified by Idaho's Secretary of State, the Honorable Arnold Williams, did on February 1, 1961, approve House Joint Memorial No. 2, petitioning the Congress and the President of the United States to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Burns Creek

project in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and to implement such authorization with necessary appropriations.

My esteemed colleague, the Honorable HENRY DWORSHAK, the senior Senator from the State of Idaho, and I have introduced at this session of the Congress, S. 66, a bill to authorize the construction of the Burns Creek project.

Mr. President, concurring in the expressed sentiments of the resolution, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the multiple-purpose use of the water resources of the Snake River has become the backbone of the economy of Idaho during the past more than 50 years, the Pallsades Reservoir and powerplant, which is located on the upper Snake River near the eastern boundary of Idaho, being the most recent addition to this multiple-purpose use; and

Whereas at the time of and ever since the planning of the Pallsades project it was and has generally been recognized by the Federal Power Commission and other Government departments, as well as by many persons and groups interested in the development of the resources of this State, that the maximum benefits to the Nation and to the State of Idaho in terms of power production and water storage for irrigation purposes will be attainable from the Pallsades project only through the construction of a reregulating dam downstream to link irrigation storage releases with the powerplant of the Pallsades project, and the Burns Creek project was designed for integration operationally and financially with the Pallsades project in order to attain the maximum of complementary benefits from both projects; and

Whereas there is urgent need in the State of Idaho for greater power production and increased reservoir capacity for the storage of water for irrigation purposes; and

Whereas the Burns Creek project was determined to be feasible by the Secretary of the Interior in his report, dated February 26, 1957, and both the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget reported favorably on legislation to authorize this project by letters directed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the 85th Congress, which committee reported favorably on the bill (S. 2757) in the 85th Congress which would have authorized the construction of the Burns Creek project, and recommended that it do pass: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, to proceed with all due speed to enact legislation similar to Senate bill 2757 of the 85th Congress authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and to implement such authorization with necessary appropriations; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified

copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

#### JOHN A. CARVER, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF INTERIOR FOR PUBLIC LAND RESOURCES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am very proud of my former administrative assistant, John A. Carver, Jr., who has been appointed Assistant Secretary of Interior for Public Land Resources in the Kennedy administration.

I think one of the finest accolades afforded Mr. Carver resulting from his appointment was an editorial in the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, one of the outstanding newspapers of the West.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### JOHN CARVER'S WASHINGTON APPOINTMENT

Idaho and the Pacific Northwest are fortunate indeed in the appointment yesterday of John A. Carver, Jr., of Boise, as Assistant Secretary of Interior for Land Resources in the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

As administrative assistant to Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, Carver has won a fine reputation in congressional circles since he went to Washington, D.C., just 4 years ago. CHURCH has been one of the most spectacularly endowed freshman Senators to arrive on the Washington scene in many sessions. His oratorical skill, quick grasp of complex issues and persuasive personality made his youth an asset rather than a liability in the age-conscious, seniority-bound Senate. CHURCH impressed his fellow Senators quickly with some excellent speeches on major issues—Hells Canyon Dam and statehood for Alaska, for example—and zoomed to assignments on key senatorial committees which are prized by Senate veterans.

Naturally, the administrative assistant of such a remarkably successful senatorial newcomer would be eyed closely by the major participants in Federal policymaking. An administrative assistant, to be sure, does not transform his boss into an outstanding Senator. However, the complexities and pressures of modern political life dictate that any senatorial office must function as a team operation if it is to function well. The administrative assistant who does his job capably is a figure to be reckoned with in Washington politics, and the practitioners of politics know it.

They quickly learned that Carver was one of the assistants who did his job superbly. A thorough student of government, a keen observer of politics, and a dynamic, forward-pushing advocate of political action, Carver quickly became one of the outstanding senatorial assistants in Washington. His own talents for effective government were sharpened rather quickly by contact with one of the best of the Capital's administrative assistants, Irving Hoff, aid for many years to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington. Carver and Hoff became good friends and close political associates, and Hoff was an outstanding tutor in the ways of Washington.

It is not surprising then that the driving, dedicated Kennedy team, searching everywhere for the talent, energy, and zest for government which are essential to a successful administration, should select this vigorous

young Idahoan to supervise the land resources agencies and programs within the Interior Department.

The assignment will not win much public notice, perhaps, because Carver will function in the background, with the next Secretary of the Interior, Representative Stewart Udall, Democrat, of Arizona, heading the entire operation. But Carver will have an important voice in such Interior Department areas as grazing and Indian affairs, for example.

Obviously this will be a voice, whether publicly raised or carefully modulated behind the curtain of public affairs, which will be of tremendous importance to Idaho and the Pacific Northwest. The region should be grateful that an able, intelligent, and dedicated Idahoan has been chosen for this vital role in the next administration.

#### ACHIEVEMENTS OF ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just learned that the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, our 17th nuclear-powered submarine, has successfully completed its first sea trials. It is the fifth nuclear-powered submarine capable of launching Polaris missiles and with the *George Washington*, *Patrick Henry*, *Robert E. Lee*, and *Theodore Roosevelt*, will provide a powerful, moving, virtually undetectable deterrent against attack.

These nuclear-powered submarines, which are the backbone of our Polaris-firing fleet, owe their present success, in large measure, to the efforts of one man, one dedicated and determined naval officer who first appreciated their significance many years ago. I am referring to Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

Admiral Rickover's achievements were officially recognized by the Navy in January when he was awarded the Navy's highest peacetime award, the Distinguished Service Cross. Now, as twice in the past, rumors are flying to the effect that the Navy is planning to retire Vice Admiral Rickover. I sincerely hope that these rumors are mistaken. I sincerely hope that the Navy can and will keep Admiral Rickover in a position where he can continue to contribute his great talents and abilities to the strengthening of American security. In this time of national crisis, we cannot afford to dispense with the services of Hyman G. Rickover for any reason whatsoever.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Secretary of the Navy and I believe all possible steps should be taken to see that Admiral Rickover is retained in the U.S. Navy. The scheduled increase in production of missile-bearing nuclear-powered submarines make the services of Admiral Rickover more necessary than ever for our country's strength.

#### THE NEED TO STUDY CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on January 26 I cosponsored and commented on two conflict-of-interest bills which have been referred to the Judiciary Committee. It is my impression that a great many people would like to see the Congress revise and update our conflict-of-interest statutes and seriously study ways in which to apply similar

statutes to the Members of the Congress. We cannot have a double standard in national ethics.

The recent confirmation of the nominations which President Kennedy submitted to the Congress raised a number of questions about the severity and impact of the conflict of interest statutes which now apply to the executive branch. This would be an appropriate time to review this entire matter and at the same time carefully study the ways in which to implement new conflict of interest statutes to apply to Members of Congress and employees of the legislative branch.

The New York City Bar Association has done a significant amount of research in this area and has presented a number of proposals which would be of interest to the committee. A great many other groups and interested individuals have developed ideas and programs which would be well worth our study.

Mr. President, last month, the Washington Post commented editorially on the need to undertake such hearings. Their editorial has just been called to my attention. It is an excellent and thoughtful statement on the need to revise and restructure our executive conflict-of-interest statutes. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### THE PRICE OF SERVICE

The Senate Armed Services Committee has taken the only obvious course open to it under the law in requiring incoming high Defense Department officials to give up all financial interest in firms doing business with the Department. The law has been interpreted to require divestiture even though the interest may be small and the connection remote between said business and the official's duties. The holding of 10 shares in an electric company that sells power to some remote airbase, or a share in almost any paper clip company are, we take it, verboten. The law was thus applied to Mr. Eisenhower's Secretaries and could hardly be softened by a mere committee consent.

So vast and varied are the operations of the Defense Department that there is hardly any important industrial investment opportunity that is not foreclosed under this interpretation of the law. The statute is nearly a century old but, on its face, remains as fair and necessary as any simple rule in this field can be. The effect today, however, is to demand wholly outrageous sacrifices for an opportunity to serve.

The several ways suggested in the hearings by which the law's effect could be softened without compromising its basic intent ought now to have the fresh and sympathetic attention of Congress. And while they are at it, Members might well look to their own favored legal position in this respect. They could more gracefully exact these tributes to purity from others if they themselves had to make at least some formal accounting of potential conflicts.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR— SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the only international trade fair scheduled annually in the United States west of Chicago is celebrating its 10th anniversary in Seattle, Wash., April 20-30, 1961.

It is the oldest international trade fair in the United States.

This is the Washington State International Trade Fair, a nonprofit organization supported by the State of Washington, by ports of entry in our State, and by business and labor organizations in our area.

Through its first 9 years our trade fair has been a display of products and a cultural exchange between all the nations of the Pacific rim. It has grown constantly larger and more effective and this year is expanding to include European and African nations for the first time.

Our trade fair is a meeting place for buyers and sellers. It includes a merchandising clinic where American business methods are fully explained and demonstrated to our visitors' satisfaction. It is a place where lasting associations are formed for mutual profit and friendship.

This annual international gathering on the shores of Puget Sound is a reminder that we are all neighbors in the modern world.

The personnel who come from Europe to our trade fair arrive in 10½ hours and American store buyers, representing 43 million Americans reach Seattle by jet in less than 2 hours.

Thus, buyers and sellers from all over the world meet in Seattle as quickly as they met only a few years ago, at a county seat.

We invite all of you to our trade fair to see the remarkable displays and to meet with our friends and business associates from all over the world.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business in the morning hour, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business, Calendar No. 28, S. 153.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, S. 153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 153) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Arkansas desires to discuss the reorganization bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is nothing new in the proposed legislation. The bill would simply extend the

Reorganization Act, in all of its terms and provisions, identically as it is at present. It would extend until June 1963, the time for the President to exercise the authority and powers which the present act confers upon him.

In times past, in the course of the development of the present law, controversies have arisen with respect to its provisions, its limitations, the authority it grants, and the veto power of Congress with respect to reorganization plans. The conflicting views, however, over the past dozen years, have finally been resolved. Each side has made some concessions. The result is that the statute now, in my opinion, adequately preserves the integrity of the legislative process, and, at the same time, confers upon the President the power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. No agency of the executive branch of the Government is now exempt from that authority. This was not true in the original acts passed by Congress.

So far as I know, there is no objection to the bill or to the statute in its present form.

The power to reorganize has been given to past Presidents; certainly the same authority should be accorded to President Kennedy and the new administration. I therefore trust the bill as reported by the committee will pass.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in his statement relating to this proposal. The President and the new administration need the new reorganization authority, as did the preceding administrations. As the Senator has so well stated, we in the Committee on Government Operations believe, as a result of the many times this legislation has been before Congress, that the so-called wrinkles have been ironed out; that we have been able to arrive at a working relationship between the two Houses of Congress and the executive branch, so that all possible authority that is required for an effective reorganization is granted, while at the same time the legislative branch has not abrogated its responsibility in the field of legislative action.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is true. No one has received everything he wants in the proposed legislation; but I do not believe there is anything really at issue now which is fundamental to either side. I believe the bill provides adequate power for the President, in all areas of the executive branch of the Government, to submit reorganization plans, even to the extent of establishing new departments of government. That was an issue at one time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At one time there were as many as 21 different agencies. That situation simply limited the President's field of operations to such a point that it was almost ineffective. In my judgment, the bill in its present form contains adequate safeguards for Congress and adequate, broad author-

ity for the President to accomplish the results desired.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. President Eisenhower was fully aware of the need for authority of this kind, because of the ponderous nature of government and the growing complications and functions of government year after year. As a matter of fact, the question of reorganization and the extension of the act on a permanent basis were matters for leadership discussion. I made some endeavor in the last Congress to secure the consideration of the President's bill for a permanent Reorganization Act.

I have no objection to the extension of the act for a 2-year period, but I want the record to be abundantly clear that the previous administration was fully aware of the need for the reorganization authority and endeavored to secure its enactment; but, tragically enough, we failed. I am grateful, therefore to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for bringing the bill before the Senate at an early date in the new session, because I think what is sought is necessary. The reorganization of the Government is a continuing process, one which must be carried on almost constantly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader. There are different views with respect to whether the act should be made permanent. As we proceed each 2 years to reevaluate and renew the authority and to extend the act further, we may all conclude later that the authority should be made permanent and, therefore, not be subject to review each 2 years by Congress.

The fact that today the Senate can consider a bill without any change in the last statute enacted is indicative that if reorganization powers are needed continuously, now that the issues have been resolved, hereafter we might well consider making the authority permanent, though I am not making an unreserved committal at the moment. However, I think it has been well that we did not make it permanent in the beginning, because in the processes of reviewing the act at intervals, we have so improved it that now I believe it is a pretty good law. The fundamental considerations of the executive branch and of Congress are pretty well protected.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that what the Senator from Arkansas says generally about the law and the objectives of the law is all right. The law deals, I know, with the whole executive establishment, but there are some agencies which are the arms of Congress, so established by law. In other words, they report to Congress. It is true that we allow the Executive to make the appointments to the agencies. Most of the nominations come for consideration before the Committee on Interstate and

Foreign Commerce, of which I am the chairman. Those agencies include the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, among others. In the basic law creating those agencies, which is very clear in its implication, they were intended to be creatures of Congress, to do certain work which Congress intended they should do. Congress could not spell out, for instance, the type of power license to be issued. We created the Federal Power Commission and said, "Let the Commission act for Congress and hold hearings and make the decisions."

Such agencies come under the executive branch of the Government only insofar as the President may appoint its members. Congress placed the appointive power with the President. The nominations of the commissioners are confirmed by Congress.

I have no objection to what the Senator from Arkansas or the administration is trying to do with respect to the reorganization of some of the agencies. I suppose no one has been more critical of the so-called independent agencies in the administration than I have. However, many of the agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, have had more work thrust upon them.

No one has been more critical of the independent agencies than I have been or my committee has been, and they have done some things which, in some cases, have required amendments to the law. We have submitted some proposed amendments. In other cases, the agencies weave around themselves a web from which they do not seem to be able to extricate themselves administratively. Sometimes there is a question of the sufficiency of personnel.

In addition, sometimes the number of the members of such a commission is at issue. I am not critical of individual commissioners; but it has been suggested that the Interstate Commerce Commission might be less unwieldy if, instead of having 11 members, it had 4, 5, or even 3 members.

It has been suggested, at the other extreme, that there be a director, and also a board of appeals, in case some persons did not like action which had been taken, and wished to appeal.

It is true, as was pointed out by the Landis report and by our committees during the last 5 or 6 years, that the average case before one of these agencies takes 15 or 16 months, and sometimes takes even years. The result of such delay is that the barn door may be locked after the horse has been stolen. In addition, many small firms, such as trucking concerns, cannot afford to have adequate representation before these agencies in Washington.

I believe that the members of these agencies individually do very fine work; but the collective situation is a bad one.

So the purposes of Senate bill 153 are good. However, we must remember that these agencies are arms of Congress.

Let me point out to the Senator from Arkansas that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has juris-

diction over these agencies, which have been created chiefly in the field of transportation, interstate commerce, communications, railroads, buslines, pipelines, and so forth. Suppose the President sends to Congress a plan calling for reorganization of the Interstate Commerce Commission, let us say. Our committee has responsibility for that agency, and reports to the Senate the nominations of the members of the Commission, and makes recommendations regarding the action to be taken by the Senate on the nominations. Our committee is also constantly concerned with any necessary changes in the laws relating to the Commission. In other words, all that responsibility rests with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If such a message were sent to Congress, it would be referred to the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]; and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would have nothing to say about the proposed reorganization, despite the fact that, actually, we believe such a reorganization should be made.

I refer to the practicalities of this situation and the responsibilities of the standing Senate committees in regard to these matters. In particular, I refer to the responsibility of our committee, because the situation as regards these agencies is unusual, inasmuch as they are arms of Congress. Is our committee to be abolished? Are we to be allowed to have anything to say about plans to reorganize these agencies? It is true that we have an opportunity to testify before the Government Operations Committee, and the Senator from Arkansas would be most generous in that respect. But this situation is one which we confront from day to day in regard to measures which relate to activities in interstate and foreign commerce, which are the responsibility of our committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is actually referring to the rules of the Senate. I have no authority to make any committal which would contravene the rules of the Senate.

My own view is that there would never be any objection by me, as a Member of the Senate, to having the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter concerned study such a plan and also make its recommendations.

But it is my understanding that—as the rules now provide—when a reorganization plan is sent to Congress, it is referred to the Committee on Government Operations; but in order to have any action taken on the plan, a resolution of disapproval must be submitted. Any Senator can submit it, as I understand. In other words, if no such resolution is submitted and voted on, the plan will go into effect. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So if such a reorganization plan came to the Congress, if the Senator from Washington decided that his committee wished to investigate and consider and hold hearings on the plan, the committee could proceed by means of authorizing the chairman of

the committee to submit a resolution of disapproval, and that resolution would be referred to the Committee on Government Operations; and before that committee, the Senator from Washington could be heard. But there would never be any objection on my part to having any committee which had legislative jurisdiction of the subject matter also consider it. However, of course, I cannot change the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that. But I am trying to work out some satisfactory arrangement, because this matter is a peculiar one. Our standing committees have jurisdiction over various fields. For instance, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has jurisdiction over that field, although the Executive has authority to determine the policies of the Department of Agriculture and to appoint the Secretary of Agriculture.

On the other hand, our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce handles five independent regulatory agencies which are arms of the Congress; and those agencies report to the Congress, not to the Executive. So that places a somewhat different responsibility on our committee.

Personally, it is satisfactory to me to have the Committee on Government Operations take over this responsibility; and if that were done, it would save me a great deal of work.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But I am not seeking additional work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, I am not speaking for the committee.

The other day, in the Committee on Rules and Administration, we discussed this matter, and I was almost tempted to say that all of us might as well resign, and then attempt to be appointed to membership on the Committee of Government Operations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would not object to that—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Neither would I because the committee has an excellent chairman.

But the various standing committees have responsibility for the agencies to which such reorganizations relate.

Suppose there came to the Congress a message which called for reorganization of the Federal Power Commission or the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee which works with those agencies and has to pass on the laws and the policies which affect them would then have nothing to say about such a reorganization, except as that committee might report to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The standing committee which has legislative authority in that field might report a resolution of disapproval.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the committee would have to appear before the Committee on Government Operations, just as any other witness would, in order to discuss the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course the chairman of that committee and its other members would be welcome to appear before the Government Operations Committee. But, in my judgment, there is nothing to prevent the Committee on In-

terstate and Foreign Commerce, which has legislative jurisdiction, from immediately taking up any such reorganization plan which might be submitted; and that committee could consider a resolution of disapproval and could hold hearings on it, before it reported it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Our committee could consider such a resolution and could hold all the hearings on it that it wished to, but could not vote on it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, it could be voted on by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and if our committee did not act on it within 10 days, that committee could submit a resolution to discharge our committee from further consideration of the resolution.

I understand what the Senator from Washington is referring to. However, so far as the rules of the Senate are concerned, I am powerless to make to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce some committal that I would have no authority to initiate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It seems to me this matter is not at all insoluble. First of all, if a majority of the Senate disagreed with a reorganization plan, the plan would be dead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under the leadership of the Senator from Washington, held hearings on a plan which related to reorganization of one of the regulatory agencies which come within the jurisdiction of that committee, and if the committee subsequently expressed its disapproval of the proposed reorganization—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or its approval.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, either one. If it expressed its approval, that would have great effect in assuring all other Senators that the plan was satisfactory, because that committee is much more expert in regard to matters which relate to the entire area of the regulatory agencies.

If the committee expressed its disapproval, and then reported to the Senate a resolution of disapproval, certainly that would have its effect on the thinking of the other Members of the Senate. Indeed, I venture to say that such a resolution of disapproval by the Senator's committee would carry with it a majority vote in this body, because of the high regard which all Members of the Senate have for that committee, as well as for the other committees. We generally go along with the recommendations made by our committees, because they have their specific assignments.

But, under the rules, the Senator from Arkansas would be required to hold some hearings on all reorganization plans if resolutions of disapproval were entered. However, this does not prevent other committees from holding hearings on exactly the same subject.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This would be the procedure: If it were desired to have adopted a resolution of disapproval, that

committee would then report to the Senate that resolution, but it would then be referred to the Committee on Government Operations. However, as the distinguished acting majority leader has said, there would certainly be quite an influence in this body if a committee sponsored a resolution of disapproval. I think the Senator from Minnesota will vouch for the statement that I am not as enthusiastic about some of the reorganization plans as are some of my colleagues, and some of the members of my committee. I have opposed as many of them as I have supported, particularly those that became controversial. I have not gone overboard. However, there is involved a rules problem that I cannot resolve for the Senator; but I will cooperate with his committee, and every committee in Congress that has legislative jurisdiction, with respect to getting their sentiments and getting their views, and giving them every opportunity for study.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas would do that. The only reason why I raised the point was that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for example, has jurisdiction over matters relating to the Commerce Department. When it is suggested that we would have no reason to examine the reorganization plan of the President referring to an executive department, I point out that, in the narrow field of these particular agencies, they are arms of the Congress by the basic laws which established them; and that becomes a little different matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator. I would be very jealous about wanting to know what the effect and impact of these reorganization plans would be. In some areas, sometimes it might be better to deal with the matters by legislation, rather than by reorganization plans. There have been some reorganization plans in the past when I felt reorganization was not the proper approach; that a legislative approach was needed, where there would be an opportunity for amendment, change, and modification, as we discussed and studied the problem, because a reorganization plan, as Senators know, is not subject to amendment. Sometimes I think we defeated one or two on the floor of the Senate when we felt the matter could be dealt with better by legislation than by a reorganization plan, or where the reorganization plan simply went too far, and did something we felt it should not do. The proponents came back with another reorganization plan. I think that occurred in one or two instances. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With reference to the so-called Landis report, and there have been others that were similar, I agree with the objectives, because, surely, we need to do something about the independent agencies; but they are arms of Congress. There are a lot of "Hill" lawyers who try to tell us the situation is different, but they are not correct. I think no responsible person looking at the history of the basic legislation establishing these agencies will doubt that they are arms of Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that he is to be commended for discussing the matter at this time. I think he is performing a real service. All I can say is that I cannot go beyond the rules, but I can assure the Senator that he will have every cooperation from the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations to see that his rights are protected, to the end that reorganization plans do not go beyond what they are supposed to, or fail to meet responsibilities that they should meet.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the Senator from Washington that if anybody feels the Senate may not have an opportunity to pass on any reorganization plan, there is the right to discharge a committee from consideration of a specific matter, and we have the right to exercise that power. So at no point does it get beyond the control of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; and once the matter gets on the calendar, it is privileged, and can be brought up at any time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was my pleasure and honor to serve under the distinguished Senator from Arkansas at the time the reorganization bill was put into effect in 1949. As one who voted with the Senator and helped to consider the matter when it originally became law, it was my hope that eventually these powers would come back to Congress, and we would not be surrendering the power of reorganization indefinitely.

It has been my impression in recent years that all the reorganizations that have been accomplished by reorganization plans could have been accomplished by means of legislation, if needed. I speak only for myself, but what I fear, in this regard, is that over a period of time Congress shall have surrendered this power, and it shall never repose with us again. The President may come to feel that Congress need not be consulted, or that it is not within the power of Congress to regulate both executive and independent agencies. However, if the President cared to follow that procedure, it would be simple as an infringement of the executive prerogatives, for some of us to oppose a reorganization plan that we thought might not be wise.

I hope the Senator will consider, both as chairman of a committee and as a Member of this body, that these powers should, perhaps after the end of 2 years, at least reside in the Congress for a while. Congress has been willing to cooperate with the Executive. I believe that, whenever a reorganization proposal has had merit, Congress has granted it to the President by means of reorganization, just as it would by not interposing an objection to a reorganization plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may point out that right now it is back in the hands of Congress. Congress can extend this power, grant it again, or withhold it.

I believe it expired in June 1959. It has been in the Congress since that time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say I think it is a very healthful situation that it comes back to the Congress from time to time, and, if there is no real necessity for passing reorganization bills, that it stay in the Congress. I would agree that a new administration, for a period of time, should have power to submit reorganization plans.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are those who feel, and they are conscientious about it, that the authority should be granted only for a certain period, that the power should come back to Congress every 2 or 3 years, so we can review it and see what has been done under the law, with the idea of amending existing statutes, or withholding the authority if it has not had good results. There is a difference of opinion as to whether reorganizations have had good results. I have seen some pass that I did not think were good. The resolution of disapproval was defeated over my protest. However, I cannot always be right, and out of the whole there has come some good, because it is difficult for Congress to process legislation in these fields. We all know that. The machinery is quite slow in these fields. But if presented, we have an opportunity to vote on the proposals. It does expedite matters, to say the least. I would not argue that expedition and efficiency and better organization always go hand in hand.

There have been instances in which reorganizations which were good in improving the economy and the efficiency of the Government have been effected.

Under the law the Congress will have the final say. The Congress can veto any proposal.

Originally, it took a concurrent resolution of both Houses to veto a reorganization plan. I always opposed that. I would oppose it now. Under the terms of the law one House of the Congress can, by a resolution of disapproval, prevent a reorganization plan from becoming law. That is the way it should be, in my judgment. I would not vote to relax that restraint on the part of the Congress. I think that power should be vested in the Congress. If one House votes to disapprove a reorganization plan, it cannot become law, exactly the same as the situation if one House disapproves a bill, which does not become law. That is the provision with regard to reorganization plans.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree thoroughly with what the chairman of the committee has said. This will not vacate permanently the power of the Congress. I was one who, in the committee, held the position that a 2-year extension was long enough. That would give us a chance to look at the matter again, which I think we should have. I think also that the Executive does have a responsibility to make suggestions of this kind.

With respect to the question raised by the Senator from Washington, I think the Senator can get some consolation

from the terms of the act itself, as the language appears on page 5 of the report. There is at least an implicit recognition of the point the Senator makes concerning agencies which are responsible to Congress and which are created as branches of the Congress.

Section 7 reads:

When used in this Act, the term "agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

That language certainly implies that those areas of executive activity which are in fact branches of the Congress are considered to be in some special classification as to which Congress has a special responsibility.

Speaking for the minority, I concur completely in the willingness expressed by the chairman of the committee to take any and every step necessary to see to it that the appropriate legislative committee does have an opportunity to hold hearings and does have an opportunity to make its recommendations. We are not trying to superimpose our judgment upon all the committees of the Congress. This is our responsibility. We have a right to make recommendations in respect to it. Certainly, the legislative committees which have responsibilities in areas such as those the Senator mentioned, I think not only should have the right but also have the duty to hold hearings and to make recommendations, pro or con.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me quite clear that the only agencies which are to be exempted from the operation of the law are the two mentioned in the act itself. All the other regulatory agencies, as to which the distinguished Senator from Washington expressed concern, are to be included within the purview of the law. Whether that is a wise course or not is another matter, but it seems to be very clear that the enumeration of the two in the act will exclude all the others.

It is quite apparent, from looking at the list of agencies which have been reorganized in the past, as shown on pages 8, 9, and 10 of the able report of the distinguished committee, that many of the agencies mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Washington, whose activities fall within the peculiar field of jurisdiction of the committee which he so ably heads, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have been reorganized in the past.

Those reorganizations have stood. I note that in at least one case, that of the

Federal Power Commission, a majority of the Senate, expressing its will upon the matter, did not approve the reorganization, but the majority was less than 49, then required by the terms of the law to be cast against any particular reorganization plan to stop it from becoming operative.

If the Senator from Florida is correctly advised, it would now require 50 or 51 affirmative votes to be cast against a particular program, or in favor of a resolution to disapprove a reorganization plan, in the Senate, to upset it. On that point is the Senator from Florida correctly advised?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is incorrectly advised on that. Under the present law it requires only a majority of those who are present and voting. The provision to which the Senator referred has been changed. That was the provision of the former act. The present act provides for only a majority vote.

I have always maintained that is the correct procedure. It maintains and preserves legislative integrity over these matters. The reorganization plan may not become law if a majority of either House opposes the plan. In that circumstance a plan should not go into effect, in my judgment.

That is the law as it is now written. I hope the provision will remain that way. So far as the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations is concerned, the law is going to stay that way. We do not wish to prevent the President from presenting his plans—whatever plans he has—but I do not wish to see the Congress abdicate its responsibility. I should like to preserve legislative integrity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator will find that provision on page 5 of the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the Senator for his insistence that a majority of the Members of the Senate participating in a session when a quorum is present certainly should have the right to disapprove a reorganization plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I fought for that provision for years, and we finally obtained it. The House has gone along with it now.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the distinguished Senator on that.

I should like to ask whether the Senator from Florida is correct in his understanding that all regulatory agencies are within the purview of the act in question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. They are.

Mr. HOLLAND. The only agencies excluded as being peculiarly a part of the legislative branch are the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. That is my interpretation of the language.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in expressing some reluctance to approve the proposal, since it runs that far. However, I recognize the fact that, with all the press of business

which is upon the Congress, some initiative has to be given to the Executive even in this field. I am willing to approve the proposal simply because the press of business is so great that I know the committees having jurisdiction over these matters cannot give them the careful attention they need.

I comfort myself with the fact that the Senator from Arkansas has insisted upon changing the older rule, so that now a majority of the Senate present and debating a measure can turn down any reorganization plan, regardless of what is the attitude of the other body.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. A majority of the other body, with a quorum present, considering the measure, can turn down a proposed reorganization plan regardless of what may have been the attitude of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

The proposal, as first adopted, was that it was necessary for both Houses to pass a concurrent resolution to veto a plan, and a number of agencies were exempted. The administrative branch of the Government kept insisting upon not placing the exemptions in the act, with the result that we finally were able to get an agreement that it took only a majority of the total membership of one House to veto a reorganization plan. Now we have it to the point that it is like any other legislative process; a majority of those who are present and voting can defeat a plan. That is the way it should be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend. There is one other matter in connection with this proposed legislation on which I should like to ask a question, so that he can state his opinion for the Record.

The Senator may recall that the Senator from Florida objected strenuously to the general terms of the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, because when that reorganization plan became effective, with certain very minor exceptions which were stated in the plan, the Secretary of Agriculture was given, until the end of time—unless the legislation is changed—the discretion, the right, and the authority to reorganize that important Department at any time and upon any basis, the entire scope of the operation being so broad as to make it difficult to think of anything which could not be done at the sole will of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The important question, in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], is that such reorganizations as may be submitted under the proposed legislation should be in sufficient detail in order to prevent the recurrence of legislation under which a *carte blanche* blank check would be given to the head of a department to reorganize in any way he sees fit all of the multiplicitous activities of his department.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, I can speak only for the Senator from Arkansas. One of the weaknesses in the reorganization program is that the reorganization plans submitted do not spell

out, as Congress would by statute, what we wish to do, and too frequently such reorganization plans are vague and leave a residue of power in the agency to do things that are not adequately spelled out.

Under the proposed plan we have the opportunity to disapprove, if a department submits vague plans, or plans that convey powers indefinitely to the head of the reorganized agency.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the intention of the distinguished chairman of the committee and all the members of his committee to require that reorganization plans be submitted in such detail as to advise Congress as to what is intended?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know that I shall be asked, but if I am asked by the executive branch of the Government, I shall certainly reply that it is very vital in my judgment to spell out such plans in detail. I know that the executive branch cannot spell out every little minor detail, but the plan ought to be so concise and explicit that we shall know what kind of law we are asked to pass. I believe there have been instances in which the plans were not so detailed, and I have opposed some of them. It is up to us to take care of whatever plans come to us in that way. That is all I can say.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for expressing the view that programs submitted under the authority of a bill, when it is passed and becomes law, should be explicit, and I join in that expression. I serve notice now that when reorganization plans come to the floor of the Senate which do not contain a reasonable degree of explicitness, the Senator from Florida will oppose them with all his vigor, because he does not think we should delegate to any President or to the head of any department such wide and unlimited powers as, for instance, were granted under the reorganization plan of the Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately that plan is still in force. I make that statement without intending any adverse comment as to the present Secretary of Agriculture. The Senator from Florida made a much stronger statement, as he recalls, upon the subject when the predecessor of the present Secretary of Agriculture was serving. In my judgment it is a question of not giving to any one man, no matter how wise, well informed and benevolent he may be, complete authority to undo and remake a very important agency of our Government at his discretion and almost at his whim. I do not think we can safely follow such a pattern. I do not propose to follow such a pattern if it is included within any reorganization plan. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I am hopeful, and I believe that the remarks in the Senate today on this subject may have some influence upon future actions taken. I hope they will, because it would never be a pleasure to me to oppose any reorganization plan sent to us by the President of the United States. I should only oppose such a plan from

a sense of duty, or because I am unable to resolve my doubts or differences about it.

Sometimes I think the members of the executive branch of the Government and those who prepare such plans have not given the thought and study to them that they should have received before they send them here. If adequate thought and study are devoted to such plans, I feel confident that in most instances the Congress will go along with the plan, and in that way we shall bring about some reorganizations that are needed, and we shall all be serving the best interests of our Government.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make this comment in order that the thoughts of the members of the committee may be more helpful to the executive branch. I feel very much as does my committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. When reorganization authority was first presented to us in 1949, I was one of those who felt that both Houses of Congress should have to register disapproval. But as we proceeded and saw the plans come down, both in the Truman administration and in the Eisenhower administration, I believe we came to the conclusion that Congress should exercise its legislative responsibilities as the present act indicates or prescribes, namely, that a majority of those present and voting in only one House of Congress is required to negate a reorganization plan on a resolution for disapproval.

I will say to the Senator from Florida that I, too, was concerned about the broad sweep of reorganization authority in not only the Department of Agriculture reorganization plan, but also in 1952 in the plan of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a result of the rejection of the plan of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1952, a more detailed plan, with more particulars—whether it was better or not may be questioned—was given to us in 1953. By the rejection of one plan the Congress set certain standards and guidelines for the acceptance of another reorganization plan. I hope that those in the executive branch who will be responsible for advising the President on matters of reorganization will read this record very carefully. I hope they will have in mind the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON], the comments of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the comments and observations of the chairman of the committee and, I hope, even my own comments, because while there were differences of opinion on reorganization authority at one time, as between the chairman of the committee of which I am a member, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from Minnesota, those differences were long ago resolved. I believe our committee, which spent months in the

study of reorganization plans, is pretty much of one mind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe we are unanimous, and I suggest that that kind of unanimity is worthy of careful consideration. But, as stated by the Senator from Arkansas, I should like to reserve any right of criticism or even of analysis until we see what is submitted to us. I think we ought to give the executive branch the authority requested, and that the executive branch should act within the spirit of the discussion we have had.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank Senators who have contributed to the discussion. I think we are all indebted to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for bringing to our attention his views, thereby providing a fuller discussion of the bill, of the authority, and what is to be hoped for.

In conclusion, I again express the hope that such plans as the President may send to us will be well thought out before they are submitted, and that they will contain a great deal of detail and be explicit as to what is proposed so that we shall understand what the results will be.

If that is done, I believe we can give the assurance that the Committee on Government Operations will undertake to analyze them and present a report to the Senate which will clearly define what the results of the legislation will be if approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 153) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 133z-3), as last amended by the Act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 611), is hereby further amended by striking out "June 1, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1963".*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### INTERIM REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF THE PIPEFITTERS AND PLUMBERS LOCAL 706, EL DORADO, ARK. (S. REPT. NO. 42)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, one of the investigations initiated by the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and continued by the staff of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations after the

select committee went out of existence, related to charges of improper activities of officers of local 706 located in El Dorado, Ark. This local is a member of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

The select committee had received numerous complaints from members of local 706 alleging that moneys collected from union members and others for the privilege of working on an \$82 million Federal arsenal project in Pine Bluff, Ark., during the period 1951-54 were not properly accounted for. It was further charged that officials of this local misused union funds; that large amounts were collected and mysteriously disappeared; and that they had rigged an election which involved members of local 706.

A hearing in executive session by the select committee was held on March 22, 1960. The select committee authorized me, as chairman, to make the proceedings and record of that hearing public at my discretion.

On August 10, 1960, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations authorized further hearings on this matter.

On August 16 and 17, 1960, additional testimony was taken in executive session. To eliminate the need for rehearing the testimony taken before the select committee on March 22, 1960, the previous testimony was made part of the record of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on August 16, 1960.

On September 23, 1960, the subcommittee voted to make public the executive testimony taken in August of 1960.

On August 17, 1960, when the subcommittee completed its hearings on this matter, I permitted counsel who represented certain officials of local 706 to read the complete record of the hearings and file, on behalf of his clients, any additional evidence he deemed pertinent to the inquiry. On October 2, 1960, additional testimony in the nature of affidavits was submitted to the subcommittee which was made a part of the official record of the hearings.

#### CONCLUSIONS

First. Before the Pine Bluff project got underway in 1951, representatives of local 155 in Pine Bluff, Ark.; local 706 in El Dorado, Ark.; and local 665 in Little Rock, Ark., entered into a joint venture agreement which Earl Griffin, financial secretary and treasurer of local 706, was to supervise, and, after expenses, divide the proceeds of the moneys collected on the Pine Bluff project equally among the three locals.

Second. For the privilege of working on the Pine Bluff job, those workers who came within the jurisdiction of local 706 and who worked in excess of 16 hours a week paid a \$3.50 weekly assessment to local 706, while those workers who worked in excess of 8 hours, but not more than 16, paid \$1.50 weekly assessment.

Third. Shortly after the project got underway, the United Association informed locals 665 and 155 that they did not have to pay any assessments to local

706. Earl Griffin, in direct violation of this directive, continued to collect assessments from all workers whether members of these or any other locals.

Fourth. Although Mr. Earl Griffin contends that moneys collected from the nonmembers of local 706 were voluntary contributions, the evidence before this subcommittee is contra and clearly shows that assessments were levied and collected from these workers under duress and under fear of loss of their jobs.

Fifth. Although these assessments continued, Earl Griffin did not share the proceeds with the other two locals in violation of the joint venture agreement.

Sixth. Even granting that some of these workers may have considered these assessments voluntary contributions, nevertheless it is conclusively established that these assessments as to many of the workers were not voluntarily paid, but were exacted from them as a price they had to pay for the privilege of working on this job. The collection of these assessments by Earl Griffin constituted violations of the legal provisions of—

(a) The international constitution of the United Association: Section 158 of the 1951-55 United Association's constitution prohibits the collection of "any monetary contribution for the privilege of working" from any member of the United Association who worked on the Pine Bluff job, but was not a member of local 706.

Section 153 of the same constitution applied to workers who were not affiliated with the United Association. Under this section, permits for work could not be issued to nonmembers of the association. This prohibits any collections from these nonmembers for the privilege of working. Mr. Earl Griffin denied that work permits were issued by this local union, but he did admit that workers came to the union office and received work referrals to go on the job. These work referrals which were issued by local 706 were in fact work permits and violated this section of the bylaws of the constitution:

(b) The Federal kickback statute: Title 18, section 874, of the United States Code, which is known as the Federal kickback statute, was violated when moneys were collected from workers on the Pine Bluff job in violation of the constitution of the United Association. The statute of limitations, which is 5 years, has run on this offense.

(c) Arkansas right-to-work law: Title 81, section 202, the right-to-work statute of the State of Arkansas, provides that no moneys shall be paid as a prerequisite to, or condition of, or continuance of employment. Under this statute, job assessments paid by nonmembers of local 706 must be supported by a written consent to prove that they are voluntary payments. No signed written consent was obtained by any of the foremen from any of the nonmembers of local 706 showing that such law was complied with. The statute of limitations, which is 3 years, has run on these offenses.

Seventh. Receipts: Mr. Earl Griffin issued instructions to his job steward

on the Pine Bluff job, Alfred "Red" Yocom, that only members of local 706 were to be furnished receipts when they made their weekly payments to local 706. The failure of Mr. Griffin to furnish receipts to nonmembers of local 706 and to obtain their written consent before collecting any moneys from them is indicative of the fact he was aware that forced assessments were being collected which he knew was violative of Federal and State statutes, as well as the constitution of his own union.

Eighth. Failure to keep proper records: The failure of Earl Griffin as financial secretary and treasurer of local 706 during this period to properly receipt and account for the moneys collected on the Pine Bluff job as specified in section 105 of the constitution of the United Association is evidenced not only by Mr. Griffin's failure to instruct Mr. Yocom to keep records of the moneys he collected on the job, but Mr. Griffin's failure to furnish Mr. Yocom with receipts when he received the moneys from him.

Ninth. The subcommittee staff was obstructed from the very beginning of its investigation into the Pine Bluff Arsenal project by the delaying tactics of both Earl and Ermon Griffin to produce certain financial records of local 706. After the subcommittee had sought these records for 11 months, Mr. Earl Griffin alleged when he appeared before the subcommittee that some of these records were found 1 hour before he left for Washington to testify.

Tenth. The records that Earl Griffin finally produced disclosed that all moneys collected on the Pine Bluff job, whether they be called voluntary or involuntary payments, had not been deposited and properly accounted for in the union's treasury.

Eleventh. Missing funds: Approximately \$111,444.22 of funds collected as assessments by Earl Griffin's local from workers on the Pine Bluff job has mysteriously disappeared. Of a total of \$214,976 collected from August 7, 1951, through June 20, 1953, only \$103,531.78 was deposited in the union joint-venture bank account. Mr. Griffin, the responsible agent for the collection of this money, has failed to produce any records and has failed to account for and explain what happened to this sum of \$111,444.42 which was collected.

Twelfth. Questionable expenditures: Earl and Ermon Griffin are guilty of extravagant and unnecessary expenditures of union funds from local 706 during the years 1952-58. The union collected during these years in excess of \$735,000 and expended in excess of \$631,000. As of August 17, 1960, less than \$10,000 remained in the treasury of local 706. Included in the expenditures were \$71,880 for the purchase of two airplanes, one of which it still operates.

Thirteenth. A number of questionable purchases were paid for by local 706. They included Christmas gifts and hunting and fishing equipment. Other items included duck stamps, rifles, pump guns, fishing rods and reels, a 14-foot boat and outboard motors, hunting pants and coats, and so forth. Although these ex-

penditures were approved by the local's finance committee, no breakdown was ever furnished to the general membership of the union.

Fourteenth. Rigging election: In December 1955, after Earl Griffin became an international representative of the United Association, with jurisdiction over pipelines in the Tulsa, Okla., area, he, along with his brother, Ermon Griffin, participated in the rigging of an election in local 798, located in Tulsa, Okla.

Fifteenth. Through the concerted efforts of these two union officials, the union books of some 40 members of local 706 were transferred into local 738, 11 days before the election. On December 11, 1955, these local 706 union members were transported from the union hall of local 706 in El Dorado, Ark., at the expense of local 706, to a polling place in Baton Rouge, La., one of the sites selected for the election of local 798, although the headquarters of the local are located in Tulsa, Okla. These men were instructed to vote for Jim Craddock, who was reelected business manager of local 798. After the election on December 31, 1955, the union books of these men were transferred back to the 706 local. It will be noted that these 40 votes comprise about 9 or 10 percent of the total votes cast.

Sixteenth. The members of local 706 who transferred into local 798 voted illegally in this election. The 1955 bylaws of the constitution of the United Association specify that in order to be eligible to vote in a local election the voter had to be a member of the local union for a period of 60 days before the election.

Seventeenth. In brief, the subcommittee concludes that both Earl and Ermon Griffin have breached their trust as union officials of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry. Earl Griffin has failed to account for approximately \$111,444.22 in assessments illegally collected from nonmembers of local 706 on the U.S. Government Pine Bluff, Ark., Arsenal project during the years 1951-53. The collection of such moneys was violative of the international constitution of the United Association, and constituted criminal violations of the Arkansas right-to-work law and the Federal antikickback statute. It is clear that men guilty of these practices should not be permitted to hold union office or be entrusted with union funds. The record of the hearings and subcommittee findings will be brought to the attention of the Internal Revenue Service, the law enforcement authorities, and other interested agencies of the Government. The record of these hearings has already been brought to the attention of the United Association. So far it has taken no action. The subcommittee feels that labor has an obligation to clean its own house. The United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry has a clear duty in this instance to deal effectively with this flagrant abuse of trust and responsibility. Failure of the responsible officials of the United Association to take appropriate action could only be

construed as condonation and approval. We are reluctant to believe that the officers of the United Association will refuse to take appropriate action.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the press release which I issued on the report.

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

**PRESS RELEASE FROM SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS**

The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations made public today its interim report on activities of Local 706, Steamfitters and Plumbers Union, El Dorado, Ark.

Executive hearings on this matter were held on March 22 and August 16 and 17, 1960, and were made public on September 23, 1960. The testimony disclosed that Earl Griffin, currently an international representative for the United Association of the Steamfitters and Plumbers Union and formerly the head of local 706, and his brother, Ermon Griffin, current secretary and treasurer of that local, have breached their trust as union officials of local 706.

The evidence clearly establishes that Earl Griffin has failed to account for more than \$100,000 of approximately \$214,000 in assessments collected from workers on the U.S. Government Pine Bluff, Ark., arsenal project during the years 1951-53. The collection of such money assessments from many hundreds of workers who were nonmembers of local 706 was violative of the International Constitution of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry and constituted criminal violations of the Arkansas right-to-work law and the Federal kickback statute.

Uncontroverted testimony was heard by the subcommittee which showed that Earl Griffin and his brother, Ermon, acting in concert participated in the rigging of an election in local 798, located in Tulsa, Okla., in December 1955.

Other testimony also disclosed that Earl and Ermon Griffin are guilty of extravagant and unnecessary expenditures of union funds from local 706 during the years 1952-58. The union collected during these years in excess of \$735,000 and expended in excess of \$631,000. Two years later, as of August 17, 1960, less than \$10,000 remained in the treasury of local 706.

Included in the expenditures were \$71,880.39 for the purchase of two airplanes, one of which it still operates. A number of questionable purchases were made by local 706. Among these purchases are included hunting and fishing equipment, duck stamps, rifles, pump guns, fishing rods and reels, a 14-foot boat and outboard motors, hunting pants and coats, etc.

The subcommittee in its report finds that these union officials who breached their fiduciary responsibility should not be permitted to hold union office or be entrusted with union funds. The record of the hearings and subcommittee findings will be brought to the attention of the Internal Revenue Service, the law enforcement authorities, and other interested agencies of the Government.

The record of these hearings has already been brought to the attention of the United Association. So far it has taken no action. The United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry has a clear duty in this instance to deal effectively with this flagrant abuse of trust and responsibility. Failure of responsi-

ble officials of the United Association to take appropriate action can only be construed as acquiescing in and condoning such improper conduct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

**NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AND CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I announce that when the Senate completes its business today, it will adjourn until noon on Thursday.

On Thursday we will proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 25 through 38, the so-called money resolutions relating to committees and subcommittees of the Senate. I should like to have all Senators on notice that on Thursday we will take up these resolutions, with the hope that we may be able to complete consideration of them on Thursday.

**MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES**

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPFEL] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASEL].

**EARLY ACTION ON PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE PROJECT WILL SAVE MONEY AS WELL AS BEACH AREA**

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, upon introduction of S. 4, the proposal to establish a National Seashore Recreation Area on Padre Island, I urged early action on the basis that this very worthwhile project will cost much less now than at some later date. Delay will not only mean additional cost, but in this case it will mean that more and more of the choice beach areas will be taken over by private interests and in many cases the public will be fenced away from the beaches.

Dr. Edward Higbee, distinguished professor of geography and agricultural economics at the University of Delaware, has written a highly informative book on population pressures on natural resources entitled, "The Squeeze."

Dr. Higbee warns:

In the past 50 years, while ocean frontage has increased in value 10,000 percent, American population has doubled from 90 to 180 million. Fifty years hence, if there is such a thing left as undeveloped seashore, perhaps \$500 a front foot might look like a steal. The ocean beach is one commodity which will not stretch. \* \* \* Congestion along the ocean's edge is unlike congestion anywhere else because time is fast running

out when something really effective can be done about it. \* \* \* The public appears doomed to fight a rearguard action from here on out.

Mr. President, in 1935 the National Park Service first urged that Padre Island, which is America's longest, southernmost natural beach, be preserved as a public recreation area. That effort failed. Since that time it is estimated that land values on the beach island have increased 800 percent. If the handful of private interests who oppose this project manage to delay it much longer, they may accomplish two things: they may continually build up the cost of the property to their own profit, and perhaps keep all of the choice beach areas for private use with only small, less desirable beaches being kept open to all of the people.

One of the major newspapers of Texas, the Corpus Christi Caller, has been a leader in the fight for Padre Island National Seashore. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "National Survey Supports Fast Action on Padre Plan," published in the January 25, 1961, edition of the Corpus Christi Caller.

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

**NATIONAL SURVEY SUPPORTS FAST ACTION ON PADRE PLAN**

There is a well-justified sense of urgency in the current effort to gain congressional approval, and State and local cooperation, for making the major part of Padre Island a national seashore area forever preserved for general public enjoyment.

The point against further delay was made in a story in the Caller recently which indicated that land values on Padre Island have increased 800 percent in the past quarter century. The case for urgency has been nationally documented in a book of population pressures on natural resources, "The Squeeze," by Dr. Edward Higbee, professor of geography and agricultural economics at the University of Delaware. Dr. Higbee makes this carefully researched estimate:

"In the past 50 years, while ocean frontage has increased in value 10,000 percent, the American population has doubled from 90 million to 180 million. Fifty years hence, if there is such a thing left as undeveloped seashore, perhaps \$500 a front foot might look like a steal. The ocean beach is one commodity which will not stretch."

Dr. Higbee's survey finds that only 24 miles (6½ percent) of the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts is now publicly owned, and more than half of that is in three reservations: Acadia National Park in Maine, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in North Carolina, and Everglades National Park in Florida. Only 295 miles of the Pacific Coast's 1,743 miles are in State and Federal reserves. And not all the publicly owned land is open to the general public. He concludes:

"Congestion along the ocean's edge is unlike congestion anywhere else because time is fast running out when something really effective can be done about it \* \* \* the public appears doomed to fight a rearguard action from here on out."

It was in 1935 that the National Park Service urged acquiring unspoiled seashores along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts as public recreation areas. Since then only Cape Hatteras has been so preserved. That opportunity for a Padre Island preserve was

missed, at great cost. If the current opportunity is missed, the cost of any future effort may easily prove prohibitive.

Dr. Higbee reports that the 18-year effort to acquire the Cape Hatteras seashore area has paid off by increasing summer visitors in 5 years from 100,000 to 348,000, hiking nearby private property values by 50 to 100 times, and bringing property tax receipts in that area higher than they were before the seashore area was removed from the rolls. This but further underlines the sense of urgency that the Padre Island project should stir.

#### TELECAST "HARVEST OF SHAME" UNFAIR TO FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on November 25, 1960, the Columbia Broadcasting System televised a program entitled "Harvest of Shame," which related to the migratory agricultural workers and their families. The transcript of this telecast was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1961, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER]. It appears at pages 1145 through 1150. The film covering the telecast was replayed, with sound, in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building on Monday, January 30, 1961.

This telecast is grossly unfair to both migrant agricultural workers and their employers. It presents migrant workers in a highly unfavorable light, and their employers as hardhearted exploiters of their labor. It is unfair not only to Florida agricultural employers and employees but also to those of other States in which agricultural migrants work. This includes the eastern seaboard from Florida north through New Jersey and New York, the Pacific coastal States of California, Oregon, and Washington, and other States.

Following the program, the Philip Morris Cigarette Co., which sponsored it, sent two of its executives, Robert W. Norris and James C. Bowling, to the Belle Glade, Fla., area to investigate the facts.

Because Florida was placed in the peculiarly invidious position of introducing the telecast at great length and of terminating the telecast at great length, these gentlemen naturally came to the vegetable-producing part of Florida to make their investigation for the Philip Morris Co.

Mr. Bowling stated that the network would not permit the sponsors to review the program in advance and that no one in the firm had any idea of its contents until the broadcast. Both Mr. Norris and Mr. Bowling said they were convinced, after visiting Florida areas where migrant labor was utilized, that the show was unfair; that it does not paint an accurate picture; and that they found in Florida "a dedicated people who have worked for years to improve the life of the migrants." At this point, Mr. President, I shall read into the RECORD an excerpt from a Tampa Tribune article, which is entitled "Cigarette Firm Bought Documentary Sight Unseen," and

which was written by Mr. Sam Mase, a highly reputable staff writer for the Tribune:

#### CRITICISM OF CBS FOR MIGRANT LABOR FILM IS JUSTIFIED, SAYS SPONSOR OF SHOW

(By Sam Mase)

Two top executives of Philip Morris, Inc., told the Tribune yesterday Floridians were justified in denouncing Columbia Broadcasting Co. for its production of "Harvest of Shame," a Philip Morris-sponsored television documentary on the problems of migrant farm laborers.

When citizens of Florida charged the TV show presented a distorted scene of migrant conditions in Florida, Joseph F. Cullmann III sent the two executives here to investigate conditions and report back to him.

They are: Robert W. Norris, director of personnel and community relations for the firm, and James C. Bowling, director of public relations.

#### CBS SHOW UNFAIR

Both men said they were convinced after visiting areas in the State where migrant labor is utilized that the CBS show was unfair to Florida because it failed to depict the great progress this State has made in behalf of migrants.

Norris and Bowling commended the Tribune for presenting an accurate account of the migrant situation in order to offset the adverse impression created by the television program.

Bowling said his firm bought the "Harvest of Shame" show in good faith that it would be an outstanding public service based on a true picture (good or bad) of the migrant story.

The public relations man said CBS would not permit sponsors to review its "CBS Reports" series in advance.

Speaking of the impression of Florida the documentary conveyed to a nationwide audience, Bowling said "the picture is not as black as portrayed."

#### DEDICATED PEOPLE

He said that on the contrary, he and Norris found in Florida "a dedicated people who have worked for years to improve life of the migrants."

The men noted that the film did not present efforts and progress of dedicated people who worked to improve conditions.

"We were impressed with the progress and feel it should have been shown (on the program)," Norris said.

Mr. President, the progress which Florida has made and is making in the field of migrant labor is shown by the following statements by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Migrant Labor, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. President, this morning I notified the office of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] that I intended to make this speech at this time, and I also notified the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], because they had had some part in the discussion of the telecast.

I was advised that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] was snowbound somewhere and could not be here. I do not know why the other two Senators are not present on the floor.

The first statement by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] was

made at a hearing in Fresno, Calif., on July 8, 1960, and is as follows:

I might say that Florida is probably the most enlightened State we have seen in the total picture of migrant State problems.

Again, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey said in an address in Boston on May 21, 1960:

In Florida, to even a greater degree than we had found in many other States, we found many people who do not believe in limiting their vision. They are concerned. They want to know what was happening in that shack seen from the highway. They are remembering the forgotten people. They believe that "any person can change," and they are working to bring about that change.

In his extension of remarks reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 27, 1960, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey said:

Mr. President, the migrant worker in the United States today often experiences hardship, danger, and exclusion as he travels from one State to another, from one crop to another, each year. In many parts of the Nation, however, he also experiences something more—community concern about the problems which face him and members of his family.

The Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor spent 3 days in southern Florida last week and there we saw evidence of this community concern in abundance.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to present some of the specific misrepresentations in the "Harvest of Shame" program which are so unfair to both migrant workers and their employers. Quotations are from the script, which I have personally read in full, and which already appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it was inserted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

#### MISREPRESENTATION NO. 1

Approximately 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant laborers, finishes grade school. Approximately, 1 of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma.

#### THE FACTS

If the producers had wanted to exercise any reasonable degree of care to present the truth, they could have easily found by questioning school authorities in Palm Beach County that there are a number of children of migrants in that one county alone who are college graduates. They would have learned of the following: Ollice Davis, coach and teacher at East Lake High School in Pahokee; Gerald Berk and Earlene King Hudson, teachers at Lake Shore High School in Belle Glade; Eugene Lincoln, teacher at Lincoln High School in Riviera Beach—his wife, Lavena Lincoln is a registered nurse at a West Palm Beach hospital—Willie Pifron, band instructor for several schools in the Lake Okeechobee area; Delois White, teacher at Okeechobee Elementary School; Helen Verence, Doris Harrell, and Julia Johnson, teachers at East Lake Elementary School in Pahokee; and Estelle Pifron, teacher at East Lake High School.

I am advised that all these college graduates were children of migrants or were migrants themselves, through high school, and that Eugene Lincoln, Gerald Berk, and Earlene King Hudson were migrant agricultural workers even during most or all of their college careers, joining the migrant stream during the summer months and returning to college in the fall.

Another prominent college graduate, who does not live in Florida, is the nationally known missionary, Mrs. Billie Davis, who is married to a minister and now lives in California.

These people do not fit into the film's insulting inference that migrant workers are so exploited that they cannot and do not make educational progress. These are well educated and useful citizens who are a credit to their State and Nation and to the type of workers from which they came.

With reference to the percentage of migrants who graduate from high school, the records at Lake Shore High School in Belle Glade show that over 30 percent of the graduates during the last 5 years have been migrant children; of that number, over 20 percent have attended college or have graduated. To be specific the number of migrant children so graduating was 65 and the number of such graduates who have attended college is 15.

Mr. President, I am indebted to Mrs. Ruth S. Wedgworth, of Belle Glade, Fla., for her assistance in checking and re-checking these facts—which I have read into the RECORD as facts—on the educational progress of migrant workers. She is a well-educated, longtime resident of the Belle Glade area; and for a number of years she has been one of the leaders in the economic, cultural, and governmental progress of the area.

I may say that Mrs. Wedgworth is the widow of a gentleman, who a few years ago was a very distinguished member of the experiment station staff at Belle Glade. Mrs. Wedgworth has led in all kinds of worthwhile, progressive civic activities in her area and in her State.

#### MISREPRESENTATION NO. 2

I quote from the telecast:

People have been killed purely because there is no interstate standard with regard to safety.

The reference was to travel by migrant workers.

The facts are as follows: A statute enacted in 1956 authorized the ICC to regulate interstate transportation of workers by motor vehicle. Pursuant thereto, the ICC issued comprehensive regulations which have been in effect for several years.

#### MISREPRESENTATION NO. 3

Again I quote from the text of the transcript and of the motion picture:

SECOND HAWKER. Over here—70 cents a day. We're paying today. . . .

MURROW. . . . The hawkers are chanting the going piece rate at the various fields. This is the way the humans who harvest the food for the best fed people in the world get hired.

The facts are these: This is not the way most of such people are hired. Less than 50 percent of the migrants engaged in harvest farm work are hired through this procedure known as day haul.

This is sometimes a necessary means of employing workers, where a farmer needs them only a few days. The U.S. Employment Service, cooperating with State employment services, has promoted this means of employing farm labor in many areas, including the State of Florida.

In fact, the Department of Labor requires farmers to cooperate in day haul programs, wherever they are feasible, as a condition of eligibility for interstate recruitment of domestic workers and/or the employment of Mexican Nationals. If this is a "slave" labor practice, it is one that has been promoted for many years by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The network denies that there was any inference that the "70 cents a day"—and I have quoted those words from the telecast—means that this is the total earnings of a worker for a day's work. It is true that the commentator did say "The hawkers are chanting the going piece rate at the various fields." However, there would be few viewers who would understand the meaning of the term "piece rate." All would understand the expression "70 cents a day" to mean that is the total earnings of a worker for a day's work.

The inference that a dollar or less a day is the usual income of such workers is further discussed in connection with the next misrepresentation.

#### MISREPRESENTATION NO. 4

Mr. LOWE (interviewer). How much did you earn?

Mrs. KING. A dollar.

The inference was that Mrs. King earned \$1 for picking beans from 6 a.m. to 3:30 or 4 p.m.

The facts are these: The prevailing base—minimum—rate for picking beans in the area is 60 cents a hamper. Most workers have little difficulty picking two hampers or more an hour. Good bean pickers can pick 20 bushels per day, for which they are paid 60 to 75 cents, and sometimes as high as 90 cents per bushel. If Mrs. King earned only a dollar for a day's work, she either was not working very hard or she was in a very unusual situation. Perhaps she felt that in view of her husband's employment and income—and in a moment I shall refer to that—there was no real necessity of pressing for a substantial income that day.

#### MISREPRESENTATION NO. 5

Mr. LOWE. How many children do you have?

Mrs. KING. Fourteen.

The inference was that Mrs. King must support 14 children on a dollar a day.

The facts are these: Mrs. King has seven children living and seven who are dead, two having been stillborn. Lest it be alleged that these deceased children were the victims of inadequate medical care, due to the financial plight of this family, the record shows—and I

quote from the public record—that in 1958, the county welfare agency in West Palm Beach paid \$943.80 to St. Mary's Hospital for the care of Katherine King, still living; and, additionally, over \$1,000 in hospital and medical bills has been written off by the local hospital and doctors at Belle Glade, in connection with medical treatment afforded the King family over the last several years.

Mr. President, this is a peculiarly interesting addition to the facts. Mrs. King's husband, Will King, has been a permanent seasonal employee at a sugar mill near Belle Glade since 1956, when he started at \$66 a week. He works there 4 or 5 months each year, and now receives a salary of \$83.50 per week. His employer provides him life insurance, workmen's compensation coverage, and Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage, free of charge.

By deliberately leaving out these facts, Mr. President, the telecast created a wrong impression.

#### MISREPRESENTATION NO. 6

Here the reference is to Florida. This part of the program occurred toward its end:

MURROW. . . . The Sunshine State welcomes them back: Homestead, Immokalee, Pahokee, Belle Glade and hundreds of other communities. This is home. New housing is available. The rent, \$15 per room, per week.

The facts are these: An exhaustive survey by those who are directly concerned in the Homestead, Immokalee, Pahokee and Belle Glade area, indicates that ordinarily housing for migrants rents for a maximum of \$7 per week for a one-room apartment, and \$12.50 paid for apartments consisting of living room, bedroom, kitchen, and bath. In the latter instance, the living room may also be used for sleeping purposes. There may be rare instances of housing for migrants renting as high as \$15 per room per week. If so, those who conducted the survey were unable to find it. If it does, in fact, exist, it is highly unusual—not the usual case, as indicated by the script. When it is considered that this housing is subjected to terrific abuse at the hands of the tenants, who occupy it seasonally for brief periods, the cost of housing is considered to be relatively low.

Incidentally, Mr. President—and the film was silent on this point—Florida has a State law regulating the safety and sanitation of migrant labor camps. Under it, the State board of health prescribes minimum standards relating to construction, sanitary conditions, light, air, safety, protection from fire hazards, equipment, maintenance and operations of camps, and other matters necessary to protect the life and health of occupants. Based upon these standards, the board of health licenses migrant labor camps; and it has the authority to revoke licenses of those who do not meet these standards.

#### MISREPRESENTATION NO. 7

LOWE. Mrs. Doby, wouldn't you ever care to have a house of your own?

Mrs. DOBY. I'd like to have a house that—we plan to buy one if we could ever get enough to pay down on one, we'd buy one.

LOWE. Do you think this will ever happen? Mrs. DOBY. Well, it don't seem like it.

Mr. President, let us see what the facts are.

After this program, Harvey Poole, a Belle Glade Negro leader, compiled a list of migrants who, since 1952, have moved out of migratory-housing quarters into homes of their own in the Belle Glade area alone. He reports that there are approximately 100 families on his list. This contradicts the inference in the film that there is almost no hope for migrants ever to own homes of their own.

I would be trespassing upon the Senate's time, Mr. President, if I should cite in detail other specific false impressions which are created by the CBS telecast. I believe the examples I have given are sufficient to show that the producers of this telecast were, to put it mildly, careless of the truth. A number of individuals were interviewed and filmed under the impression that their comments were to be included in the program. They subsequently found that the interviews and films which did not support the impression the producers wished to create were deleted. The housing shown was the worst the producers could possibly find. There was no balancing presentation of relatively good housing provided farmworkers in many areas. Everything supporting the view desired by the producers was included; everything not supporting it was excluded.

The film was propaganda, pure and simple.

As a result, the brighter side of the migrant labor story failed to emerge. The production excluded everything which might tell the story of the progress which has been made in recent years in this field: the improvement in housing, the enactment of State legislation of various kinds—not only in our own State, but in other States—the efforts of local authorities, the upward trend in farm wage rates, and the progress in education. Regarding education of migrants, the report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor says:

There is a definite trend, particularly since 1954, of increased and sustained interest on the part of State departments of education, local school districts, and communities, and private organizations to provide for the educational needs of migrants.

Mr. President, I am willing to give the producers the benefit of the doubt as to their motives in presenting this so-called documentary. Perhaps they wanted to contribute to the improvement of a situation which needs continual improvement. However, good motives are no excuse for playing fast and loose with the truth, which is what was done. Slanted documentary films are fully as unethical as rigged quiz shows. Perhaps they are more dangerous to a free society, since they present a false picture as a basis for shaping public opinion and the laws resulting therefrom.

I have no evidence, Mr. President, that the executives of the CBS network which telecast this program had knowledge of its unfairness before its original presen-

tation. However, when they continue to actively cooperate in promoting the showing of this film, as they did in the presentation last Monday—January 30—at the New Senate Office Building Auditorium, they make it impossible for me to feel that they are proceeding with the caution and fair play which the American public has a right to expect from those who hold and use a valuable franchise given by all the American people.

#### SPENDING FOR SUBSIDIES BENEFITS CONSUMER

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as a farmer, I have become increasingly concerned about the rift that has developed in recent years between farm and nonfarm people. It is getting to be a very common thing for publications of all kinds and individuals everywhere to bitterly criticize farmers.

Many of them think that farmers are getting rich, at the taxpayers' expense. Oftentimes the criticism goes so far as to claim that farmers no longer work very much and that they have an easy life. As a farmer, and one of only three left in the U.S. Senate, I have long been concerned about this.

Perhaps we who are farmers feel it more keenly than do others. This is one of the reasons why I so deeply appreciated the speech made at a farm forum held recently in Fargo, N. Dak., by Mr. Ovid Martin. It was an effective and masterful defense of farmers. Mr. Martin is rated as a great journalist, and I believe most people who read his AP stories on farm matters would have to agree that he has been most fair and accurate in all his reporting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks a summary of Mr. Martin's speech carried in the Fargo Forum of February 3. Also, Mr. President, I ask that a news story in the same issue be inserted, which is entitled, "Martin Tells Fargo Farm Forum Spending for Subsidies Is Benefiting Consumer."

There being no objection, the summary and news article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Farmers Forum, Feb. 3, 1961]

#### AMERICA'S AGRICULTURE ENVY OF RUSSIA—NO DRASTIC CHANGES IN FARM PROGRAMS SEEN

(EDITOR'S NOTE. The following is a condensation of the talk given by Ovid A. Martin, Associated Press farm writer, Washington, D.C., at the banquet session Thursday evening of the first Fargo Farm Forum.)

(By Ovid A. Martin)

I am convinced from the facts that are available to me that agriculture is not getting the economic returns to which it is entitled.

The outlook for sharp changes in farm programs is cloudy to say the least. Certainly we have a new administration and a new Congress—both of the same political party. That has not been the case for several years.

The new President is committed to take more aggressive action to improve the farm economy. He is expected to push ahead toward this objective, but he may not try to use some of the measures and devices

he outlined during the campaign. He did stress farm production and supply management controls as an important device for stabilizing farm income. Much opposition to this device has been raised.

I would expect the new administration to push first for broadened outlets for agriculture's abundance. It already has increased donations to the needy at home. It is expected to take bolder action than in the past to move food to foreign outlets. This may require U.S. establishment in some backward areas of facilities for unloading at ports, and transportation and distribution into interiors of countries now lacking such facilities.

Some increase in price supports above Eisenhower administration levels is to be expected—but not to levels prevailing when the Eisenhower administration took over 8 years ago.

The new administration's efforts to control production may be limited in the beginning to crops already under control—cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and a cropland retirement program for feed grains, soybeans and the like. It undoubtedly will try to push through Congress a certificate plan for wheat. But this plan has tough sledding ahead among wheat farmers.

All and all, it appears that drastic changes in farm programs will face stiff opposition in Congress despite the fact it is controlled by the President's own party.

Why do I say this?

One reason is a lack of feeling that there is an urgent need for action with regard to the farm situation. There has been much talk about depressed industrial areas and urban unemployment. But little is being said about the farm situation. This goes for President Kennedy's economic advisers.

There was a time when downturns in farm income caused alarm in the cities and in Congress. There was a realization a farm depression would spread to the city. But this fear has just about disappeared. That is because the farm population makes up such a small part of the total population that a depressed agriculture no longer cripples the entire economy as it once did. Yet, there may well be a close tie between agriculture's reduced level of buying power and unemployment in the steel industry and in other industrial areas now worrying our leaders.

Another factor in the situation is the declining strength of farming areas in Congress. City Congressmen now write farm legislation—what there is of it. Urban lawmakers are growing more and more opposed to farm programs. They see in them higher food prices for their consumers and higher taxes for the taxpayers.

We already hear in Washington that many city lawmakers are asking, "Why should I support stronger farm programs when farmers themselves voted against them?" They refer, of course, to the fact that many midwestern farm States voted Republican in the last election.

Another barrier to stronger farm programs is the fact that organized agriculture itself is divided on remedies. Some farm groups want more Federal aid and others less. This division influences some Congressmen to vote against farm bills.

Perhaps the biggest stumbling block to agriculture is the image of the farmer held by many nonfarm people. From the farmer's standpoint, it is not flattering. The image is reflected in editorials in city newspapers and magazines, in consumer remarks at grocery stores, and in discussion groups.

It is reflected in remarks like these:

"The farmer must be getting rich from the looks of my grocery bill."

"The farmer gets paid to do nothing."

"I wish I were subsidized as is the farmer."

"No wonder taxes are going up the way the Government wastes money on farm surpluses and subsidies."

And so on and on. You have heard remarks like this.

The reflection of this image bobbed up during the recent inaugural parade. When Secretary of Agriculture Freeman passed along, a loud-mouthed spectator shouted derisively, "You getting ready to give the farmers bigger subsidies." The guy got a cheer from many of those around him.

Let me say I am not here to defend or criticize the farmer. It is the job of the reporter to stick to the facts and not to take sides in controversies and issues.

But the farmer needs no defense. I am convinced by the facts that no group or industry has contributed more toward the economic development of this Nation than has agriculture. No industry has shown an increase in efficiency of production that compares with that shown by agriculture.

The United States has grown from a Nation in which one of every four workers had to produce food, to a Nation in which 1 farmer is producing food for 24.

Productivity of the American farm worker is growing more than twice as fast as the productivity of workers in industry. Government reports show that since 1950, output per man-hour in nonfarm industry has risen 2 percent a year. In agriculture the increase has averaged 5 percent a year—2½ times as much as that in industry.

How the Russians would like to have our agriculture and its so-called surplus problems. Agriculture is their one big weak point. A group of us who accompanied former Secretary of Agriculture Benson on a tour of Russian farms in 1959 saw how desperately the Soviet leaders are trying to get more food produced. They are having no great success, as recent reports from Moscow indicate.

Who has benefited from this marvelous increase in productivity of American farms? Many farm leaders say consumers mostly, rather than farmers. There are facts to back them up.

Consumers are spending an average of 20 percent of their incomes for food. They are eating better than ever before. Today's diet would have taken 32 percent of consumer incomes before World War II.

How about farmers? What has agriculture's technological revolution brought them in economic terms?

Farm income has gone down in the last 10 years. Today the farmer gets about 38 cents of the consumer food dollar. It was 45 cents 10 years ago and 53 cents in 1945. The average per capita income of the farm population is slightly less than \$1,000 a year. That compares with about \$2,300 for the urban population.

Why this discrepancy in incomes? I believe it reflects a lack of appreciation on the part agriculture is contributing to the Nation.

Agriculture, as a segment of the economy, has not been as aggressive as have industry and organized labor in telling of its accomplishments. It has not been tooting its own horn. Rather it has been content to sit back and take whatever recognition others might give it.

We are living in an age of propaganda—an age in which various forces are fighting for men's minds, not only in the international field, but in the domestic one as well. He who does the best job of telling his story usually comes out on top. We may not like it that way. But that's the way things work.

The American people want to be fair. I believe the city image of the farmer can be changed. An urban appreciation of agriculture's contributions would, I am sure, make

a change in attitude toward farmers' efforts to get a fair return for what they do.

Farmers have every reason to hold their heads high with pride. I am confident the facts show there is no room for an inferiority complex in agriculture.

How is agriculture to get its story across? Some may not agree with me, but I believe agriculture must match industry, labor, and the professions in laying its side before the public.

The others have what is called public-relations programs. They employ specialists in this field to use the various avenues of communication and information to get their stories told. Agriculture needs to do the same.

Perhaps farmers, through their various organizations, should set up a promotional agency—one that would use the press, radio, television, the movies, the pamphlet, and the speakers' platform—to enlighten the public as to farm accomplishments. Success in such a venture would help not only agriculture but the rest of the country as well. The result would be a greater understanding and a desire to share the Nation's wealth more equitably.

[From the Fargo Forum, Feb. 3, 1961]

#### MARTIN TELLS FARGO FARM FORUM: SPENDING FOR SUBSIDIES IS BENEFITING CONSUMER

Ovid A. Martin, Associated Press farm reporter in Washington, said here Thursday night that in his opinion much of the spending for so-called Government subsidies benefits the consumer as well as the farmer.

Martin, who has covered the farm beat in Washington for 23 years, said that in his opinion, so far as food goes, the consumer is better off, or at least as well off, today as he would be if there were no surpluses or no farm program.

The farm reporter, who addressed the banquet of the Fargo Farm Forum in Fargo Memorial Auditorium, said he was disturbed by criticism of the spending of Federal money to store farm surpluses because the same critics—the consumers—are paying for storage in other industries without realizing it.

"Other industries store reserves," he said, "and who pays for that? Well, the consumer pays. But the difference is that they see the cost of the agricultural stores and they don't see the cost of the other."

He noted also that such things as Federal inspection of meat, poultry and grain and other Federal operations in the field of farming rebound to the consumer's benefit.

"I think," he continued, "that there is some unfairness here. On balance, in my opinion, the consumer is better off, or as well off, as if we had no surplus or no farm program."

Martin made these observations during a question period after a talk in which he suggested that farmers should get together to tell the public of agriculture's vital contributions to the economy of the Nation.

It is time, he said, for agriculture to start "tooting its own horn," rather than to do as it has done—"sit back and take whatever recognition others might give it."

The banquet marked the midpoint of the 2-day forum, which ends today with meetings at 9 a.m. and 1 p.m.

Martin, the only newsman in Washington assigned solely to farm news, said a basic cause for declining farm income in the face of the farming industry's tremendous contributions to the Nation's economic development has been what he termed the unflattering image of the farmer held by many nonfarm people.

One result of this image, he said, is the increasing lack of concern among the public and in Congress regarding farm problems.

He predicted that drastic changes of any kind in farm programs during this session of Congress will face stiff opposition for two principal reasons:

The lack of feeling that there is an urgent need for action with regard to the farm situation.

The declining strength of farming areas in Congress, with urban lawmakers seeing in farm programs higher prices for their consumers and higher taxes for their taxpayers.

Noting that he was speaking as a reporter and not taking sides, Martin said that the farmer needs no defense before consumers, industry or any other segment of the population.

"I am convinced by the facts that no group or industry has contributed more toward the economic development of this nation than has agriculture," he said. "How the Russians would like to have our agriculture and its so-called surplus problems."

To get their fellow countrymen to appreciate their contributions to the Nation, Martin said, farmers must realize we are living in an age of propaganda, in both foreign and domestic fields.

Farmers, he said, must get into this fight for men's minds and suggested that through their various farm organizations they set up a promotional agency to tell the public about farm accomplishments.

"I believe agriculture must match industry, labor and the professions in laying its side before the public," he said.

"The American people want to be fair," he continued. "I believe the city image of the farmer can be changed, and an urban appreciation of agriculture's contributions would, I am sure, make a change in attitude toward farmers' efforts to get a fair return for what they do."

John D. Paulson, editor of the Fargo Forum-Moorhead News, presided at the banquet. The Forum-News and the Fargo Chamber of Commerce are sponsoring the farm forum.

Paulson said the farm forum was the logical result of a growing feeling among farm and city people in this area that the only thing that will succeed in promoting the region is a combined farm and city effort.

He introduced Royal Berstler, Mapleton, secretary of the Red River Valley Fair Association, who presented plaques to members of the NDSU livestock judging team, who were special guests.

The team won the world championship livestock judging contest at the International Livestock Exposition in Chicago last November.

Coach Marle Light introduced the team members: James Carr, Baker, Minn.; Ray Kleppe, Dawson, N. Dak.; Paul Brackelsberg, Minot, N. Dak.; Richard Knutson, Oakes, N. Dak.; Keith Bjerke, Northwood, N. Dak., and Mike Brandvick, Killdeer, N. Dak.

#### TELEVISION'S "OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE" SERIES BRINGS HISTORY TO LIFE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the past few weeks I have commented on television's unique thrust into our hearts and minds. I have placed in the RECORD a selection from the growing number of distinguished news feature programs in which this unprecedented communication impact has been put to great good purpose.

Another unique boon we now enjoy from television is American history brought to life. Viewers around the

country received a brilliant taste of this in the program "The Invincible Teddy," based on the life of President Theodore Roosevelt, which was broadcast 3 weeks ago.

In this program television's tremendous ability to take the viewer by the hand and lead him back through a magic time machine into the realism of life was focused on actual events in the life of this great President.

Teddy Roosevelt was a complex and unusual human being. This program retells just a few years of his life: the period of his first entry into active politics, the subsequent death of his first wife, his trip to the West, his return home and second marriage, and his re-entry into politics, which this time he terms public service. Yet this relatively brief glimpse in the life of the man is enough to greatly deepen our insights into his character and personality.

Rereading the script of this program has made me freshly aware of the excellence of the writing that is going into television. As in the case of fine plays based on historical events, this script uses the small detail, knowingly perceived, to give us a better, clearer understanding of the broad train of events. To do this well is a test of the writer's art, and this script passed with top marks.

The other scripts of television programs which I have placed in the Record also bear witness to the fact that some of the crispest, most compelling writing now being done is television writing. This new medium has enlisted the efforts and output of writers of unusual distinction, and the results can be seen in the many scripts of high literary merit.

The program which I would like to place in the Record today was written by Mr. Tad Mosel, and was broadcast in the NBC "Our American Heritage" series on January 13 of this year. I am informed that the ratings for this series have not been high, even though it has been presented in prime evening time, and I find it encouraging therefore, that the sponsor, the Equitable Co., has continued the series into what is now its second season. There can be little doubt that the quality of the smaller audience, drawn by the high quality of such a program, may be worth as much to a sponsor as the quantitatively larger mass audience attracted by programs of less distinct merit.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of the program "The Invincible Teddy" based on episodes in the life of President Theodore Roosevelt, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE INVINCIBLE TEDDY

(By Tad Mosel)

ACT I

(Fade in: A room at 6 West 57th Street, New York City. It is crammed with furniture and mementos. The camera holds on the entire room for a moment, then slowly moves in.)

NARRATOR. They say rooms tell us all we need to know about the people who live in them.

(Camera holds on a Harvard pennant, pictures of athletic teams, and a lone oar leaning in the corner. Camera moves to a mouldy stuffed pelican, its beak piercing a piece of paper on which is a legend.)

Pelecanus onocratulus. Benesoolf, December 22, 1872. Length 59.5. Wing 25.5. Tall 10.5.

(Camera moves to a pair of boxing gloves. Then to a glass case filled with rocks, etc.)

Sixty-five relics, correctly identified and catalogued, collected on the banks of the Nile at the age of 14.

(Past a full gun rack on the wall and crossed fencing foils. On to an imposing solemn bookcase.)

Blackstone's Commentaries, Parsons on Contracts, Washburn on Real Property.

(Cut to: An open book on the seat of a leather easy chair.)

Robert Browning.

(On to an easel, a sketch pad, an unfinished drawing of a ship, on to a large Bible, open on an ornate bookstand. Move in close to page.)

"But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father give the commandment, even so I do."

(Camera moves slowly back.)

"Arise, and let us go hence."

(Hold on entire room again.)

Theodore Roosevelt, New York City, 1881. Aged 23.

(Roosevelt enters. He is followed by Joseph Murray.)

MR. ROOSEVELT. You don't mind the smell of formaldehyde, do you?

MR. MURRAY. It is rather penetrating, Mr. Roosevelt.

MR. ROOSEVELT. Taxidermy is the one pursuit guaranteed to insure privacy. Even the maids won't come in here. You like Browning? "I sprang to the stirrup, and Joris, and he; I galloped, Dirck galloped, we galloped all three!" By Godfrey, sir, have you ever made the trip from Ghent to Aix on horseback?

MR. MURRAY. No, Mr. Roosevelt, I haven't.

MR. ROOSEVELT. Bully good ride.

(Murray points to picture.)

My honeymoon, sir.

MR. MURRAY. You've just returned from abroad, haven't you?

MR. ROOSEVELT. Climbed the Jungfrau and the Matterhorn. And my bride turned out to be the best traveling companion I have ever known. Sit down, sit down. What's your business?

MR. MURRAY. As you know, Mr. Roosevelt, some of us in the 21st District Republican Club—

MR. ROOSEVELT. Blast.

MR. MURRAY. I beg your pardon?

MR. ROOSEVELT. Excuse me, Mr. Murray, I'm preparing a naval history of the War of 1812 and I must make corrections when I see them. Continue. I'm listening.

MR. MURRAY. Some of us intend to oppose the renomination of Trimble for the State assembly—

MR. ROOSEVELT. You may count on my support. I took my stand against Trimble when he blocked the street-cleaning bill. Who can we put up against him?

MR. MURRAY. Some of us were thinking of you, sir.

(Roosevelt goes to the easel and draws vigorously.)

MR. ROOSEVELT, sir, I have just suggested that we nominate you for the State legislature, and you stand there drawing a ship.

MR. ROOSEVELT. If I should run against Trimble, it would look as if I had had selfish motives in opposing him in the first place. It would weaken the stand I took on street cleaning.

MR. MURRAY. From the many vigorous stands you take at our meetings, we as-

sumed you would jump at the chance of participating actively in politics.

MR. ROOSEVELT. In England, recently, I took a stand on Henry Irving's Othello, but that does not mean I want to be either an actor or a moor in Venice.

MR. MURRAY. Why did you join the Republican club?

MR. ROOSEVELT. Because it was there to be joined. Whatever made you think I could win the nomination?

MR. MURRAY. The name of Roosevelt is highly respected in this district. The upper classes were your late father's friends. The lower classes have never forgotten his philanthropies.

(Anna "Bamie" Roosevelt enters with a coffee tray.)

BAMIE. Excuse me, Teddy, I've brought you coffee.

MR. ROOSEVELT. Bamie, may I present Mr. Murray. This is my sister Anna, and of all the Roosevelts, she most resembles my dear father. Mr. Murray wants me to go into politics, Bamie. What would father have said?

BAMIE. The only time he tried politics, I'm afraid he was a miserable failure.

MR. ROOSEVELT. Then maybe this is my chance to vindicate him.

MR. MURRAY. Then you'll do it?

MR. ROOSEVELT. I don't think so.

MR. MURRAY. Have you any immediate plans that would prevent you from accepting the nomination?

MR. ROOSEVELT. None.

BAMIE. There's his book to be finished, of course, and a month or so in the Dakotas for some good hunting. Then he's about to start his second year at law school, and there's his work as trustee of the Orthopedic Dispensary and the New York Infant Asylum. And he's enlisted in the National Guard.

MR. ROOSEVELT. Otherwise, I have no plans, so it's not time lack, it's the inclination.

MR. MURRAY. You're interested in just about everything, aren't you, Mr. Roosevelt? What will you settle down to eventually? bird watching? taxidermy? mountain climbing?

MR. ROOSEVELT. There's plenty of time to decide on a career.

MR. MURRAY. I know other young men of your class, Mr. Roosevelt, who are still saying that at 50.

(Alice Lee Roosevelt and Edith Carow enter.)

ALICE. Edith's going home, Teddy. She wants to say goodnight.

MR. MURRAY. Good evening, sir. Good evening, Mrs. Roosevelt.

BAMIE. I'll call your carriage.

ALICE. Edith's just been telling me the fun you used to have when you were children, Teddy.

EDITH. Fun? All he did was drag me on backbreaking hikes to spy at birds.

MR. ROOSEVELT. Edith was an admirable hiker.

EDITH. She had to be if she wanted Teddy's company.

MR. ROOSEVELT. She was also an outrageous flirt.

EDITH. And he, my dear Alice, was just like Mr. Browning's "pertest little ape that ever affronted human shape: full of his travel, stuck on himself."

MR. ROOSEVELT. "Sing a song of acids."

EDITH. "Base and alkali."

MR. ROOSEVELT. "Four-and-twenty gases."

EDITH. "Baked into a pie."

MR. ROOSEVELT. "When the pie was opened."

EDITH. "Wonderful to say."

MR. ROOSEVELT. "Oxygen and hydrogen."

BOTH. "Both flew away."

(Bamie enters.)

BAMIE. Edith, your carriage is here.

EDITH. Just coming, Bamie. Welcome home, Teddy. Thank you for a lovely eve-

ning. Goodnight, Alice. I know you're going to be happy.

ALICE. Dear Edith—

EDITH. Good night.

(She and Bamie go.)

BAMIE (as they go). I hope you'll be able to attend the Patriarch's Ball next week, Edith—

ALICE. Am I an admirable hiker? Teddy dear, I love all your friends so very much, but I don't seem able to get close to Edith Carow. Were you and she sweethearts?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Some people thought so.

ALICE. But were you? Don't squeak in my ear.

(He squeaks in her ear. She steps back.)

ALICE. Teddy, answer my question.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Oh, Alice! My sunshine. Never, by any word or action or even thought, never have I loved any girl but you, nor will I ever, on my solemn oath. What is it, Sunshine?

ALICE. I have been reading another one of your diaries.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What year? Have I written something to upset you?

ALICE. "March 26, 1880. Complete physical examination today. Dr. Sargent says my heart is my weak point, that I must beware of too much exertion, that I must in fact even avoid running upstairs. Otherwise my life will be a short one."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. "My reaction was prompt. I answered that I was going to disobey these instructions to the letter, that if I must live the kind of life he prescribed, I preferred dying young."

ALICE. That was only a year and a half ago.

(He tears out the page and throws it away.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That page was unfit, Sunshine. I've been fighting death all my life, Alice, and by heaven, I've licked it. When I was just a boy, my dear father said to me, "Teedie—" they called me Teedie in those days. "Teedie, you have the mind but you do not have the body, and without the help of the body, the mind cannot go as far as it should." Then his face became very grave, and he called me Theodore, as if I were grown up. "Theodore," he said, "you must create your body. It is hard drudgery, but I know you will do it." And I did it, Alice. Where there was just flesh, I made muscle. I expanded my chest by inches. I even made myself grow taller.

ALICE. But you can't make a good heart, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Listen. That's the best heart you'll ever hear.

ALICE. In all ways.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. How do you make those pretty waves?

ALICE. With water. Oh, Teddy, I'm so frightened of death.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (O.S.). Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In here, Mother.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy. Bamie tells me you're considering going into politics, and I want to know if it's absolutely necessary? After all, you come from prominent landowners and clergymen, at least on my side. And everybody knows that politics are not controlled by gentlemen but by saloon keepers and horse car conductors and the like. Rough, brutal and unpleasant men, all of them.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If that is true, Muffie, then it means that the people we know do not belong to the governing class, and it's time they did.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. So you are going into politics?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Why not?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (putting her handkerchief to her nose, waiving at the air). Have you been stuffing animals again?

(She hurries out.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My life, Alice.

(Dissolve to: Closeup of saloon.)

Mr. MURRAY. Beers for the house—on Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. FISCHER (contemptuously). A dude from Fifth Avenue.

(Pull back to see a low saloon on Sixth Avenue near 55th Street. Joseph Murray at a table. Fischer, the owner, stands.)

Mr. MURRAY. Good healthy American stock. Not a blot on the "scutcheon." And he's not machine. What's more, he's a crusader. Once he's elected—

Mr. FISCHER. If he's elected.

Mr. MURRAY. He won the nomination hands down, didn't he? Look at the votes he can bring us. All his Fifth Avenue friends. And he's a law student at Columbia College, you know, so we'll get all the athletic teams and the faculty—

Mr. FISCHER. And what about us on Sixth Avenue? What's his kind got to offer my kind?

Mr. MURRAY. That's exactly why I've asked him here tonight, so you can see for yourself what he has to offer. Just listen to him. That's all I ask.

Mr. FISCHER. What's his name again?

Mr. MURRAY. Roosevelt. T. Roosevelt.

Mr. FISCHER. Why'd you say T. Roosevelt?

Mr. MURRAY. Because that's his initial.

Mr. FISCHER. What's it stand for?

Mr. MURRAY. Theodore.

Mr. FISCHER. Theodore? You might as well give us an Algeron or a Percy.

(There is something of an explosion as Roosevelt bursts into the saloon, calling loudly, attracting a great deal of attention.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Joe, where are you? Joe Murray? I'm sorry to have kept you waiting, Joe, but I couldn't get away from the FCDC.

Mr. MURRAY. A secret university organization.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (squeaking). The Family Circle dancing class, Joe. One of Ward McAllister's innovations. And I got so involved in quadrilles and lancers and polkas that I lost all track of time.

Mr. MURRAY. Becoming quite a fad. I'd like you to meet Mr. Fischer, the proprietor. Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. How'd you do, sir. Where's the kitchen?

Mr. FISCHER. What?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Where's your kitchen?

Mr. FISCHER. What's he going to do out there?

Mr. MURRAY. I'm not sure.

(The kitchen door bangs open and Roosevelt reappears.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Bully.

(Rushing to Fischer, pumping his hand again.) I've dined at Delmonico's and all the others, Mr. Fischer, and your kitchen's as clean as the best of them.

Mr. MURRAY. Sit down Mr. Roosevelt, and have a drink.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not for me, Joe. I don't believe in it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Roosevelt means he doesn't believe in drinking for himself.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Ale's all right, and a little wine now and then doesn't hurt.

Mr. FISCHER. If we send you to Albany, Mr. Roosevelt, how do we know you'll be fair to the liquor interests?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because I intend to treat all interests fairly.

Mr. FISCHER. All right, let's start with the license fees. What'll you do to lower them?

Mr. MURRAY. As Mr. Roosevelt's manager, I can assure you that he—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What do you pay?

Mr. FISCHER. Two hundred dollars.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. By Godfrey, that's not right.

Mr. MURRAY. You see!

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's not enough, Joe. Not half enough.

Mr. FISCHER (in a fury). I think you're a prohibitionist, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Oh, no, sir. You don't catch me there. Prohibition is a curse. I will oppose them with all my strength. Mr. MURRAY. I told you, Fischer, that Mr. Roosevelt would stand up for you.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's foolish to hope for the enforcement of such laws. People will find ways to drink. You liquor sellers know this, and we don't frighten you for a minute. We do frighten you if we try to regulate your traffic, to see that as far as it can be made, it shall be made decent. That's why I do not favor prohibition and I do favor a high license fee.

Mr. FISCHER. Hear that, boys? Theodore is out to scare me.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What did you call me, sir? Mr. FISCHER. Theodore. That's your name, isn't it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, it's my name, and I don't mind your calling me by it, although I haven't given you permission to. What I do mind is the manner in which you said it.

Mr. FISCHER. What'd you wear that ribbon on your glasses for, Theodore? Why don't you tie it in your hair, Theodore?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I have everyone's attention for a moment. I'd like you to listen carefully to the manner in which Mr. Fischer, here, is addressing me. Mr. Fischer, if you'll oblige.

Mr. FISCHER. Won't mama's boy catch cold out in them tight pants, Theodore?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Roosevelt, please—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Theodore is a perfectly good masculine name, deriving from the Greek "theos" meaning god, and "doron" meaning gift. Gift of God. The tone of voice in which Mr. Fischer is saying it implies a slur on my manhood and masculinity, if not on the manhood and masculinity of all Theodores. I trust I have made my position clear. Is it clear to you, Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER. Why sure, Theodore.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My glasses, Joe. I can't see a thing. Give this man a glass of cognac.

BARTENDER. A glassa what?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Brandy. Are you all right, Mr. Fischer? Sir, your face is dirty.

(He turns to address the room.)

As a man is privately moral, so is he publicly moral? You have seen my private morality. Was it fair?

(A slight murmur and mumble.)

Well? Speak up.

(Muttering from the group.)

That, gentlemen, is the kind of justice you will receive if you see fit to send me to Albany in the coming election. I shall go untrammelled and unpledged. I will obey no boss and serve no clique. Are you ready, Joe?

(He puts a coin on the bar, gives the brandy to Fischer, receives his handkerchief in return, swings his cape over his arm and supports a very limp Joseph Murray out of the saloon.)

Mr. MURRAY. In the future, Mr. Roosevelt, I think it might be wiser if you saw to the college boys and your friends on Fifth Avenue, and left the other end to me.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That's the way, Joe. Divide the duties, then everything gets done.

(Dissolve to: Bamie and Alice in a small sitting room. Bamie is at the desk, answering neat piles of correspondence. Alice reads Teddy's diaries.)

BAMIE. It really is exciting, Alice. Teddy has received support from the most unexpected places. Ellhu Root. And Moses Taylor Pyne. He writes that although he is a Democrat, he is supporting Teddy.

(Mrs. Roosevelt enters.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. I'm so nervous. I don't know how you can be so calm during an election. Any news yet?

BAMIE (back to her work). It's too soon, Muffie. The polls have just closed. I thought you were going to the opera.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. On Teddy's election night?

BAMIE. You said you were. With the Lanes.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. The Lanes. Oh, dear, Bamie, I forgot. It was last night I was going to the opera. I know because it was Tristan, and they only do German on Mondays. Oh, blast! I wish this election were over with. It's reached the point where I can't remember my own name.

(She crosses to hall.)

Mr. Murray.

Mr. MURRAY. Where's Mr. Roosevelt?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy, Mr. Murray is here. (Spreading the sheet on the floor.)

Before you say a word, Mr. Murray, I want you to stand on this, for you've been walking through nothing but slush.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe I have the pleasure of addressing the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt.

ALICE (embracing him). Teddy, you won.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (beaming, all teeth). By Godfrey, sir, you may call me Teddy.

Mr. MURRAY. By 1,500 votes. Twice the usual margin. What a day it was. All the young men from Columbia College turned up at the polls and wanted to know where the tough districts were.

It was the cleanest election in 20 years. I must spread the good news. Congratulations, Teddy.

(Murray leaves.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (kissing Teddy). If it's what you really wanted, Teddy, I'm happy for you.

(Bamie enters.)

BAMIE. The neighbors are coming in. They want to congratulate you.

ALICE. You'll have to make a speech.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (gathering up the sheet). Heavens, my hall carpet.

ALICE. Let me help you.

(She and Alice go out, and voices may be heard.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Did you think I'd win, Bamie?

BAMIE. Whatever you do, Teddy, you do thoroughly. Yes, I thought you'd win.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Blast. I just did it. Out of the corner of my eye. And now I'm suddenly responsible for the welfare of several thousand people I don't even know. That's the end of the law studies.

BAMIE. You weren't really serious about law.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I just wonder if a few years from now I'll be putting politics on the shelf to make room for some new career. And a few years later, will I be putting that career on the shelf—I wonder if father is looking down on me and shaking his head, "Teedie, Teedie." As if I were a little boy. (Edith Carow appears in the door, unnoticed.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want him to be proud of me, and he wouldn't be. Look at this room. I'm sick of this hodge-podge, Bamie, this maze of half-started lives.

EDITH. Even when you were little, Teddy, you never could decide if you wanted to serve the world, yourself, God, or your father.

(She advances to hug him.)

EDITH. I've just heard the news. Congratulations.

(Gallery.)

ALICE. Oh, Muffie, must you always be late?

MUFFIE. For once in my life I was early, and I stopped in this little shop.

ALICE. Oh, Muffie, isn't it exciting? It's the first time we've heard Teddy speak in the assembly.

(Dissolve to: Teddy on the floor of the assembly.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am proposing is simple in the extreme and does not warrant this prolonged discussion. I am simply seeking the reestablishment of a means of inflicting corporal punishment upon male persons in certain cases only. Any

man who inflicts brutal or unusual pain or violence upon the person of any female or a male under 14 years of age deserves to be whipped and to be whipped publicly. The only way this can be accomplished is by the erection of outdoor whipping posts.

(Crowd reacts.)

(Cut to: Gallery.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. That sounds like a very sensible proposal.

(Cut to: Assemblyman.)

ASSEMBLYMAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Roosevelt has an excellent suggestion but let us hope he will not stop at the whipping posts. I propose a vote of thanks and wish him Godspeed in the reestablishment of the stocks, the pillory and the rack, and once having advanced to this point, there will be little trouble in paving the way for the thumbscrew and the ducking stool.

(Cut to: Alice and Mrs. Roosevelt, her packages piled high on her lap, in the gallery.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. What's the matter?

ALICE. They're laughing at Teddy. They're laughing at him.

(They lean closer together. Teddy is heard screaming "Mr. Spee-kar. Mr. Spee-kar," over the roaring laughter.)

#### ACT 2

(Fade in: Mrs. Roosevelt and Bamie in the sitting room. Bamie cuts articles from the newspapers and Mrs. Roosevelt pastes them into a scrapbook.)

BAMIE. What's that you're hiding?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Do we have to save every single article, Bamie? Why can't we just keep the pleasant ones?

BAMIE. Father would want Teddy to pay special attention to the unpleasant ones.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. But this one is dreadful. "When young Mr. Roosevelt finished his affecting oration, the house was in tears—the house was in tears of uncontrollable laughter." Oh, Bamie, after almost three terms, they're still laughing at him, even in the newspapers. Why do they keep reelecting him if all they're going to do is laugh at him?

BAMIE. They didn't laugh at him over the Westbrook affair, or Jay Gould—

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Of course I never understood that anyway. Isn't Mr. Gould a wealthy man?

BAMIE. Very.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Then why did Teddy attack him so? It seems to me he's turning against his own kind.

BAMIE. Mr. Gould is a member of the criminal wealthy class, Muffie. I say good for Teddy.

(Alice enters.)

ALICE. Hasn't Teddy come in yet?

BAMIE. Those meetings go on all night sometimes.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. You go to bed, dear. We'll wait up for him.

ALICE. No, Muffie, I must be down here when he comes in. I don't want him to think I spend all my time lying down.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. But when a woman is expecting a baby, dear, she's supposed to rest. My dear, there's nothing wrong with being tired.

ALICE. Have you ever known Teddy to be? Of course not, he won't let himself.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy's not having the baby.

(A door slams off.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Blast. They should be arrested, but I'll wager they've bought off every policeman on the force.

(Kissing Alice.)

How are you, Sunshine? Shouldn't you be resting?

ALICE. I'm not tired, not a bit.

BAMIE. What's happened, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'll fight them any way they want to, with words or insults, or even pistols, as long as it's in the open. But

when they attack a man in the dark of night, as he's turning into his own gate.

ALICE (frightened). Did someone attack you, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (squeaking). Of course not, Sunshine. I outfoxed them.

(He kisses her. A maid enters.)

MAID. Excuse me, Mr. Roosevelt, there's a Mr. Gompers to see you.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. At this time of night?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Samuel Gompers?

MAID. He just said Gompers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There can't be two men walking the earth with an idiot name like that. Take him to my study.

(He implies "in chains." The maid goes.) Now they're invading my very hearth.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. He might have sent in a card.

BAMIE. Isn't he the labor organizer, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The Cigarmakers International, if you please.

(He strides out of the room, blood in his eyes.)

(Dissolve to: Samuel Gompers, waiting in Teddy's study. Roosevelt storms in, closing the door.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Gompers, as I was peacefully walking across 57th Street this evening, not an hour ago, a number of the more anarchistic leaders of your Cigarmakers International tried to ambush me in the middle of 57th Street.

Mr. GOMPERS. I knew nothing of this, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. All because I opposed that blasted tenement bill of yours.

Mr. GOMPERS. I came here to reason with you.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm a reasonable man, but—

Mr. GOMPERS. You don't seem to be.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Hold on, Gompers, I'm the most reasonable man in the world and you know it. Proceed, reason with me.

Mr. GOMPERS. (Almost with a sigh.) The purpose of our bill, Mr. Roosevelt, is merely to prohibit the manufacture of cigars in tenement houses. Despite popular belief, we are not staging a revolution or—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And I say it is unthinkable to interfere with an employer, to tell him where and how he can make or have made his cigars.

Mr. GOMPERS. All I want to do is to improve the working and living conditions of the people I represent.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Rot. You're the worst enemy of the people you represent. It is criminal to teach a poor laborer that he is a victim of conspiracy and injustice, when in reality he is merely working out his fate with blood and sweat as men who are worthy of the name always have done and always will have to do.

Mr. GOMPERS. You profess to be fair to every American citizen; are laborers not included?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is up to the man to change his conditions, not up to his government. All the State can do is see that no wrong is done him by someone else—

Mr. GOMPERS. No wrong is done him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (overriding). And that all alike have a fair chance in the struggle to improve themselves.

Mr. GOMPERS. A fair chance in the—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Stop repeating what I say. Mr. GOMPERS (direct, almost aggressive).

Mr. ROOSEVELT, our bill has gone to the committee on cities of which you are a member. I'd like to know what progress has been made.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We're investigating conditions. Isn't that what you wanted?

Mr. GOMPERS. Where?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We're holding meetings at the St. James Hotel.

Mr. GOMPERS. But the cigars are being made in the tenements.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We're calling in witnesses, of course. Landlords, employers—

Mr. GOMPERS. The landlords are the employers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The landlords, the employers, the laborers themselves—

Mr. GOMPERS. Why not go to the tenements?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I imagine we'll make a tour eventually.

Mr. GOMPERS. And I imagine you'll permit the landlords to map out your tour.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Are you suggesting our investigation will not be fair?

Mr. GOMPERS. The landlords will only let you see what they want you to see. I suggest you make an unofficial tour with me tonight.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And won't you show me only what you want me to see.

Mr. GOMPERS. Of course! Then later on, after your official tour, you'll have seen both sides.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. At this hour? The whole point is to see the people working, isn't it?

Mr. GOMPERS. You will see the people working.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We can't just poke our way in.

Mr. GOMPERS (opening his satchel). I have here a cheap set of Dickens' works. You and I, Mr. Roosevelt, are going to be book agents for an evening.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (taking a book, turning it over in his hand, suddenly laughing his squeaky laugh). By Godfrey, that tickles me. But we can't go from door to door selling books at midnight.

Mr. GOMPERS. Night and day are all the same in the tenements, as you will see if you are willing to be fair.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. All right, Gompers, I'll go! How's that for being fair?

Mr. GOMPERS. Bully.  
(Dissolve to: Alice in the sitting room. Mrs. Roosevelt joins her.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Alice, why are you up so late?

Alice. It's suicidal weather, Muffie. If one were easily influenced by such things, life wouldn't seem worth living. The very air suggests death and decay, doesn't it?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy wouldn't want you to sit up for him like this. He'd want you to go to bed. He won't think you're being weak.

Alice. I've been to bed, Muffie. I can't sleep.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. That uncomfortable?  
(Alice nods.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Would you like me to send for the doctor?

Alice. No.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Just uncomfortable?  
(Alice nods.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Well then, dear, I'll sit up with you. Only I think I'll stay over here, because I've had a feeling all day that I'm coming down with a cold, and I don't want you to catch it.

Alice. Don't sit with me if you're not feeling well.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. I know what it is to be uncomfortable—as you are. Bamie, of course, arrived punctually, with no fuss. But Teddy, he came into the world as if on a dare. (Softly, shaking her head.) Oh, yes, I remember what it is to be uncomfortable.

Alice. I hope my baby looks like Teddy.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. No, you don't, Alice, because he looked like a turtle. I must get you some ginger preserves. That's what I had for lunch the day he was born, and they tasted so good. I'd actually been out shopping that morning. And when my time came, late in the afternoon, every doctor in the neighborhood was ill in bed, if you can believe it. But my mother was with me, and Mother Roosevelt, and I remember how comforting their presence was.

Alice. Yours is comforting too, Muffie.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Is it? Is it, really? Well now, that pleases me very much. Except Bamie would be annoyed with us for sitting down here in the cold.

Alice. Bamie wouldn't know how to sit with me like this.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Bamie is so very efficient. I used to run the house, you know, and handle the servants and plan the menus, but she does it so well that I let her do it now. Although it leaves me feeling rather useless sometimes. (Dabbing her forehead with her handkerchief.) Do you think it's unusually warm in here?

Alice (overlapping). Was that the front door?

(They listen.)  
(Cut to: Teddy, just inside the front door, ashen, upset. He suddenly is wracked by coughing and desperately tries to smother it.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (off, softly). Teddy? (He enters the sitting room.) It's your asthma again, isn't it? After all these years.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (reassuringly). No, Muffie, it's just this filthy weather.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Where did you go with that funny Gompers man?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (wearily). Don't laugh at him, Muffie. (Then trying to be bright and jocular.) He's the first labor leader I've ever known who spoke grammatically. (He laughs and puts his arm around her.) What are two of my girls doing up?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Talking about you, dear. But now that you're home, I'm going to bed. I won't kiss either of you good night, though, because of my germs. I think I'm coming down with a cold. Good night.

Alice. Good night.  
(She goes. Teddy immediately turns away, another stored-up, heaving cough.)

Alice. Oh, Teddy, it is your asthma.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I won't have it be.  
(He sprawls, exhausted, into a chair, forcing himself to breathe deeply, to control and bring a rhythm to his breathing, audibly counting.)

One, two, three.  
Alice. Oh, Teddy, I'm going to have this baby as if it were nothing at all. I'm not even going to make a sound.

(He is now breathing more easily and puts his head back. She sits on a stool at his feet.)

Alice. Is there anything I can get you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (closing his eyes, half mumbling). These men, Alice. These fiends.

Alice. What men, dear?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They import these poor ignorant devils—Bohemians who can't even speak English, they bring them in by the hundreds. And they literally lock them up in tenements, sometimes two families to a room. And there they sit, round the clock—making cigars. And they pay them \$3 a week and they charge them \$3 a week for dirty food and verminous lodging. And the tobacco is piled in the corners, and the children sleep on it when they're not working. And the consumptives. We were pretending to sell these people books. Books. And one little girl saw a picture in one of the books, and she laughed, and she pointed to the picture and then to herself as if to say, "It's me." It was Little Dorrit in Marshalsea Prison. (He takes off his glasses and rubs his eyes.) I've always felt that if a man believes something, he should believe it unswervingly and live by it to the end of his days. I do not believe in this tenement bill before the house. It is wrong.

Alice. Can't wrong ever be right, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (smiling affectionately at her foolishness). Never, Sunshine. That I know. And yet I have seen what I have seen. And I feel I must support Samuel Gompers. But I cannot and will not change my beliefs, which means I must support a man whose principles I decry. That I cannot do, either. (Suddenly sitting forward, slap-

ping his knee.) And I won't. After all, if this bill were passed, those poor devils would be thrown into the streets to shift for themselves in a strange, foreign city. They might even forfeit their livelihood.

Alice. But if they go on as they are, Teddy, mightn't they forfeit their lives?

(They cross to hall stairs.)  
Mr. ROOSEVELT. You go to bed, Sweetheart, I have some work to do.

Alice. Are you sure you're all right, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes. Good night.  
Alice. Good night, Sweetheart.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You must promise not to have the baby until I return from Albany.

Alice. I'll have it whenever you say.  
(He goes off to his study. She returns to her chair where she sits in the dark, gazing out the window at the cruelest of all Februaries.)

(Dissolve to: The lobby of the Delavan Hotel. Gompers comes downstairs, a bell-boy carrying his suitcases.)

Mr. GOMPERS. Get me a carriage, please. (The boy goes. Gompers turns to the desk.)

Do you know if Mr. Roosevelt has returned from the capitol?

CLERK. Not to my knowledge, Mr. Gompers. And if I may say so, sir, we always do know it when Mr. Roosevelt passes through the lobby.

Mr. GOMPERS (sternly). He is not a theatrical entertainment, you know.

CLERK. I'm sorry, sir.

Mr. GOMPERS. It's time people started taking Mr. Roosevelt more seriously. He's a man to be reckoned with.

(He sees Roosevelt coming in.)  
Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Gompers.

Mr. GOMPERS. I'm on my way to catch the 6 o'clock, Mr. Roosevelt, but I did want to thank you again for your efforts in our behalf.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Just don't misunderstand my motives. Whatever I did, I did solely in the interest of public health.

Mr. GOMPERS. Your speech this morning was truly impassioned. It was the deciding factor that turned the tide in our favor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (squeaking). I'll tell you a secret, Mr. Gompers. This morning I could have defeated the Devil himself and all the legions of hell, single handed, in open combat. You see, 10 minutes before I rose to speak, a telegram was put in my hand. I'm the father of a baby girl.

Mr. GOMPERS (shaking his hand). Congratulations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (beaming, all teeth). Thank you, sir.

Mr. GOMPERS. Then you'll be going to New York tonight, too, won't you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. All's well at home. I'll stay till tomorrow. My aldermanic bill is to be put up for its final passage.

CLERK. Telegram, sir.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You and I must keep in touch, Mr. Gompers, for your problems aren't over yet.

Mr. GOMPERS. They never will be, Mr. Roosevelt. (He opens it. His expression changes.) What is it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You say you're going on the 6 o'clock?

Mr. GOMPERS. I've a carriage waiting.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (grabbing his arm). Come along.

Mr. GOMPERS. Your baggage, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Come along.  
(Roosevelt is pushing him toward the street.)

(Dissolve to: The front hall of the Roosevelt house. Edith Carow hurries across the hall, Teddy enters.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Edith.

EDITH. I can't tell you, Teddy. Bamie must do it.

(She hurries up the stairs as Bamie comes down to face Teddy.)

BAMIE. There's a curse on this house, Teddy. Alice is dying, and Mother is dying, too.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Muffie?

BAMIE. Our little Muffie. Typhoid. We thought it was a cold.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Alice.

(Teddy rushes past her and up the stairs.)

(Dissolve to: Alice in bed. Teddy enters and leans over her.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Alice? My Sunshine?

ALICE. Oh, Teddy, I failed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Never, Sweetheart, we have a beautiful baby girl, just as sunny as her mama.

ALICE. I failed. I've tried, honestly I have, to make myself live—it was in my mind to—but you said the mind isn't good without the body, and—I've tried to grow taller. But Teddy, I keep, I keep getting smaller. I grab each breath. (She closes her eyes and tries to breathe deeply.) One, two, and then there isn't. (She struggles pitifully for a moment, then becomes calmer. She gazes at him clearly.) Where's Muffie? She promised to come and sit with me.

(Bamie has entered quietly.)

BAMIE. Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'll find out where she is. (He steals softly out of the room, leaving Bamie at Alice's bedside.)

(Dissolve to: Mrs. Roosevelt in bed. A chair nearby is covered with a sheet. Teddy comes close.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What's this sheet for, Muffie?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. For the doctor, of course, when he calls. Think of the places he has been, Teddy. The diseases he has come in contact with. I don't want him to bring any more germs than necessary into my house, or to leave them on my chairs, at any rate. Do you see how efficient I am? Now let me see, do I have any instructions for you and Bamie? Is there any place where I'm supposed to be? Why hasn't Alice come to sit with me?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You'll see her very soon, Muffie.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. After all, I've only a little cold. Now let me see. Is there any place where I'm supposed to be? Would you like me to hear your prayers, Teedie?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, Mama.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Put that sheet on the floor, dear, under your knees.

Now let me see. Is there any place where I'm supposed to be?

(He tries to pray, but sobs instead. It doesn't matter, for she no longer hears.)

#### ACT 3

(Dissolve to: Teddy, in study. Bamie enters.)

BAMIE. The nurse has agreed to stay on, Teddy, so Baby Alice will be in capable hands. When are you returning to Albany?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Efficient, even unto death, aren't you?

BAMIE. Someone has to keep the house running.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm going West, Bamie, as soon as possible.

BAMIE. At this time of year? Your term in Albany isn't half over.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm leaving politics.

BAMIE. For good?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have to be where there's activity, strenuous activity. I need the roundups and the hunting and the fighting. (Suddenly brandishing the rifle over his head in an outburst of outraged grief.) By Godfrey, I wish there'd be a war.

BAMIE. That remark would make father very proud of you.

(Joseph Murray appears.)

Mr. MURRAY. Teddy?

BAMIE. Look, Teddy, here's Mr. Murray.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Hello, Joe.

Mr. MURRAY. I guess this February weather is never going to end, is it. My feet are

wet, Miss Roosevelt, maybe I should have something to stand on. That was clumsy, wasn't it? Just trying to recall pleasanter days.

BAMIE. It's good of you to come and see us, Mr. Murray.

Mr. MURRAY. It was a beautiful service yesterday.

BAMIE. You were there. Thank you for that.

Mr. MURRAY. Maybe you and Teddy didn't see all the people there. Mayor Grace and Mayor Seth Low from Brooklyn—and Titus Sheard.

BAMIE. Did you hear that, Teddy? How could they leave Albany, Mr. Murray?

Mr. MURRAY. The assembly adjourned yesterday, Teddy.

BAMIE. In the middle of a session? That's unheard of.

Mr. MURRAY. After the journal was read, there was a resolution, and it set forth the condolence of that assembly in the hope that it might serve to fortify you (he takes a sheaf of papers from his pocket). Fortify you (reading), "in this moment of agony and weakness." There were seven speeches made before the vote. I've brought you copies.

BAMIE. Look, Teddy—O'Neil, Isaac Hunt, Lucas Van Allen—

Mr. MURRAY. Even our enemies, Teddy.

BAMIE (reading): "We can say nothing to console our friend. We, his fellow members, who are here today in the full enjoyment of our health and happiness, all that we can say to him is: Be still, and know that God is just."

Mr. MURRAY. Then the resolution was passed.

BAMIE. What was the vote?

Mr. MURRAY. Unanimous. Tammany and all. That body of men rose to its feet like a great wave. And the assembly was adjourned. But I thought you'd like to know.

BAMIE. They're not laughing at you any more, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'll finish out my term. That's all.

Mr. MURRAY. Putting another career on the shelf? What would his father say?

BAMIE. He'd shake his head and he'd say "Teedie, Teedie."

(Fade in: Film clip of desolate, snow-driven prairies. Teddy's voice comes in over the scene.)

ROOSEVELT'S VOICE (tired, subdued). Dear Bamie, here in the Badlands this is known as the winter of the iron cold. The cattle lie frozen everywhere, and they say that any man who survives it deserves to call himself a man. I will not be home for Baby Alice's first birthday, for it is also the first anniversary of the loss of her dear mother, and I prefer to spend it in the desolate, grim beauty of this place, with its lonely prairie and broken land.

(Cut to: Film clip of a violent roundup, dust and hot dry sun.)

(Coming in with booming vitality.)

Dear Bamie, today I was in the saddle at 2 a.m. It has been 5 weeks since I had breakfast as late as 4 a.m. When I am sleepy, I rub tobacco in my eyes to keep them open. On the range, they laugh at me for my grammar, for whereas the other cowboys holler "Giddyap." I am often heard to shout, "Hasten along there, quickly." I have finished writing a new book called "The Hunting Trips of a Ranchman."

(Cut to: Teddy, with his rifle, creeping stealthily through the brush. His voice comes through an excited whisper.)

Dear Bamie, I find my blood leaping with sheer buoyant lightheartedness. The statesman, question mark, of the past has been merged, alas, I fear for good, into the cowboy of the present. Best love to baby Alice, and tell her, if she yet understands the English language, that her daddy will visit his sunshine girl for Christmas.

(The creeping figure has poised his gun and now empties it wildly. In the silence that follows.)

Today I shot a 9-foot bear.

(Dissolve to: Teddy's study. See him stowing his books into packing cases.)

EDITH. Bamie? Bamie, it's Edith. (She enters.) Good morning, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Good morning, Edith.

EDITH. Bamie invited me to spend the day with her, so I brought along your birthday present.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Aren't you being a bit premature? My birthday isn't until the end of the month.

EDITH. My invitations to this house are becoming increasingly rare. I warn you, it will make you look a fool on the range, because it's something for the opera. But then, I'm trying to lure you back to civilization. It's true. I'm not going to let you return to your precious Dakota. Did you have fun last night? I haven't danced so long and so late in years. And I'd completely forgotten how graceful you are on the dance floor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Any man worthy of that name is not graceful, Edith, he's well coordinated.

EDITH. And pompous, too. Let me help. Why are you packing?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Now that I'm settled out there, I miss my books and collections.

EDITH. There's plenty of time for that, because you're not leaving us for months and months yet.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As a matter of fact, I've decided to cut short my visit.

EDITH. Can't you at least stay until February? For Baby Alice's second birthday.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Baby Alice doesn't even know who I am, Edith.

EDITH. That's your fault, isn't it? Is this a sudden decision?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This morning.

EDITH (after a moment). What's it like out there? Where do you live? Who looks after you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My ranch is called the Maltese Cross. I live in a cabin. I look after myself.

EDITH. It sounds lonely.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have never minded loneliness.

EDITH. I have always minded it. I can't imagine anyone deliberately seeking it out.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (briskly). Here they only talk about democracy, Edith. Out West they have it. Complete separation from the past. Each morning symbolizes the start of a new life.

EDITH. Complete separation from the past. Is that what you really want?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have not missed public life for a moment.

EDITH. I was thinking more of your personal life.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have none.

EDITH. You could have. Oh, Teddy. It's been almost 2 years since Alice died.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. For joy or for sorrow, Edith, that side of my life has been lived out.

BAMIE. I didn't hear you come in, Edith.

EDITH. Hello, Bamie. Mother wants to know if you and Teddy will come to us for dinner tonight.

BAMIE. Of course we will. We'd love to, wouldn't we, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm sorry, but I've made other plans for dinner.

BAMIE. What plans have you made?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Other plans.

EDITH. I think I'll go see Baby Alice.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Bamie, may I remind you it's not right for Edith to come here quite so often.

BAMIE. Edith is my dearest friend, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm not sure it's wise for her to be seen entering and leaving the house so freely.

BAMIE. And you won't go to her house, not even with me.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I won't do anything that could possibly be misinterpreted as disloyalty to the memory of Alice. For the duration of my visit perhaps you'll warn me when Edith is going to be here so that I may absent myself.

BAMIE. All right, dear. This parcel just came from Putnam's. How many books did you write out West?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's a book about Alice. (He hands her a copy.) I want you to read it.

BAMIE (taking it). Thank you. (Sitting room.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Joe Murray.

Mr. MURRAY. Teddy, you're looking fit. I have something important to tell you. I need the smell of formaldehyde. (They walk through hall to study.) Look at that barrel chest—all rugged and tanned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think I've finally won my battle for strength. Really won it this time, Joe.

Mr. MURRAY (sitting busily). Good. Then you're all set to go to work. This is to go no further. Mayor Grace wants you to consider the presidency of the board of health.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The board of health?

Mr. MURRAY. That whole department needs cleaning up, Teddy, and you're just the man to do it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Me?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, the incumbent's been indicted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What for?

Mr. MURRAY. Accepting a bribe in the course of his official duties.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The man ought to be publicly horsewhipped.

Mr. MURRAY. No, not that again, Teddy. Of course you may think the position beneath your dignity—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have never been that kind of a snob and you know it.

Mr. MURRAY. Then you would accept?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You've ambushed me, Joe. No, I would not.

Mr. MURRAY. You just want me to talk you into it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not. I'm going to the Dakotas. This time forever.

Mr. MURRAY. Now, Teddy, you're not going to spend the rest of your life chasing cows.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I made a pledge to myself to be through with public life, and by Godfrey, I am. From now on its adventure. And writing on the side.

Mr. MURRAY. Why, Teddy? I could understand at first. The whole world went wrong and you had to get away. Of course, you did. But now it's time to come back.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Whatever success I had in politics was mainly accidental.

Mr. MURRAY. Now, Teddy—I wouldn't say that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I mean, I went into it out of the corner of my eye, and that's how I sailed through the whole thing. But in the past year and a half—since Alice—I find I must care very greatly for whatever I do, or I simply cannot do it.

Mr. MURRAY. Teddy, that's just the very thing you needed to put you head and shoulders above every other man in public life.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But now I don't want to hear any more about public life.

Mr. MURRAY. All right. When I first came to you 4 years ago and asked you to run for the legislature, I was just looking for a votegetter, and that's all I got. A nice young man in politics, that's what you were. But you became a professional. You took a big step forward in your life, Teddy. But now you're on the verge of taking two steps backward. What do you want to be now, a nice young man in a cowboy suit? A nice young man in literature. Then a

nice young man here, a nice young man there, until there's nothing left of you but a nice old man nowhere. Or will you, for once in your life, finish what you started? And become the man you can become. Whatever you do, Teddy, I'll always be proudest of the fact that I discovered you.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And I'll always be proudest of the fact that the man who discovered me was absolutely straight.

(They shake hands. Bamie enters, the memorial in her hand.)

BAMIE. Teddy, I've read your memorial to Alice.

(She holds out the book.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That's for you to keep, Bamie.

BAMIE. I don't want it. (She hands him the book.) Have you read what you've written?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No.

ROOSEVELT'S VOICE. "She was beautiful in face and form, and lovelier still in spirit; as a young flower she grew, and as a fair young flower she died. Her life had always been in the sunshine—and when I lost my heart's dearest, the light went from my life forever."

(He gazes at the page, then closes the book. He removes his glasses, places them on the closed book, and rubs his eyes.)

(Dissolve to: Bamie and Edith in the small sitting room, trimming a Christmas tree.)

EDITH. Why hasn't he come out of his study all afternoon, Bamie? He even insisted on having his lunch sent in to him. Is it because I'm here? Doesn't he want to see me for some reason?

BAMIE. Dear Edith. I think he's afraid he wants to see you too much.

EDITH (after digesting this for a moment). I don't know whether to be flattered or heartbroken. I think all I really am is sad. And not only for myself. But for the whole world that he's forsaking.

(Teddy enters.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, Edith. Bamie.

BAMIE. Would you like some tea, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, thank you.

EDITH. I must be on my way.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Don't go, Edith. What I mean is—you're welcome to stay.

EDITH. Thank you, Teddy. But it's late.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well then, Bamie, perhaps you'll have Edith's carriage brought round.

BAMIE. Of course, Teddy.

(She goes.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Edith, once you told me I had to decide if I wanted to serve the world, myself, God, or my father.

EDITH. Imagine your remembering.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, at last I've decided. I want to serve them all.

EDITH. How can one man do that? Even you, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's very simple. You see, I must first determine what God would think, what the world would think, and what father would think. Then I'll know what I think. In any given situation, I take my time. Forgive me Edith, if I take my time.

EDITH. I have time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. By Godfrey, is it too late to accept that invitation for dinner?

EDITH. Of course not.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And perhaps you'll do me the honor of attending the Patriarchs' Ball on the 27th.

EDITH. Thank you, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And then there's the New Year's Ball the Astors are giving—

BAMIE (entering). Your carriage is here, Edith.

(Edith kisses Teddy's cheek and goes.)

EDITH. Do you know why I wrote this book, Bamie?

BAMIE. Out of the most beautiful of motives. You were so afraid Alice might fade away from you.

EDITH. I wanted this book to keep her alive. (After a moment.) But it doesn't do that, does it?

BAMIE. No, Teddy.

EDITH. Alice is dead.

BAMIE. Yes, dear. And it's time to go on.

EDITH. Do you remember how poor Muffie used to worry about slush in the streets. Of course, if the city had a decent street-cleaning service, there wouldn't be slush in the streets. But how can we have decent street cleaning when the head of the board of health is a thieving rascal.

BAMIE. Does slush come under the jurisdiction of the board of health?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Did you know he's been indicted? Mayor Grace wants me to take his place. And blast it, maybe I will.

BAMIE. Are you going back into public life, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I took a pledge never to return to public life, and I am not a man to break a pledge. No, Bamie. This time, I am going into public service.

BAMIE. What's the difference?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (sternly). Public service is public life with a conscience. It is both a calling and a career.

BAMIE. You don't have to make a speech at me, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Unpack those books for me, will you, Bamie? What would father say?

BAMIE. Well now, I'll have to think. First of all, I'm sure he'd call you Theodore—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What would he say, Bamie?

BAMIE. He'd say, "Well, Theodore, if you're determined to go into public service, I dare say one day you'll become President."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I suppose I shall.

(She laughs. He is severe.)

Is that funny?

BAMIE. You agreed so quickly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, by Godfrey, if I ever do become President, I'll bet I make a good one.

(He leaves the room, erupting into the world. Bamie begins putting the books back on the shelves as the camera pulls back.)

NARRATOR. A year later, in December of 1886, Theodore Roosevelt was married to Edith Carow. They had five beautiful and heroic children. His marriage was happy and complete. At the age of 43, he was the youngest man ever to become President of the United States.

(Cut to: The statue of Roosevelt at the Museum of Natural History in New York City.)

Orator, statesman, educator, naturalist, hunter, philanthropist, author, humanitarian. But the name of Alice Hathaway Lee Roosevelt was never spoken, or written, ever again. Only in his self-made heart did she remain. Forever young. Forever fair.

#### BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am gratified that the President's message concerning the balance-of-payments problem has demonstrated a full comprehension of that problem and the steps necessary to meet it. It would have been unrealistic to have expected him to offer any new and magic solutions.

With few exceptions, he has proposed to continue and expand the necessary corrective actions initiated by President Eisenhower.

Especially important was his emphasis upon the necessity of keeping America competitive in world markets. This will require restraint by both labor and management.

President Kennedy's firm grasp of these matters demonstrates his wisdom

in keeping Secretary Dillon as a link between the old and the new administration.

#### IMPORTANCE OF AIDING ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED AREAS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a matter I have spoken about on many previous occasions—the need for legislation specifically designed to aid economically distressed areas. Such legislation was passed by the 86th Congress, and the hopes of millions of our fellow Americans were stirred by this action. But their hopes, regrettably, were short lived—cut in their flourishing moment by the unjust knife of a Presidential veto.

But now, in this 87th Congress, these hopes have a right to be nurtured again—and fulfilled. And in connection with these hopes I would recall to my distinguished colleagues a few lines of apropos poetry penned by that profound, New England lady, Emily Dickinson:

We never know how high we are  
Till we are called to rise;  
And then, if we are true to plan,  
Our statures touch the skies.

Mr. President, I remember these lines because the eyes of millions of our fellow Americans are upon this 87th Congress, waiting to see "how high we are"—waiting anxiously and trustfully to see whether we have the stature to make it possible for them to reach for a paycheck instead of a handout.

The Americans I refer to are the chronic unemployed who, paradoxically, live in areas of great natural wealth—wealth which begs for exploitation by muscle and machine—but wealth which ironically lies untapped amid a sea of human despair. It lies there either for lack of the means by which it can be profitably converted for man's purposes, or because its profitable conversion is thwarted by economic circumstances which include thoughtless import policies.

This tremendous untapped or underdeveloped natural wealth, sitting as it does in areas of abysmal human poverty, reminds me of the words George Herbert penned centuries ago:

For the want of a nail the shoe is lost,  
for want of a shoe the horse is lost,  
for want of a horse the rider is lost.

Mr. President, it is for just such a "nail" that the people of our economically depressed areas look hopefully to this 87th Congress to supply. For once they have the "nail" it will become possible for them to "shoe" their rich natural resources and ride again toward a better, more productive, and satisfying life.

What is this "nail" they beseech us to supply? It is aid—enriching, repayable aid—not a handout. It is aid in the form of long-term, low-interest-rate loans; aid in the form of engineering and technical assistance; aid in research to develop new products and new uses for their abundant natural resources; aid in helping them to find new markets for their products; aid in building and improving roads to make better marketing conditions possible; aid in the construc-

tion of water storage basins for industrial and human consumption; and aid in curbing the kinds of thoughtless imports that have pounded and pummeled previously thriving industries into comatose conditions.

Why, one might ask, should the Federal Government concern itself in this matter? Aside from the Biblical admonition that we are our brother's keeper, there is a more pressing consideration which we cannot ignore: an economically healthy America—an America sturdy and strong in all of its national fibers—can remain forever the cathedral of hope for freemen everywhere. But can we expect this of an America with festering areas of economic sickness?

Why, one might also ask, cannot the individual States supply aid to their own areas of economic distress? For the most part the affected States are too poor themselves—poor because so many of their people and so much of their industry have been idle or partially employed over a long period of time. Yet, the affected States have done all they can do to help themselves and their people, many to the full measure of their capabilities. And I submit that they are continuing to use every medicant at their disposal to help their sick areas.

But one cannot tap a maple tree for sugary sap when its roots are embedded in dry, moistureless soil. One cannot expect States with economically distressed areas to be able to furnish the overall kinds of assistance these areas need.

My own State of West Virginia is a good case in point. It is an example of a sturdy, self-reliant people living in the midst of abundant natural wealth. Yet, tragically, my State has had a consistently higher record of unemployment over the past few years than any other State in the Union. In 1958, it had an unemployment rate of 10.4 against a national average of 6.1; in 1959, the rate was 8.3 against a national average of 4.4; and in 1960 the rate was 8.7 against a national rate of 4.9. Today, 295,665 people in my State, according to the latest report, who otherwise would starve, are receiving surplus Government food.

These figures do not truly reflect the whole picture. This is only half of the picture. The other half is underemployment. Today our operating coal mines are working on an average of 17 days a month. Our steel mills and metal fabricators are operating at about 50 percent of capacity; and our clay, pottery, and glass manufacturing plants are also operating at that low level.

Today, a major number of the cities and towns of my State are classified as labor surplus areas—Charleston, Huntington, Logan, Wheeling, Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Martinsburg, Morgantown, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant, Ronceverte, Welch, Williamson, and all of Mineral County. In addition, there are scores of smaller towns and hamlets which are equally bad off.

Can it be presumed, then, that a State so beset by so many areas of longstanding unemployment and underemployment can supply the needed where-

withal to aid its people in exploiting its untapped and underdeveloped natural resources? Obviously not. To ask the question is to answer it.

Even the fine financial institutions of my State cannot possibly meet the challenge confronting us. Only one bank in West Virginia has assets as high as \$80 million. The next largest bank has assets of approximately \$78 million. The next largest bank has assets of about \$74 million. The next two largest banks have assets of approximately \$70 million each. A total of 12 banks have assets of more than \$30 million, while all the rest have assets ranging from \$1 million to \$25 million. By comparison, I point out that any of the several major banks in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area have, individually, anywhere from two to three times the assets of the largest bank in West Virginia.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news story published in the Washington Evening Star of February 1, 1961, which gives the relative U.S. ranking of several banks in this area.

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

#### RIGGS NATIONAL KEEPS RELATIVE U.S. RANKING (By William A. Millen)

The American Banker, daily banking newspaper, said today the Riggs National Bank has maintained its relative position of No. 51 among the Nation's largest commercial banks. It had record deposits of \$517,166,676 at yearend.

The American Security & Trust Co., with \$355,371,318 in deposits, held its same relative rank of No. 85.

The National Bank of Washington, with \$285,999,791 in deposits, jumped six places to No. 108.

The Union Trust Co., with \$116,948,328, was placed No. 248 in the Nation's 300 biggest U.S. commercial banks.

The publication said the Suburban Trust Co., Hyattsville, Md., showed a sharp gain of 31 places with a new ranking of 171 on its yearend deposits of \$175,691,932.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point information from the 60th annual report of the commissioner of banking of the State of West Virginia showing the assets of State banks and the assets of National banks in West Virginia.

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

#### Reports of conditions of State banks and trust companies as of June 30, 1960

Bank:	Assets
Athens, Bank of Athens.....	\$1, 685, 615. 32
Barboursville, the First State Bank.....	1, 225, 932. 45
Beckley, Bank of Raleigh....	11, 378, 070. 66
Beckley, the Raleigh County Bank.....	15, 330, 428. 64
Belington, Belington Bank....	1, 845, 769. 63
Berwind, Berwind Bank....	375, 489. 76
Bluefield, the Commercial Bank of Bluefield.....	7, 329, 338. 61
Bridgeport, Bridgeport Bank.....	3, 098, 299. 20
Bruceton Mills, Bruceton Bank.....	1, 534, 600. 30
Buckhannon, Adrian Buckhannon Bank.....	5, 354, 558. 92

## Report of conditions of State banks and trust companies as of June 30, 1960—Con.

Bank:	Assets
Buffalo, the Buffalo Bank	\$2,166,235.83
Cairo, Farmers & Merchants Bank of Cairo	803,591.22
Charleston, Bank of West Virginia	9,458,725.04
Charleston, Kanawha Banking & Trust Co.	24,897,952.19
Charleston, the Kanawha Valley Bank	77,527,530.19
Charles Town, Bank of Charles Town	7,165,836.24
Charles Town, Peoples Bank of Charles Town	3,294,657.47
Clarksburg, the Lowndes Bank	13,998,126.53
Clay, Clay County Bank	2,926,415.75
Clendenin, Farmers & Citizens State Bank	2,848,425.19
Danville, the Bank of Danville	3,081,755.43
Dunbar, the Bank of Dunbar	6,549,675.74
East Rainelle, the Western Greenbrier Bank	3,444,595.69
Elizabeth, Wirt County Bank	2,171,835.17
Elkins, Davis Trust Co.	4,741,043.11
Fairmont, Community Savings Bank & Trust Co.	3,120,984.92
Fairview, the Bank of Wadestown	1,604,005.68
Follansbee, Bank of Follansbee	1,731,103.37
Follansbee, Citizens Bank of Follansbee	2,871,546.83
Franklin, Pendleton County Bank	2,537,900.86
Gassaway, Bank of Gassaway	2,690,612.32
Glenville, Kanawha Union Bank	4,256,457.93
Grantsville, the Calhoun County Bank	4,939,301.53
Greenville, Bank of Greenville	396,761.47
Harmon, the Stockmans Bank	809,252.05
Harrisville, the Union Bank of Harrisville	3,871,974.23
Hundred, Bank of Hundred	1,850,054.33
Huntington, Huntington Trust & Savings Bank	9,294,239.79
Huntington, the Security Bank of Huntington	3,132,382.74
Huntington, the Twentieth Street Bank	22,684,712.19
Hurricane, Putnam County Bank	3,700,073.86
Iaeger, the Bank of Iaeger	3,981,084.30
Keyser, Farmers & Merchants Bank	5,632,750.35
Lewisburg, Greenbrier Valley Bank	3,567,009.59
Lost Creek, the Harrison County Bank	1,764,121.69
Man, the Bank of Man	1,924,322.16
Mannington, First Exchange Bank	2,755,888.05
Marlinton, Bank of Marlinton	3,056,957.85
Martinsburg, Merchants & Farmers Bank	3,874,761.09
Martinsburg, the Peoples Trust Co.	5,449,683.87
McMechen, the Bank of McMechen	3,237,710.59
Middlebourne, Tyler County Bank	950,523.09
Mill Creek, Bank of Mill Creek	1,918,242.18
Milton, Bank of Milton	4,375,891.60
Morgantown, Farmers' & Merchants' Bank	12,460,651.52
Moundsville, Marshall County Bank	1,961,878.43

## Report of conditions of State banks and trust companies as of June 30, 1960—Con.

Bank:	Assets
Moundsville, Mercantile Banking & Trust Co.	\$6,469,902.65
Mount Hope, Bank of Mount Hope	3,832,637.41
Mullens, the Peoples Bank of Mullens	6,044,649.98
New Haven, Mason County Bank	2,651,885.89
New Martinsville, New Martinsville	2,190,817.74
Nitro, Bank of Nitro	3,920,444.04
Oak Hill, New River Banking & Trust Co.	4,589,756.09
Parkersburg, Commercial Banking and Trust Co.	11,253,185.36
Parkersburg, Union Trust & Deposit Co.	14,289,688.46
Parkersburg, Wood County Bank	12,719,145.35
Parsons, the Tucker County Bank	1,841,692.16
Pennsboro, the Community Bank	1,315,730.21
Petersburg, the Grant County Bank	3,261,398.78
Petersburg, Potomac Valley Bank	2,872,882.98
Pineville, the Castle Rock Bank of Pineville, Inc.	3,996,392.72
Princeton, Mercer County Bank	3,458,501.69
Princeton, Princeton Bank & Trust Company	13,513,737.97
Rainelle, the Bank of Rainelle	2,521,551.15
Ranson, Blakeley Bank & Trust Company	2,389,778.31
Ravenswood, Jackson County Bank	5,754,384.96
Ripley, Bank of Ripley	3,972,972.19
Romney, the Bank of Romney	3,571,012.41
Shepherdstown, Jefferson Security Bank	1,686,533.93
Shinnston, Bank of Shinnston	3,127,374.18
Sistersville, First-Tyler Bank & Trust Co.	4,528,404.53
South Charleston, the Chemical Bank & Trust Co.	3,249,332.60
Spencer, Traders Trust & Banking Co.	4,872,809.79
St. Albans, the Bank of St. Albans	7,160,967.10
St. Marys, the Pleasants County Bank	2,565,185.27
Farmers and Merchants Bank of Summersville	4,602,464.27
Summersville, Nicholas County Bank	3,960,767.11
Terra Alta, the Terra Alta Bank	1,221,583.73
Thomas, the Miners & Merchants Bank	1,325,821.07
Union, the Bank of Monroe	2,715,622.32
Walton, the Poca Valley Bank	1,133,974.82
War, the Bank of War	2,220,494.08
Wardensville, Capon Valley Bank	974,795.37
Wayne, Wayne County Bank	3,379,025.25
Weirton, Bank of Weirton	24,528,107.98
Weirton, the Peoples Bank	15,262,235.04
Wellsburg, Wellsburg Banking & Trust Co.	4,299,534.68
Weston, the Citizens Bank of Weston	8,458,087.92
West Union, West Union Bank	1,974,828.45
Wheeling, the Bank of Warwood	3,427,504.81
Wheeling, Half Dollar Trust & Savings Bank	15,255,998.03
Wheeling, Security Trust Co.	15,765,658.66

## Report of conditions of State banks and trust companies as of June 30, 1960—Con.

Bank:	Assets
Wheeling, South Wheeling Bank & Trust Co.	\$7,014,527.67
Wheeling, Wheeling Dollar Savings & Trust Co.	50,707,415.96
White Sulphur Springs, Bank of White Sulphur Springs	5,439,198.80
Whitesville, Whitesville State Bank	2,445,397.00

  

Reports of condition of national banks as of June 15, 1960	
Bank:	Total resources
Alderson, First National Bank	\$2,671,689.40
Ansted, the National Bank of Ansted	1,607,133.92
Beckley, Beckley National Bank	18,584,862.80
Berkeley Springs, Citizens National Bank of Berkeley Springs	3,078,799.11
Bluefield, First National Bank	32,045,303.92
Bluefield, Flat Top National Bank	15,751,242.89
Buckhannon, Central National Bank	7,988,323.50
Cameron, First National Bank	3,755,620.01
Ceredo, First National Bank	6,590,821.35
Charleston, Charleston National Bank	86,775,539.86
Charleston, City National Bank	6,815,931.93
Charleston, National Bank of Commerce	27,294,204.79
Clarksburg, Empire National Bank	24,483,931.16
Clarksburg, the Merchants National Bank	8,103,142.94
Clarksburg, Union National Bank	29,516,658.57
Davis, National Bank of Davis	1,390,321.36
Elkins, Citizens National Bank	7,269,409.01
Elkins, Tygarts Valley National Bank	3,499,665.81
Fairmont, City National Bank of Fairmont	8,434,520.00
Fairmont, First National Bank in Fairmont	21,397,145.49
Fayetteville, Fayette County National Bank	2,997,005.52
Gauley Bridge, Gauley National Bank	1,408,265.86
Grafton, First National Bank	5,876,779.78
Hamlin, Lincoln National Bank	5,367,732.69
Hinton, First National Bank	6,350,217.66
Hinton, National Bank of Summers	5,838,467.30
Huntington, First Huntington National Bank	67,014,986.08
Huntington, Guaranty National Bank	21,543,655.30
Kenova, First National Bank	2,528,815.93
Keyser, National Bank of Keyser	5,264,024.39
Keystone, First National Bank	5,554,968.84
Kingwood, Albright National Bank of Kingwood	5,618,043.29
Logan, National Bank of Logan	20,419,462.54
Madison, Boone National Bank	6,725,207.35
Marlinton, First National Bank in Marlinton	2,008,823.00
Martinsburg, Citizens National Bank	5,828,810.11

Reports of condition of national banks as of  
June 15, 1960—Continued

Bank:	Total resources
Martinsburg, Old National Bank	\$9,512,770.88
Matewan, Matewan National Bank	4,807,907.49
Monongah, the First National Bank	1,470,012.15
Montgomery, the Merchants National Bank	6,611,682.63
Montgomery, Montgomery National Bank	8,862,680.90
Moorefield, South Branch Valley National Bank	2,783,320.54
Morgantown, First National Bank	23,027,416.39
Moundsville, First National Bank	5,192,928.32
New Martinsville, First National Bank	8,281,051.85
Northfork, First Clark National Bank of Northfork	3,383,423.03
Oak Hill, Merchants & Miners National Bank	5,908,944.86
Parkersburg, Parkersburg National Bank	21,206,972.07
Parsons, First National Bank	1,412,868.01
Peterstown, First National Bank	1,449,986.13
Phillippi, First National Bank in Phillippi	5,192,730.30
Piedmont, First National Bank	4,467,938.30
Point Pleasant Citizens National Bank	5,889,287.71
Richwood, Cherry River National Bank	3,718,811.73
Ripley, First National Bank	5,720,376.96
Romney, First National Bank in Romney	2,017,951.24
Ronceverte, First National Bank	3,336,529.87
Rowlesburg, Peoples National Bank	1,501,173.10
St. Marys, the First National Bank	3,783,137.36
Salem, First National Bank at Salem	1,975,480.34
Sistersville, Union National Bank of Sistersville	3,132,702.09
South Charleston, First National Bank	11,519,949.03
Spencer, First National Bank	4,952,253.15
Sutton, Home National Bank	3,615,979.29
Terra Alta, First National Bank	1,559,702.07
Vienna, Ohio Valley National Bank	3,987,754.14
Webster Springs, Webster Springs National Bank	2,359,783.79
Welch, McDowell County National Bank	18,076,456.21
Wellsburg, Wellsburg National Bank	3,695,376.65
Weston, Weston National Bank	5,191,252.03
West Union, First National Bank	1,411,508.24
Wheeling, First National Bank & Trust Co.	7,094,631.79
Wheeling, National Bank of West Virginia	17,399,035.68
Williamson, First National Bank	9,046,315.87
Williamson, National Bank of Commerce	8,107,153.03
Williamson, Farmers & Mechanics National Bank	1,586,624.38

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I have stated before, Mr. President, the people of West Virginia are sturdy and self-reliant. They are the kind of peo-

ple who pay homage to the words penned by Thomas Dekker more than 300 years ago:

Man was not created to be an idle fellow; he was not set in this universal orchard to stand still as a tree.

My people are tired of standing in idleness—of viewing the gauntness of their own shadows amid immense natural wealth. All they want is opportunity—opportunity to do the productive labor they know they can do, and for which they have been trained. This opportunity can come to them through the means of long-term, low-interest-rate loans and other kinds of assistance—assistance which only the Federal Government can afford them.

Mr. President, let me picture for Senators the towns of Davis and Thomas in West Virginia—adjacent towns which once had about 15 active coal mines in their immediate vicinities. I was in those two towns yesterday. I was told by town leaders that 37 percent of the total population has left the county of Tucker, in which those two towns are located, in the last 10 years. I thought of the children I saw one day a couple of years ago, marching down the street, participating in high school band activities. One of the store owners, as he stood outside his establishment, almost tearfully pointed out to me that the young people of the town were leaving, that there was nothing to keep them, nothing upon which they could pin their hopes for the future. I thought of the Pied Piper of Hamelin—how, when he went away, he took the children of the community with him, and how they never returned.

There are many towns and communities in West Virginia which have experienced the same sad story we heard a long time ago in the Pied Piper of Hamelin.

Mr. President, today none of these mines in the Davis and Thomas area is functioning or fully functioning. As a result, these two towns are economically distressed. Yet, one small functioning modern mine producing, say, 350,000 tons of coal a year at a rate of 2,500 tons per man per year, would give employment to approximately 140 or 150 men in these towns, plus employment made available to people in auxiliary services.

But to develop one such new mine in the Davis and Thomas area and to equip it with new and efficient machinery of the new and smaller kinds only recently developed would require an investment of approximately \$1 million. For about \$1 million, some of the vigor of the towns of Davis and Thomas can be renewed. In short, for the want of a nail, the shoe is lost.

What is true of the Davis and Thomas areas is equally true of many other areas in my State. A little bit of low-interest capital here and there would mean an end to much human idleness and despair.

Let me, however, draw still another picture of what long-term, low-interest-rate loans can mean to the people of West Virginia. My State has been

blessed by nature with 100 separate seams of coal—black gold, as it is sometimes called. Of these, only 41 are of minable thickness. At present, production is obtained from only 30 of these seams. This production, almost 118 million tons in 1959, came from 1,601 mines. But of this number of mines, more than 50 percent were diggings operated by from 2 to 14 men—men used to vicissitudes but not easily dejected—men who pooled their meager resources to pay the required \$10 mining license fee and buy needed picks and shovels.

When it is realized that West Virginia is the most important bituminous coal-producing State in the Union, and that many of its coal seams are of exceptional quality, then one cannot fail to recognize the economic importance of these 2- to 14-man small mines—almost 900 in number. Over 10,000 people are employed in such small-mine operations in my State, and their daily coal production is roughly estimated to be about 130,000 tons.

The Department of Mines in my State, fully cognizant of the old proverb that mighty oaks from little acorns grow, has sponsored a technical assistance program for these small mines. This program has been helpful, but the operator of a small mine still feels like a man trying to bat a ball with one hand tied behind his back. He is still without the capital he needs with which to purchase the kinds of machinery and equipment that would make his mine a truly productive enterprise and a realistically profitable one.

Where can the small mine operator get the needed capital? In most instances he has no substantive equity to pledge. Few banks lend venture capital on the promise of ceaseless labor and sweat, no matter how prospectively rich the mined seam of coal may be. Yet, what better way can we foster and promote free enterprise than by finding a way of providing at least an important portion of the needed capital?

Give the bee pollen and it will make honey. Give the small entrepreneur the capital he needs and he will create wealth—the kinds of wealth that can transform our areas of chronic unemployment and underemployment into areas of job opportunities and business activity, the kinds of wealth that will enable millions of our working Americans to purchase the products and services created by the labors of millions of other Americans. In short, as we stimulate the economy of every currently depressed area, we also stimulate better economic conditions throughout the length and breadth of our land.

But a necessary handmaiden to long-term, low-interest-rate loans is research—research to find new products and new uses to which we can put our great natural wealth. Today, for example, if my State's 900 small mines were as highly productive as our 700 medium and large mines, my State would be producing coal without enough markets to consume the production. Thus, one can readily see that any Federal program to aid depressed areas should incorporate a comprehensive research program, perhaps

in cooperation with the affected States, the affected industries and the affected labor organizations.

Insofar as coal is concerned, some research has been and is being done to find new markets and to renew lost markets. The program, however, has been a meager one despite the stimulation given to it through the Coal Research and Development Act passed by the 86th Congress. My colleagues of the 87th Congress will have to determine whether the competent administration of this act requires the enriching blood of enlarged appropriations. Certainly, research, which has thrust us into the space age, can find many new potentialities in this wonderful, though mysterious and complex mineral we know as coal.

But when we consider legislation to aid our depressed areas, we should also examine the dark cloud that hangs over them in the form of cheaply produced imports. It would be wasteful to spend money and effort to rehabilitate our depressed areas only to have all of our good works washed away by the menacing flood of such imports.

Take, for example, the flow of imports of residual fuel oil and the consequent displacement of domestically produced fuel and energy. No other coal-producing State has been so adversely affected by the level of such imports as has West Virginia. Each year, in lost wages to coal miners, the cost of such imports is estimated to be around \$145 million to my State alone. But more than that, there is the additional loss of countless millions of dollars in profits and wages to the railroad industry and to other industries.

Today, even under a quota system of imports, foreign residual fuel oil unloaded in our country is equivalent to 30,642,000 tons of coal per year. In terms of lost labor for our miners, based on a national average of approximately 12 tons of coal production per man per day, the loss is 2,553,500 man-days of work.

West Virginia ranks second in the Nation as a glass producer. My State also boasts the world's largest plate glass factory, located in Charleston. But because of an upward trend in flat glass imports, this vital industry is economically sick. In the Morgantown area alone, one of the leading glassmaking regions of my State, three glass manufacturing plants have shut down in the past several years due to the unequal competition of cheaply paid, foreign labor produced glass imports.

In the early 1950's a thousand workers were employed in Morgantown's glass factories. Currently, employment is down to less than 600. And those who are fortunate enough to have jobs are now employed only 2 or 3 days a week.

The growing level of imports has also adversely affected the clay and pottery industries of my State, causing islands of unemployment in many of the cities and towns. The idle people of these communities are rightfully resentful that little or nothing is being done to curtail the kinds of imports that throw them out of work.

We worry about the flow of gold reserves, and a Presidential mission is sent

abroad to see what can be done about the situation. But the real rascal causing our gold outflow is seldom spoken of—the imports for which we have to pay in gold—the imports which are not only the real drain on our gold reserves, but a drain as well on the resources of our fellow Americans—the imports which are casting them out of jobs and forcing them to live on Federal handouts of surplus food packages. This is a situation too intimately connected with the economic distress of many of our communities to be ignored. It is a situation to which we must address ourselves with utmost speed. We must take the bull by the horns and curb the importation of such foreign products which directly affect the economic well-being of any American community. In all good conscience we cannot do otherwise.

There are other important facets which we must consider when planning for the revitalization of our depressed areas, and one of these is highway construction and highway improvement. Good roads have a direct bearing on the economic health of an area, on its potential to produce and to trade. In this connection, a wag once said about my State, "It's difficult to get into it and almost impossible to get out of it." He was referring, of course, to the fact that there are almost no modern highways leading into West Virginia. And perhaps this is one of several good reasons why the State of West Virginia has been suffering a general economic decline.

For example, there is not a single good road up the Monongahela Valley from the Pittsburgh industrial complex to the Morgantown-Fairmont-Clarksburg area of West Virginia. There is not a single good highway leading into the northern part of my State—potentially one of the finest recreational areas in the United States. In fact, in this age of increasing highway transportation, the roads in West Virginia are at least 30 years behind in time.

Yet the people of my State are carrying a very heavy long-term bonded indebtedness on road construction—so heavy, in fact, that it is almost impossible for the State to plan very much new highway construction. In addition, because of the mountainous topography of much of my State, the cost per mile of construction is much above average. The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads estimates that on a national average it costs 150 percent more to build a road in West Virginia than elsewhere in the country.

The roadbuilding problem of my State is further complicated by the vast areas of nonproductive and subproductive land. The few settlers in these areas cannot pay for the required roads. Yet these nonproductive and subproductive areas are among those which are especially well suited for recreational purposes if they are made accessible to the general public.

Thus, a federally aided roadbuilding program must become an integral part of any effort to revitalize the kinds of depressed areas such as those in West Virginia. Such an action would not only open these areas to economic opportunities, but would serve the immediate

purpose of putting many idle people to work. We can accomplish this action by amending the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, as amended, to permit additional apportionment of funds for road construction in nonproductive and subproductive land areas.

As we examine the many things we must do to revitalize our economically sick communities, one which we must not overlook is that of accelerating and expanding the Federal-State pollution abatement program to improve water quality and supply. We must do this not only for public health purposes, but also for the purpose of encouraging industrialization as well. The present lack of good water in many of our depressed communities is an economic handicap of the first magnitude. An example of this is related in a recent report of the Tug Valley Chamber of Commerce, located in Williamson, W. Va. This report declares:

Recent investigations by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in our area have revealed that we do not possess a satisfactory supply of industrial water resource for any type of industry which would require some. In fact, there are a few cases in which we have been completely eliminated from consideration for an industrial location, because we did not have an adequate water supply to offer industrial clients.

This report, from which I have quoted, goes on to call the nearby Tug River a disgrace, and it says of the adjacent Guyan River that it is a mass of black, filthy liquid, too thick with impurities for fish to live in, and too impure for human utilization.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that the area referred to in this report by the Tug Valley Chamber of Commerce is one of the worst economically distressed areas in the United States. The city of Williamson, W. Va., and its immediate vicinity, has lost 23.1 percent of its population since 1950, because of its economic plight. Mingo County, which embraces Williamson, has a total population, according to latest census figures, of 39,318 people. Yet of this total, almost 5,000 employable people are unemployed, and about 41 percent of the population are eligible for surplus food.

In the face of this area's dire economic hardship, when it had opportunities for economic recovery through the location of new industries, its polluted waters defeat it. Can there be a more piercing reason for expanding the Federal participation in water pollution abatement?

At present, one small federally aided program for water pollution abatement is partially underway in Williamson—I say partially underway because the city is having some difficulty in raising its required share of the expense. Only 30 percent of the cost is met by the Federal Government. This imbalance and its attending hardship on a depressed community speak eloquently of the need for close examination of the Federal pollution abatement program as it may relate to an economically distressed area.

First off, we must recognize water pollution as an adverse economic condition—a condition which makes economic recovery on the part of a depressed area

extremely difficult. Then we should consider the realistics of such situations by increasing Federal participation—say by switching the current ratio of 30-70 to 70-30 or even 75-25 for depressed areas. Such action would not be a handout, for over the years the beneficial results would mean greater tax revenues accruing to the Federal Government.

Still another facet of the overall problem of aiding our depressed areas lies in the plight of education and the educational systems of these areas. Not only are they suffering a loss of qualified teachers, a steady deterioration of their school buildings and a lack of funds to build additionally needed classrooms, but they are also suffering the loss of student morale—student interest. Sadly enough, in these areas of severe economic hardship, growing numbers of students are becoming disenchanted with education because they do not see how education, in the face of longtime economic suffering on the part of their parents, can bring them job opportunities. They have seen the educated and the uneducated standing alike in line for surplus food packages, and they question whether going to school is worth such inglorious equality.

In West Virginia, the educational process is in an extreme crisis. We have 1,242 schoolrooms to replace because of obsolescence and dilapidation, as well as 680 new rooms to build to take care of excess student population. We have 1,316 students attending half-day school sessions. Approximately 85 percent of our rural schoolteachers are unqualified to teach because our local school districts have no alternative but to hire untrained teachers. Our qualified teachers are leaving the State at every opportunity because their average pay is \$3,980 per year against a national teacher pay average of \$5,215 per year.

My State ranks 43d out of 50 in educational expenditure per pupil—\$240 against a national average of \$369. Of the students entering the ninth grade in West Virginia, only 61 percent remain in school to graduate. The national average is 65.7 percent. But the picture is blacker regarding those who do stay in high school and graduate. Only 25 percent of them go on to college against a national average of 52 percent.

In the face of this distressing picture of education in West Virginia, the challenge before us must forge immediate action to furnish Federal aid to school systems in areas of economic depression. We must act to make funds available for school construction in terms which will not further burden such areas, and we must assist them in reaching pay levels for their teachers which will keep them from leaving the State for greener pastures.

In the space age, and in the competitive struggle with Russia for the minds of men, and for our own future security and freedom, we cannot afford the luxury of masses of poorly educated or undereducated children. Whatever the price we must pay for good education, the cost is cheap enough.

Mr. President, in taking inventory of the measures we must enact if we are to rescue our depressed areas from the economic morass in which they find themselves, I would call attention to the Youth Conservation Act introduced in the 86th Congress by my distinguished colleague, Senator HUMPHREY. The purpose of this act was to provide healthful training and employment opportunities for young men—employment in conservation work, and in the development of our natural resources.

Unfortunately, this inspired piece of proposed legislation never became the law of the land. I say "unfortunately" because almost 3 years have passed since the senior Senator from Minnesota introduced this measure in the 86th Congress, in May 1958. The 3 years that have passed since that date are lost years—lost not only in time, but also in the use to which they could have been put in helping reshape the idle and frustrated lives of many unemployed young men.

Now more than ever, the urgent need for passage of such legislation is before us. Now more than ever, as we seek ways to give new life to depressed areas, the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps becomes a primary task. I say this because today depressed areas are losing their young people—their future, if you will—in ominous numbers. The older people see their blood of tomorrow flow away to areas of economic opportunity. And this flow, if not induced to stop, can only compound the difficulties facing long-term rejuvenation of distressed areas.

A Youth Conservation Corps can help young people to stay within areas adjacent to their homes—keeping them busy with reforestation work, with construction of camping and vacation facilities in our national parks; with the development of roads and trails through these parks, with the improvement of scenic splendors within park areas. Such a Conservation Corps would mean jingling money in the pockets of our idle young people, instead of sullen or careless thoughts in their heads.

To the depressed areas, not only will a Youth Corps mean the infusion of new money into their economies, but also the bolstering of their long-term economic prospects through new and improved tourist and vacationist facilities and attractions. The American tourist dollar has been an important factor in aiding the recovery of distressed European countries. In 1959, the latest year for which figures are available from the U.S. Department of Commerce, American tourists and vacationists spent \$2.4 billion in foreign countries. If a greater part of this money could be attracted to our own vacation areas, it would make well worth whatever we expend to make such areas desirable places to visit.

In this connection, the establishment of additional national parks and monuments, and the acquisition of more land for existing ones, is another positive step we can take to aid our depressed areas. For example, there is every reason to believe that the extension of, say, the Monongahela National Forest into

south-central and southwestern West Virginia, or the extension of Harpers Ferry National Monument into the northeastern counties of my State, would be immediately beneficial to the people in those regions. Not only would such extensions bring tourist and vacationist dollars to those areas, but work opportunities as well through the National Park Service.

Mr. President, each of the needs I have briefly outlined are indelibly related to the revitalization of our depressed areas. Together, they are a ladder upon which the people in these areas can climb out of the well of economic hardship and onto a plateau of well-being. We cannot leave out any rungs in this ladder. For this reason, it would be well for us to petition all departments, their agencies and bureaus, and all the independent agencies and commissions, to be mindful of our depressed areas and to seek within themselves for ways and means of aiding those areas.

Shakespeare has said:

The miserable hath no other medicine but only hope.

But if hope is a medicine, let us fill the necessary prescription with the best possible ingredients.

For many years now, this country of ours has been an angel of aid to the economically sick countries of the world, unselfishly expending our fortunes on them in earnest concern for their well-being. But the time has come now for this angel to look homeward—to show the same kind of earnest concern for its own economically sick areas. The 86th Congress showed great virtue in this respect. Nothing less can be expected of the 87th Congress.

#### RETREAT FROM FREEDOM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as a lawyer with a high respect for the judicial process, and as a legislator strongly conscious of the separation of powers of our governmental structure, I hesitate even to allude to a Supreme Court decision, much less criticize one.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, in commenting on what promises to be a historic opinion, I find myself in rather eminent company—the Chief Justice of the United States, who is one of America's most preeminent citizens and a former great California chief executive; three other esteemed members of the Supreme Court; and innumerable writers, commentators, and editors of leading newspapers—all of whom dissent from the 5-to-4 decision in the Chicago censorship case—Times Film Corporation, Petitioner against City of Chicago, et al.—which the Court handed down on January 23.

This case involved the constitutionality of a city of Chicago ordinance which makes the police commissioner—and on appeal, the mayor—the censor and licensing authority over all motion picture film prior to its public exhibition in that city. In this 5-to-4 decision the Court sustained the constitutionality of this form of censorship and for the first time in our Republic sanctioned the doctrine of prior restraint.

I wholeheartedly concur with Chief Justice Warren, who, for the four dissenters, in a scholarly, heavily documented, and sharply worded opinion, stated:

I cannot agree with either the conclusion reached by the Court or with the reasons advanced for its support. To me, this case clearly presents the question of our approval of unlimited censorship of motion pictures before exhibition through a system of administrative licensing. Moreover, the decision presents a real danger of eventual censorship for every form of communication, be it newspapers, journals, books, magazines, television, radio or public speeches. The Court purports to leave these questions for another day, but I am aware of no constitutional principle which permits us to hold that the communication of ideas through one medium may be censored while other media are immune. Of course, each medium presents its own peculiar problems, but they are not of the kind which would authorize the censorship of one form of communication and not the others. I submit that in arriving at its decision the Court has interpreted our cases contrary to the intention at the time of their rendition and, in exalting the censor of motion pictures, has endangered the 1st and 14th amendment rights of all others engaged in the dissemination of ideas.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the American constitutional tradition of freedom has correctly recognized that no one has sufficient wisdom nor the right to say in advance what another may publish, paint, produce, exhibit, or say. As the New York Times observes:

If the movie, or the printed sheet, is obscene or slanderous or otherwise impermissible under the statutes, its distribution ought to be blocked after its appearance in accordance with already approved legal procedure.

This fact is emphasized forcefully in editorials in the January 25, 1961, issues of the New York Times, Washington Post, and Los Angeles Mirror, as well as the magazine Broadcasting for January 30, 1961, and the Commonweal, one of America's leading religious weeklies, for February 10, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1961]

#### RETREAT FROM FREEDOM

By the narrowest possible majority the Supreme Court has endorsed the right of local authorities to impose prior administrative censorship on the movies. In this 5 to 4 decision we think the minority, headed by Chief Justice Warren, took the sounder view and the one that in the long run will prevail.

In saying this, we hold no brief for an industry that has churned forth—alongside many admirable productions—a stream of sex-crammed, crime-strewn motion pictures pandering to lascivious instincts and degraded tastes. In its grasp for the box office, the industry has called down on its own head the demand for censorship now heard so widely. One could almost say it deserves what it gets.

But one cannot say this if one has regard for the most fundamental principles of freedom that far outweigh in importance the faults of the movie industry. Such principles are freedom of speech and freedom from prior censorship. The Supreme Court itself held in the *Miracle* case in 1952 that

"expression by means of motion pictures is included within the free speech and free press guarantee of the 1st and 14th amendments." Since then it has repeatedly limited the authority of censorship boards.

But in the present case it was asked for the broadest possible ruling against arbitrary and prior censorship. We regret that it did not give such a ruling; for in our view it is as potentially dangerous for any board to prevent a film from being shown in the first instance as it would be to prevent a handbill or book or newspaper from being printed. If the movie, or the printed sheet, is obscene or slanderous or otherwise impermissible under the statutes, its distribution ought to be blocked after its appearance in accordance with already approved legal procedure.

In 1957 the Supreme Court upheld the Government's right to act against obscenity, and also the right of a city (New York) to obtain an injunction against distribution. But the difference between those rulings and this one is that they involved court action; this involves administrative fiat. In those cases the burden was on the State to attack the publication; in this it is on the producer or distributor to seek permission, which may be rejected without cause. There is a world of difference.

We do not believe that any administrative body should have the right thus to stop a publication or a film before its appearance. Prior censorship leads too easily to the stultification of ideas. But absence of censorship does not imply absence of responsibility.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1961]

#### THE CURTAIN FALLS

It is hard to foresee the extent of the baleful consequences which may flow from the Supreme Court's sudden and inexplicable enthronement of censorship in a 5-4 decision on Monday. The majority, speaking through Mr. Justice Clark, says in the *Times Film Corp.* case that "we are dealing only with motion pictures." But if the majority is right in its astigmatic view of the first amendment, what it says can be applied with equal logic to every other form of expression—the theater, television, books, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers.

Today, no more than four States and a handful of cities permit censors to decide what their citizens may see in motion picture theaters. But who can foretell how far repression in the name of morality will be extended now that the Court has licensed it? Hollywood, banal enough in much of what it produces anyhow may now be even more governed by Comstockery and Grundyism.

The case before the Court involved a film known as *Don Juan*—a cinematic rendition of Mozart's opera, *Don Giovanni*. In Chicago, a film can be exhibited to the public only if it can win prior approval by the police commissioner or some underling connoisseur of the arts designated by him. The exhibitors of *Don Juan* sought a permit without submitting their film for inspection, were denied it and sued for injunctive relief. It would be hard to invent a clearer case of prior restraint—censorship in its blackest and most blatant form.

Freedom from prior restraints on expression was achieved in England with the abandonment of licensing in the 18th century even before the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. The first amendment to the Constitution established that freedom as fundamental law for Americans—and went beyond it to give expression an unprecedentedly privileged and protected position in the new world. It was this protection and privilege accorded to speech and to the press that constituted, as James Madison put, "the essential difference between the British Government and the American Constitution."

The founders of the American Republic were determined that here expression should be unfettered by any official regulation; and they were willing, for the sake of the great benefits to be derived from this freedom, to undergo the risks involved in giving wide latitude to silly, salacious, and even seditious utterances. If they did not mean expression to be absolutely free, they meant at least to insure it the largest practicable freedom; they meant it to be punishable, if at all, only upon a due process trial and not at the whim of some petty official.

[From the Los Angeles Mirror, Jan. 25, 1961]

#### HOLD BACK THE MOVIE CENSORS

There's real danger to our freedom of expression in the Supreme Court's ruling on censorship of movies.

The test case involved only movies. The film company claimed the right to show anything, subject only to local obscenity laws.

The Court said that was claiming too much under the Constitution.

But Chief Justice Warren foresaw a threat of censorship over every form of communication.

The danger is that censors may run wild, demanding prior examination of other media before showing or publication.

It's time for caution. The Court's ruling was no *carte blanche* for every State and municipality to set up censorship laws.

The target of the would-be censor is not confined to material which some would consider obscene.

Fanatics of every shade attempt to strangle political expression when it disagrees with their ideas.

Let some of these persons gain control of a censorship post and we lose our freedom. They mean well. Most censors do.

The main concern of the moment is that the 4 States with well-intentioned censorship laws not be joined by the other 46.

The four should repeal theirs.

[From Broadcasting, Jan. 30, 1961]

#### SPECTER OF CENSORSHIP

It is not improbable that broadcasters, along with all media, will someday find themselves suffering under censorship that is traceable to a decision reached by the U.S. Supreme Court last week.

By the narrowest of majorities—5 to 4—the Court upheld the constitutionality of motion-picture censorship. Broadcasters can take small comfort in the observation of the majority that the decision applied to no media other than movies. As the minority said, in an eloquent dissent written by Chief Justice Earl Warren, "the decision presents a real danger of eventual censorship for every form of communication, be it newspapers, journals, books, magazines, television, radio, or public speeches."

Of all the endangered media, television and radio, it seems to us, are the most vulnerable. They alone are already licensed by the Federal Government and their performance already subjected to periodic review. It is not an impassable distance from Supreme Court approval of local censorship, as in the Chicago case decided last week, and an assertion by the FCC of authority over broadcast programming. The Chicago city government claims the right to censor movies on the grounds of protecting the public interest. It is in the public interest that broadcasting is regulated by the FCC.

Last week's Supreme Court decision is the more ominous for broadcasting because of the prevailing mood of the new administration. James M. Landis, the President's overseer of administrative agencies, has repeatedly said that the FCC ought to exert stronger control over programming. Newton Minow, the FCC Chairman to be, has expressed similar views. We imagine that by

now both have committed the Supreme Court's majority opinion to memory.

Do we seem unnecessarily alarmed? Four distinguished members of the Court took this minority view:

"Let it be completely clear what the Court's decision does. It gives official license to the censor, approving a grant of power to city officials to prevent the showing of any moving picture these officials deem unworthy of a license."

The question under consideration, the minority said, applies to "any city, any State, or the Federal Government."

Do broadcasters need a rallying cry to arouse their interest in this subject? Here is what Justice Douglas wrote in a separate dissent in which the other dissenters concurred:

"The first amendment was designed to enlarge, not to limit, freedom in literature and in the arts, as well as in politics, economics, law, and other fields. Its aim was to unlock all ideas for argument, debate, and dissemination. No more potent force in defeat of that freedom could be designed than censorship. It is a weapon that no minority or majority group, acting through government, should be allowed to wield over any of us."

To read the dissenting opinions is to be convinced that the majority decision runs counter to the benchmark cases of the past. Clearly there will be chance for reappraisal by the Court. When that chance will come or how cannot now be known. But broadcasters must do what they can to make it come as soon as possible.

The Motion Picture Association of America has already announced its intention to seek some kind of relief from the decision of last week. It would be to the benefit of broadcasting if the NAB at least conferred with the movie group to explore ways of joining forces.

#### SCOTUS CENSORSHIP DILEMMA

Because of dire consequences that could ensue from Supreme Court decision in motion-picture censorship case, publishing interests are strongly urging petition for reconsideration by losing Times Film Corp. While chances of Supreme Court reconsideration usually are remote, attorneys feel that in light of sharply divided Court (5 to 4) and strength of dissenting opinions, reconsideration might be entertained.

First to urge immediate petition to rehear was American Book Publishers Council, Inc., which indicated it would support this move *amicus curiae* (as friend of Court). American Newspaper Publishers Association likewise was being impetioned to lend its support, and it was learned Friday that strong segments among broadcasters favor *amicus curiae* participation through NAB in light of precedent-shattering opinion which would invoke censorship "before the fact." NAB board session in Palm Springs, Calif., February 8 to 10, will consider participation.

[From the Commonweal]  
FREE SPEECH AND MOVIES

Censorship is a very delicate and difficult business, and it is not helped by the extremists on both sides—those who think that every piece of obscenity published is a blow struck for freedom and the vigilantes who would ban first and ask questions afterward. As Justice Clark noted, every city has "the duty to protect its people against the dangers of obscenity in the public exhibition of motion pictures." But the steps taken to protect the people against the evil of obscenity must not bring about the danger of a worse evil—the loss of the precious and perishable commodity of free speech—and this is the danger which the dissenting opinion discusses. Weighing the evils and the dangers in the question of prior film censor-

ship, we would have to align ourselves with the dissenters.

We think Chief Justice Warren is on strong ground when he points out that the majority opinion gives no explanation for its special treatment of movies among all the various communications media. In 1952, it must be remembered, the Supreme Court ruled in the *Miracle* case that moving pictures were covered by the guarantees of free speech and free press in the 1st and 14th amendments.

The argument that movies are somehow specially censorable—even though prior censorship of all other media is unconstitutional—we find unconvincing. The mass audience, the vividness of the communication, the tender age of those exposed to movies—all these conditions are met, to a greater or lesser degree, by other forms of modern communication. As the minority opinion asked, why should movies be singled out for government censorship by a society which fears and abhors state-controlled press or radio or communications systems generally?

As for the danger of removing precensorship from movies altogether, we can only say that it is a danger to be faced. It might be, as Justice Clark charged, that without prior censorship any and every kind of film could be shown at least once. But if law-enforcement officials are prompt and conscientious in arresting and prosecuting those who exhibit obscene films this danger is not likely to be great.

Even more important, such a procedure puts the burden of proof not on the individual, as does the system of prior licensing, but on the State, which is where this burden belongs. Any conflict between the State and a citizen is an unequal one by definition, since the State has virtually limitless resources of funds, personnel and equipment in its police and legal agencies. Nowadays especially, one would think, our concern would not be to strengthen the already vast powers of government but to safeguard the rights of the individual citizen who for one reason or another arouses the displeasure of the governmental colossus.

It is, we think, unreasonable and unjust to put restraints on individual freedom because of what the individual might do, and particularly in the extrasensitive area of free speech and free communication. With Justice Warren and the other dissenters, we fear that the power to withhold a license from a film—or a book or anything else—without the necessity to show cause or even to give a reason, is not in the best interests of a healthy democracy. We are surprised at the inconsistency of the many avowed champions of individual rights who are hailing this latest Court decision. What they are now cheering, it seems to us, is tighter state control of the very lifeline of the democracy they cherish.

#### HOUSING COSTS FOR THE AGED ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the *Washington Post* for Sunday, January 8, 1961, published an article disclosing a situation sadly prevalent among too large a proportion of our senior citizens. It is a story which far too often is told to me by elderly correspondents, both from my own State and from the District. It reveals a situation which, in common humanity, ought to be corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I refer be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*.

#### FLIGHT OF MAN, 84, POSES CASE FOR TALKS ON AGING

A retired District grocer typifies the problems which delegates to the White House Conference on the Aging will debate when they gather here next week.

The 84-year-old man lives on public assistance payments of \$87 a month. After he has paid his \$60 monthly room rent, he has less than \$1 a day for the rest of his needs.

On this sum, or a little more or less, he has somehow been existing for 20 years since he lost his grocery store in a legal dispute.

#### HEALTH PROBLEM INCREASES

Now his health is failing.

He lives in a large room with little kitchen in a tidy apartment house on a quiet street. There are few personal things in the room, but it is immaculate. The door to the hallway is left ajar, so that the sounds of people in the elevator may take the edge off his loneliness.

He has no wife or relatives and the friends of good times have slowly left him as bad times came.

Before December, he lived in a \$70 room. His rent allowance from public assistance was \$36. But since he was eating in restaurants, his food, clothing, and incidentals allowance was \$60. By skimping on food and getting a little help from his church, he managed.

But the public assistance division told him he was paying too much for a place without cooking facilities and even too much for one with them. He looked about and found his present lodgings.

#### FOOD ALLOWANCE DROPS

Since he could cook in his new and cheaper quarters, he learned that his rent allowance would rise \$11 but his food and clothing allowance would drop \$14. His move had cost him \$3.

Medicine bottles and boxes are neatly stacked on a little table in his room. A rosary lies next to them, and a half-empty bag of peanuts. The refrigerator contains only bread.

"I've been living on bread," he says. "I have a kitchen now, but what can I buy to cook? And how can I do my laundry and have my hair cut?"

"I can't find any cheaper place. Now I just wait for the end."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is simple dignity and infinite pathos in that concluding remark:

I can't find any cheaper place. Now I just wait for the end.

It is a terrible indictment of the failure of our society to find a solution to a problem which touches upon a large number of our elderly citizens. Decent, safe, and comfortable housing for the aged, at a cost within their means, should not be an unreachable goal. It can be had without too large a drain upon the public resources. It is my hope that the delegates to the White House Conference on the Aging will give strong support to programs designed to meet this need.

There is, however, a method of approaching this particular problem locally and in part, available to us. What is needed is a changed attitude upon the part of our welfare officials to the pressing human needs they are called upon to meet. Such a changed attitude, however, cannot be expected until and unless the rules and regulations governing the granting of public assistance are changed. In the District of Columbia—and I am sure that the situation is the

same in many other communities—there is a policy, binding upon case-workers, restricting the amount which can be permitted in the relief budget for the payment of rent to a flat maximum amount. The shelter allowance in the District for a single person receiving old-age assistance, where cooking facilities are provided, is \$36 for rent, \$6 for fuel, \$3 for utilities, and \$2 for refrigeration—a total of \$47 a month. This shelter allowance is based upon a regulation which provides that actual costs up to a maximum can be allowed. The \$47 a month shelter allowance has been unchanged since the date of its inception on July 1, 1953. Seven and one-half years have brought increased costs in rent in the District, since that time; and the older people are not exempt from this process. It is high time, in my judgment, for a revision of the budget standards to be made. I would suggest to the Public Assistance Advisory Council and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that they take a good look at this situation, in order to determine what changes are needed, and, where justified, to make the needed changes.

Mr. President, in Proverbs 28, verse 27, we are told:

He that giveth unto the poor shall not lack: but he that hideth his eyes shall have many a curse.

We have no excuse for hiding our eyes, for we have a duty and a responsibility to men and women in the public charge in their declining years.

#### TRIBUTE TO SELMA BORCHARDT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 7, 1961, contained a news story worthy of more than passing comment. It concerned the tribute paid to a dedicated educator upon the occasion of her retirement from the school system of the District of Columbia.

Selma Borchardt, a lawyer in her own right, as well as a teacher, is known to those of us who have served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, as a great woman of untiring energy, wholly dedicated to the upholding and advancement of educational values. In every issue affecting the teaching profession she has been in the forefront of those who sought to convince and persuade the Congress of the desirability of the legislation she advocated. Although she has earned many honors, in my judgment, the accolade given her by her colleagues, through her election to important posts in the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, was for her most precious, since it provided an opportunity for service to all teachers.

Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Public Education Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee, through hearing her testimony upon a great many District teachers' bills, I have come to appreciate the sterling qualities of Selma Borchardt. I treasure that knowledge. In the productive years which lie ahead, I wish for her every good wish for the continuation of

her career of dedicated service. Her retirement, I feel sure, is but the freeing of her energies and capacities for much further hard work in the interests of the boys and girls of this city and our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news item to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 7, 1961]

#### EASTERN HIGH TEACHER RETIRES—MISS BORCHARDT'S SERVICE CITED

(By Martha Strayer)

"Probably no classroom teacher in America has contributed more to high school education than Miss Selma Borchardt," Eastern High School Principal Lynn S. Woodworth told the District School Board in a tribute to Miss Borchardt, who was retired yesterday.

Mr. Woodworth reported some of her educational achievements, such as addressing educational meetings in Tokyo, Rio de Janeiro, and Dublin.

The Federal Government sent her to Denmark, Holland, France, and Italy as a post-World War II educational observer, and she was the only classroom teacher in America named by President Eisenhower as a delegate to the White House Conference on Education in 1955.

#### CHAIRMAN

She was chairman of the Curriculum Committee for the District delegation at President Eisenhower's 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

At Eastern High School, where Miss Borchardt taught until 1945, she was chairman of the English department, developed the school's remedial reading program and coordinated its reading clinic and speech correction activities.

She helped greatly in the school's readjustment to integration.

She addressed 200 patriotic, religious, educational, and civic meetings in 1 year, 1957.

All these things Mr. Woodworth listed, but he omitted Miss Borchardt's career as a teachers' union leader.

#### ORGANIZER

She helped organize and direct the local teachers' union. She is a vice president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO).

She helped get a teacher pay raise through Congress. She will devote her leisure to educational research.

#### BORROWING AUTHORITY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have had the privilege since 1957 to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress, it will be recalled, we passed into law substantial amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. Included in those amendments was new authority for the Railroad Retirement Board to borrow, for a temporary period, from the railroad retirement fund, amounts necessary to cover unemployment insurance benefits when the demand for such benefits was high. That borrowing authority was contained in section 308 of Public Law 86-28.

The subcommittee very carefully considered the advisability of granting that borrowing authority. In our view, it was

an important aid to efficient administration to permit it. It allowed the Board to avoid crisis calls for help from the U.S. Treasury and the Congress when the payment of unemployment benefits became heavy during recession periods. On behalf of the subcommittee, I can say we studied with great care the actuarial soundness of this authority. It was our belief that the railroad retirement fund, out of which railroad retirement benefits are paid, would in no sense be endangered by the temporary loans for the payment of unemployment benefits.

Nevertheless, despite our care, a number of persons who have written to me and to many other Senators have given voice to their concern that their railroad retirement benefits would become endangered by such temporary transfer of funds. Because of this concern, I requested the Railroad Retirement Board to furnish me with a brief report on the problem. I should like to introduce for the RECORD two letters from Howard W. Habermeyer, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board. The first of these is dated December 20, 1960, and refers to two tables, which are attached. The second one is dated January 13, 1961. In my view, this report from Mr. Habermeyer is most helpful in reassuring those who have been uneasy concerning the long-range soundness of the railroad retirement fund.

I ask unanimous consent to have this material printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD, Chicago, Ill., December 20, 1960.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is with reference to your request of June 10, 1960, for a complete report "regarding the operation and solvency of the railroad retirement fund" as of the end of this year in the light of section 308 of Public Law 86-28 (approved May 19, 1959). This section authorizes the Railroad Retirement Board to borrow funds, under certain conditions, from the railroad retirement account for the payment of benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The enclosed table "A" shows the amounts borrowed and repaid (with 3-percent interest) from time to time pursuant to the provisions of section 308 above referred to. It also shows that the balance of principal and interest due the railroad retirement account as of the end of November 1960, was \$149,947,520.

The reserve in the railroad retirement account as of the end of November 1960 was \$3,780,210,748. This amount includes the above-mentioned \$149,947,520 due the railroad retirement account from the railroad unemployment insurance account.

The enclosed table "B" shows the estimated amounts that will be due the railroad retirement account from the railroad unemployment insurance account (including 3-percent interest) at the end of each of the calendar years 1961-65, depending upon the maximum contribution rate in effect for such calendar years. It is estimated that the reserve in the railroad retirement account at the end of 1965 will be \$4.2 billion.

Sincerely yours,  
HOWARD W. HABERMEYER,  
Chairman.

TABLE A.—Statement of borrowings, repayments and balance due, under authority of sec. 308(a), Public Law 86-28; 73 Stat. 25, at monthly intervals from July 1959 through November 1960

Period	Gross borrowings for month	Accrued interest for month	Repayments for month		Amount due railroad retirement account at end of month		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Total
1959—July	\$1,000,000	\$245.90			\$1,000,000	\$245.90	\$1,000,245.90
August	31,500,000	45,250.01			32,500,000	45,495.91	32,545,495.91
September	20,125,000	57,549.17	\$16,450,000	\$36,827.88	36,175,000	66,217.20	36,241,217.20
October	30,606,000	131,938.69			66,781,000	198,155.89	66,979,155.89
November	26,005,000	198,729.11			92,786,000	396,885.00	93,182,885.00
December	15,125,000	187,579.20	27,775,000	211,428.28	80,136,000	373,035.92	80,509,035.92
1960—January	21,845,000	231,635.76			101,981,000	604,671.68	102,585,671.68
February	14,869,000	262,776.89			116,850,000	867,448.57	117,717,448.57
March	1,245,000	256,018.04	18,525,000	235,555.33	99,570,000	887,911.28	100,457,911.28
April	13,195,000	260,434.02			112,765,000	1,148,345.30	113,913,345.30
May	8,215,000	297,803.68			120,980,000	1,446,148.98	122,426,148.98
June		247,738.77	22,481,000	416,079.75	98,499,000	1,277,808.00	99,776,808.00
July	8,650,000	258,593.75			107,149,000	1,536,401.75	108,685,401.75
August	16,455,000	299,845.89			123,604,000	1,836,247.64	125,440,247.64
September	5,500,000	270,561.49	19,040,000	469,355.51	110,064,000	1,637,453.62	111,701,453.62
October	21,165,000	307,476.37			131,229,000	1,944,929.99	133,173,929.99
November	16,425,000	348,590.21			147,654,000	2,293,520.20	149,947,520.20

Source: Prepared by the Director of Budget and Fiscal Operations of the Railroad Retirement Board.

TABLE B.—Estimated status of railroad unemployment insurance account, fiscal years 1961 through 1965, under various contribution rate assumptions

[In millions. (D)=deficit]

WITH PRESENT 3¼ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE						WITH 4¼ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961					
Fiscal year ending June 30—	Balance, beginning of year	Contributions credited to account	Interest on debt to railroad retirement account	Benefit payments	Balance, end of year	Fiscal year ending June 30—	Balance, beginning of year	Contributions credited to account	Interest on debt to railroad retirement account	Benefit payments	Balance, end of year
1961	\$97(D)	\$156	\$4	\$200	\$144(D)	1961	\$97(D)	\$156	\$4	\$200	\$144(D)
1962	144(D)	161	5	175	163(D)	1962	144(D)	195	4	175	128(D)
1963	163(D)	166	5	170	172(D)	1963	128(D)	201	4	170	101(D)
1964	172(D)	170	5	165	172(D)	1964	101(D)	206	3	165	62(D)
1965	172(D)	170	5	165	171(D)	1965	62(D)	206	1	165	22(D)
WITH 4 PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961						WITH 4¾ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961					
1961	\$97(D)	\$156	\$4	\$200	\$144(D)	1961	\$97(D)	\$156	\$4	\$200	\$144(D)
1962	144(D)	172	4	175	151(D)	1962	144(D)	206	4	175	117(D)
1963	151(D)	178	4	170	148(D)	1963	117(D)	213	3	170	77(D)
1964	148(D)	182	4	165	134(D)	1964	77(D)	218	2	165	25(D)
1965	134(D)	182	4	165	120(D)	1965	25(D)	218	(1)	165	28
WITH 4¼ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961						1 Less than \$0.5 million.					
1961	\$97(D)	\$156	\$4	\$200	\$144(D)	NOTE.—For these estimates, average conditions are assumed for the years after 1961, with neither serious recessions nor unusually high levels of prosperity. Detail may not add to totals shown because amounts are rounded to nearest million. Interest income not shown because it would be less than \$0.5 million in all cases except possibly the last year with a 4¼-percent rate. No allowance made for possible transfers from the administration fund.					
1962	144(D)	184	4	175	140(D)	Source: Office of Director of Research, U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, Dec. 13, 1960.					
1963	140(D)	189	4	170	124(D)						
1964	124(D)	194	3	165	98(D)						
1965	98(D)	194	2	165	71(D)						

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,  
Chicago, Ill., January 13, 1961.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This will supplement my letter to you of December 20, 1960, concerning the effect of the borrowing authority contained in section 308 of Public Law 86-28 on the solvency of the railroad retirement account.

As shown from table A submitted with my letter of December 20, 1960, amounts borrowed from the railroad retirement account for the payment of benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are being repaid from time to time. Thus, the total amount borrowed at various times in the period July 1959–November 1960 was nearly \$250 million, but this amount was reduced by repayments from time to time to less than \$150 million, and the reserve in the railroad retirement account at the end of November 1960 was some \$3.7 billion.

That this borrowing authority is essential is obvious from the table marked "B" submitted with my letter of December 20, 1960. This table shows that if the current contribution rate of 3¼ percent of taxable payroll continues in effect, there will be due

from the railroad unemployment insurance account to the railroad retirement account on June 30, 1965, an amount estimated to be \$171 million. Despite this increased deficit in the railroad unemployment insurance account, however, it is estimated that the reserve in the railroad retirement account will at that time be \$4.2 billion, or some \$500 million greater than it was at the end of November 1960. Were it not for this borrowing authority, there would have been no funds in the railroad unemployment insurance account to pay the claims of the many thousands of unemployed and sick railroad workers, and there would be no funds in the next 5 years to pay any such claims. What is also obvious from table B is that the indebtedness to the railroad retirement account will not be eliminated in the next 5 years as long as the current contribution rate of 3¼ percent continues. But this circumstance, in the light of the figures referred to, does not, in the Board's opinion, warrant the conclusion that this borrowing authority constitutes any threat in the foreseeable future to the solvency of the railroad retirement account.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. HABERMAYER,

Chairman.

## TARIFF RELIEF FOR SEED FARMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 23, 1960, the Oregon Crop and Livestock Reporting Service released summary figures upon one of the more important agricultural products of my State. These figures indicate the strong interest in seed crops displayed by many Oregon farmers who devote their energies to the production of this important group of commodities.

I was pleased to note that Oregon ranked first in the Nation in the production of the following varieties of seed: Merion Kentucky bluegrass, chewings fescue and red fescue, bentgrass, crimson clover, common vetch, and the ryegrasses. As a matter of fact, in 1960, Oregon produced all of the Nation's supply of chewings fescue, perennial and common ryegrass seed. In addition, Oregon growers produced nine-tenths of bentgrass and common vetch seed, more than four-fifths of the national production of red fescue, over half of the Merion Kentucky bluegrass seed grown, two-

fifths of the crimson clover, and about one-fourth of the national production of hairy vetch and alsike clover seed.

That this important segment of Oregon's agricultural economy is not in the healthiest of conditions, however, is shown by the hard statistic that while the value of Oregon seed crops in 1959 was \$25.3 million, in 1960, this had been reduced to only \$17.5 million—a drop in value of some \$7.9 million.

Many responsible growers of Oregon feel that this economic loss is attributable, at least in part, to the failure of the Tariff Commission and the administration to control imports of seed from other countries. The \$7.9 million deficit in receipts from these seed crops would seem to lend substance to this point of view.

It is my hope that in the coming year the Tariff Commission will give heed to the representations made to it by Oregon producers who are seeking equitable remedies, in order that a further decline may be avoided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full summary to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OREGON SEED CROPS, 1960 ANNUAL SUMMARY—  
TOTAL PRODUCTION AND VALUE DOWN

Production of Oregon's 16 major grass and legume seed crops for 1960 was estimated at 213 million pounds clean seed, according to the Oregon Crop and Livestock Reporting Service. This is 12 percent less than the 242 million pounds produced in 1959, but nearly one-fifth larger than the 1949-58 average of 181 million pounds. Lower seed production during 1960 was primarily due to the smaller common ryegrass crop which accounted for one-half of all the seed produced in Oregon.

Harvested acreage for the 16 seed crops estimated for Oregon during 1960 was slightly lower than last year and average while value of production for all Oregon seeds, based on returns to growers up to December 1, 1960, was estimated at \$17.5 million, down nearly one-third from 1959.

Larger values of production during 1960 for alfalfa, red clover, white clover, Austrian winter peas, and common vetch were offset by the decline in value of the other seed crops. Alsike clover production and value was the lowest since the early 1930's.

OREGON SEED PRODUCTION RANKS HIGH IN NATION

Oregon's 1960 seed production ranked first in the Nation for Merion Kentucky bluegrass, Chewings and red fescue, bentgrass, crimson clover, common vetch, and the ryegrasses. Austrian winter peas, ladino clover, and hairy vetch ranked second with white and alsike clover third, and tall fescue fourth. Red clover and alfalfa seed produced in Oregon ended in ninth place. In 1960, Oregon produced all of the Nation's Chewings fescue, perennial, and common ryegrass seed, more than nine-tenths of the bentgrass and common vetch, more than four-fifths of the red fescue, over half of the Merion Kentucky bluegrass, more than two-fifths of the crimson clover and about one-fourth of the hairy vetch and alsike clover.

SOME SEEDS HIT RECORD PRODUCTION

Record high production was realized on alfalfa, red clover, crimson clover, and Chewings fescue seeds during the 1960 crop year in Oregon. Alfalfa, with the second largest acreage of record, had a record high yield with an estimated production 52 percent larger than last year. Red clover seed, with the largest acreage of recent years and above average yield, produced nearly two-fifths more than last year. Production of crimson clover was nearly one-fourth above last year's record level, primarily due to the largest acreage on record and an above average yield. Chewings fescue seed production for 1960 was nearly one-tenth above 1959 due to record high acreage and yield. Production of white clover seed was slightly

above last year and 6 percent above average. Tall fescue, with a record high yield, produced 2 percent more seed than 1959, while acreage remained unchanged.

The 1960 perennial ryegrass production, second largest of record, was down slightly from 1959 but far above the 1949-58 average. Other seeds with crops smaller than last year but having above average seed production during 1960 included common ryegrass, 22 percent below last year but 36 percent above average and the third largest crop of record. Red fescue seed production for 1960 totaled 4.2 million pounds, 11 percent below last year, but still the second largest crop of record. The 1960 Merion bluegrass crop, second largest of record, was 16 percent below last year but far above average. Hard frosts during May in central and eastern Oregon hurt many Merion bluegrass stands and reduced yields below earlier expectations. Both red fescue and Merion bluegrass acreages were the largest to date. Bentgrass seed production totaled 5 million pounds, one-fourth below the 1959 crop, but still more than one-third above the 1949-58 average. This year's crop yields turned out sharply below forecast indications. Growth was heavy and lodging in stands caused sizable seed losses.

SHARP DECLINE NOTED

Oregon seed crops which declined in production this year were alsike clover, one-third below last year and the smallest since 1930; Ladino clover, 23 percent below 1959 and the smallest since 1937; hairy vetch, 37 percent below last year and the smallest production of record. Austrian winter pea and common vetch seed production, while above 1959, were far below average.

U.S. CARRYOVER AND SUPPLY

The carryover of old crop seed by dealers and farmers on June 30, 1960, totaled 262.5 million pounds, 7 percent above last year's stocks of 245 million pounds, but 22 percent under average. The initial supply of 27 kinds of seed (1960 production plus carryover by dealers and growers) for use in the 1960-61 plantings totals 1,072.3 million pounds, virtually the same as the 1959-60 season total, but 15 percent below average.

Oregon seed crops, 1960 annual summary—Seed crops: Acreage, production, and value, 1960 with comparisons

Seed crop and State	Acreage harvested			Production, clean seed			Value of production	
	Average 1949-58	1959	1960	Average 1949-58	1959	1960	1959	1960
Alfalfa:				Thousand pounds	Thousand pounds	Thousand pounds	Thousands	Thousands
Oregon	7,540	9,500	11,000	2,290	3,610	5,500	\$1,206	\$1,485
Idaho	34,000	29,000	30,000	5,794	7,975	11,100	2,337	2,942
Washington	22,300	20,000	19,000	11,088	8,000	7,600	2,864	2,090
California	130,000	153,000	141,000	52,518	58,140	51,465	19,186	16,983
United States	1,033,970	745,500	702,200	151,546	129,288	130,323	37,592	35,830
Red clover:								
Oregon	17,900	15,000	23,000	3,054	3,300	4,600	894	1,012
Idaho	31,250	34,000	29,000	9,134	9,860	8,120	2,968	1,908
United States	1,375,355	1,138,600	1,069,800	85,755	86,831	89,765	22,401	18,847
Alsike clover:								
Oregon	8,490	5,500	3,000	3,237	1,650	1,110	312	189
Idaho	13,100	9,000	5,000	2,728	1,710	1,450	328	254
California	3,710	3,300	1,000	1,517	1,023	500	191	85
United States	63,760	33,200	25,200	11,309	6,010	5,160	1,119	852
White clover:								
Oregon	1,330	1,300	1,400	211	221	224	106	146
Idaho	9,970	15,500	14,500	2,293	3,875	2,320	1,686	1,438
United States	35,670	27,400	32,450	4,180	4,640	3,940	2,343	2,610
Ladino clover:								
Oregon	9,510	1,300	1,000	1,540	169	130	96	83
California	23,400	16,000	21,000	4,752	4,160	4,200	2,288	2,520
United States	34,650	17,300	22,000	6,490	4,329	4,330	2,384	2,603
Merion bluegrass: <sup>1</sup>								
Oregon	3,257	5,700	7,500	577	1,608	1,350	1,849	1,202
Idaho	647	1,300	1,600	135	410	432	492	419
Washington	2,390	4,600	5,600	364	1,058	1,176	1,270	1,058
United States	6,519	12,830	15,070	1,138	3,174	3,099	3,733	2,820
Chewings fescue: Oregon	17,250	24,000	25,000	5,094	10,560	11,500	2,904	1,840
Red fescue:								
Oregon	5,650	11,000	12,000	1,791	4,730	4,200	1,253	714
Washington	1,080	1,600	1,800	432	720	608	176	103
United States	7,190	13,400	14,200	2,348	5,702	4,968	1,489	845
Tall fescue:								
Oregon	15,150	5,000	5,000	4,817	2,700	2,760	486	344
United States	122,513	110,500	145,300	27,232	22,134	31,331	3,665	3,550

<sup>1</sup> Short-time average.

Oregon seed crops, 1960 annual summary—Seed crops: Acreage, production, and value, 1960 with comparisons—Continued

Seed crop and State	Acreage harvested			Production, clean seed			Value of production	
	Average 1949-58	1959	1960	Average 1949-58	1959	1960	1959	1960
				Thousand pounds	Thousand pounds	Thousand pounds	Thousands	Thousands
Bentgrass:								
Oregon.....	18,300	23,000	22,000	3,758	6,670	5,060	\$1,467	\$1,417
Washington.....	2,180	1,000	500	187	95	38	34	15
United States.....	20,480	24,000	22,500	3,945	6,765	5,098	1,501	1,432
Austrian winter peas:								
Oregon.....	25,700	8,000	7,600	25,350	6,000	6,992	201	217
Idaho.....	21,300	28,000	32,000	30,683	42,000	36,000	1,428	1,170
Washington.....	7,170	500	600	8,300	425	510	14	16
United States.....	55,820	36,500	40,200	65,554	48,425	43,502	1,643	1,403
Crimson clover:								
Oregon.....	5,850	15,000	21,000	2,102	6,450	7,980	1,516	1,237
United States.....	124,308	73,500	86,000	19,269	13,477	18,700	3,278	3,167
Hairy vetch:								
Oregon.....	44,900	28,000	18,000	15,022	9,240	5,850	924	573
United States.....	197,170	98,000	90,000	36,480	22,060	21,390	2,256	2,128
Common vetch:								
Oregon.....	30,300	8,000	9,000	13,233	4,080	5,400	212	281
California.....	1,150	1,000	1,000	403	300	220	18	14
United States.....	31,860	9,000	10,000	13,802	4,380	5,620	230	295
Common ryegrass: Oregon.....	98,600	124,000	115,000	78,369	136,400	106,950	7,502	3,957
Perennial ryegrass: Oregon.....	25,600	46,000	48,000	20,960	45,080	43,200	4,418	2,765
Total Oregon seeds.....	335,327	331,300	329,500	181,405	242,468	212,796	25,346	17,462
Other seed crops, United States:								
Sweetclover.....	278,410	136,900	130,200	45,451	27,507	27,696	2,416	1,856
Lespedeza.....	715,190	582,500	454,000	142,730	124,295	90,625	12,382	11,099
Timothy.....	274,580	296,500	289,000	38,501	44,098	46,875	4,751	2,755
Redtop.....	79,400	60,000	52,000	5,338	5,325	4,460	1,498	696
Orchardgrass.....	60,100	48,000	52,500	11,984	8,985	11,880	2,020	1,850
Kentucky bluegrass.....				20,223	3,550	29,400		
Sudangrass.....	111,100	64,300	73,000	54,683	38,248	44,811	1,878	2,368
Smooth bromegrass.....	81,535	39,700	66,700	14,061	4,943	11,443	755	1,080
Crested wheatgrass.....	40,520	38,500	35,200	3,643	2,745	2,754	625	439
Lupine.....	67,360	13,000	9,000	44,987	10,050	7,060	419	276
Purple vetch.....	24,800	45,000	26,000	7,818	8,100	3,900	635	312

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to announce I intend at a later time to discuss in some detail, here on the floor of the Senate, some of the policies of the Tariff Commission. However, I prefer to wait until there is some indication as to whether the Tariff Commission proposes, on its own, to change some of its practices which, I believe, have been doing great harm to various segments of American agriculture, including not only the seed industry, but also some of our other industries, and with particular reference to the fruit industry.

Let me point out that it was never the intention of Congress that segments of American agriculture must wait until damage was done, before the Tariff Commission proceeded to carry out its responsibilities under the laws applicable to it. It was the clear intention of Congress that the Tariff Commission should function in a preventive capacity, so as to see to it that the signals of economic harm were raised long before segments of American agriculture were damaged.

Unfortunately, the record shows clearly that on too many occasions the Tariff Commission has permitted irreparable damage to be done to some segment of the Nation's agricultural industry before the Commission has carried out any of its responsibilities in connection with its statutory duties.

I sincerely hope that by raising this question in regard to the plight of the seed industry in this country, today, the Tariff Commission will take note of my observations, because as a representative of a great agricultural State, I have no intention of sitting mute in the Senate while such damage—for which, on too many occasions, the Tariff Commission has been responsible—continues to be done to the agricultural economy of the Nation.

**RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR TREATMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS BY RESEARCH GROUPS RECEIVING FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last year the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] introduced a bill, numbered S. 3570, of which I was happy to be one of the cosponsors. The bill provided some rules and regulations for the treatment of experimental animals by research groups receiving Federal research funds.

The bill was subsequently attacked very strongly by medical research organizations and many persons in the medical profession. Last fall there appeared in Science magazine a letter from Prof. Bradley T. Scheer, chairman of the department of biology at the University of Oregon, in which he made what I regard as a very sound and worthwhile analysis of the bill and its purpose. I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Scheer's letter to Science magazine printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues.

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

The bill S. 3570 recently introduced into the Senate by Senator COOPER and others, "to provide for the humane treatment of animals," has been strongly attacked both in Science [132, 7 (1960)] and in the Bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research. These attacks have given what I think to be a false idea of the nature and intent of the bill, and of the motives of its sponsors, and prompt me to make a carefully considered statement of my own opinion.

The issue of humane treatment itself is a moral one: To what extent are we justified in inflicting pain and discomfort on other organisms in our search for knowledge? Bill S. 3570 takes the position "that living verte-

brate animals used for scientific experiments shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed, and humanely handled." This is a statement with which, I think, most biologists would agree in principle; personally I should feel more comfortable if the words "potentially valuable" were inserted after the words "scientific information," but I think that the efforts of the National Society for Medical Research, the Animal Care Panel, and the American Physiological Society over the past several years have been directed toward the general aims stated above.

The second issue posed by the bill is a practical political one: Granted that humane treatment is desirable, is legislation, and in particular this legislation, the best means to assure it? The alternatives would seem to be voluntary action by the investigators or local control by individual communities. The charges recently brought against Stanford University and the College of Medical Evangelists in California show that local action under the influence of extremist pressure groups may still endanger medical research; it seems probable that the existence of Federal legislation of the type proposed in S. 3570 would do much to protect laboratories against this sort of local attack. The question of voluntary action is a more debatable one. In my own experience I have never come across an instance of wanton cruelty to experimental animals, but I have encountered numerous cases of neglect due to callousness, inadequate facilities, inexperience, or carelessness; again, it would seem that S. 3570 would help to eliminate such instances.

The reasonable objections which have been made to the specific provisions of S. 3570 are well summarized in the Science editorial: "Advanced approval of experimental plans by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, burdensome recordkeeping, annual or more frequent reports to HEW, additional costs and a new and unnecessary amount of

redtape." As I read the bill, it seems to me that the requirements are not greatly beyond those now in force. Every application for Federal research funds requires submission of an experimental plan which is approved by a panel of scientists. I hope that all of us who publish results of animal experiments do at least the amount of recordkeeping specified by the bill. Every Federal research grant now requires an annual report. The only additional features are that the experimental plan must specify what animals are to be used and what type of experiments are to be performed; there is nothing in the bill requiring advance approval of every minor change in experimental procedure. The report, also, must specify the animals used and the procedures employed, but there is nothing in the bill to say that this must coincide exactly with the plan proposed. Compliance with the provisions of the bill will cost more, insofar as the existing laboratories do not provide adequate facilities for the animals used, but this should result in better experimental results as well as more humane care.

The National Society for Medical Research has devoted much attention to the provision for inspection of facilities and for certificates of compliance with regulations to be laid down by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; this is presumably the redtape with which Science is concerned. At present, every institution receiving grants from Federal agencies is visited—or if you wish, inspected—by officers of those agencies. On the basis of past experience, I think that we have nothing to fear from these officers, who have abundantly demonstrated that their main aim is to further research of the highest quality. Any regulations which HEW might lay down under an act of the sort proposed would, I think, not depart from this aim. In any event, the bill gives no police powers to HEW or anyone else, so that work sponsored by any but Federal agencies would not be in any way affected.

In sum, I cannot find in this bill the evils which the National Society for Medical Research or Science profess to see, and I would urge my colleagues who are interested in animal experimentation, humane treatment, or both, to read the bill with care, to make their own appraisals on the basis of their own judgments, and to communicate these judgments to their representatives in the Congress.

BRADLEY T. SCHEER.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Kentucky contemplates reintroducing his bill at a later time in this session. I shall, at a later time, present some information I have received in opposition to the bill in the form in which it was introduced last year.

I feel it is only fair to see to it that the points of view of both the opponents and proponents of the bill are made available for the study of our colleagues in the Senate before any further action is taken on the bill.

I think it is quite possible some of the objections to the bill may lead to a consideration of some modification in the language of the bill, or possible amendment to the bill, in case it is introduced in its original form.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate very much the references made by the Senator from Oregon to the bill I introduced last year. As the Senator will remem-

ber, the purpose of the bill was to assure humane treatment of animals used in federally financed research.

After I introduced the bill—and the Senator from Oregon and other Senators joined in introduction of the bill—I was flooded with letters of protest from various sources, many of them from people engaged in research, who made the assertion that the bill, if passed, would very seriously interfere with all such research. Others have said that its hidden purpose is to stop all research with animals.

I have also read the articles that have been appearing in the magazines. I must say that those articles and advertisements, sponsored by the antivivisection society, must have cost a great deal of money. They say, on the contrary, that it is a ruse for actually approving the use of animals for research.

I am not an expert in this subject. It could very well be true that the bill should be modified. I assume it would be the function of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to consider modification when it reaches the committee.

I intend to introduce the bill again. I hope the Senator from Oregon will join me in its introduction. I am sure that most people doing research use humane methods, as has been stated in their letters, and I know it is not the intent of any of the bill's sponsors to interfere with their search in any way. But there may be some who should not be engaged in research; and if they are using methods which are not humane or necessary, or if animals are neglected in some places prior to their use by qualified researchers, then I think there is a real purpose in the bill.

I was much interested in one article I read only yesterday, which will appear in one of the leading magazines in a short time. It said, commenting on the "dangers" of the bill which I introduced, that it would "torpedo" medical research, that it would "strangle" it.

I assert that the statements which have been made are exaggerated, and most of them are without any foundation at all. I would say some of them have evidently been devoted to preventing any kind of judgment as to what kind of methods are being used.

Research with animals has produced great benefit for humanity and society, as a result of methods which have been developed to treat human disease. I am sure that the lot of animals killed or injured for that purpose is not always pleasant or happy or without pain. Surely, if the lives of animals are to be taken for our benefit—to help mankind—standards ought to be established to treat those animals humanely. That is the purpose of the bill.

As I have said, I have no scientific knowledge as to whether the particular provisions of the bill are extreme or whether it should be modified. But I say flatly the purpose of the bill is not in any way to inhibit, frustrate, or interfere with research. It is to encourage research, for the best research is carried out as humanely as possible.

The bill does have a humane purpose. When animals are to be used to save

human life or treat disease, surely we can establish methods to give assurance the animals are well treated. If one does not care about life in one form, he may not care about life in any form.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his comments. I shall make available to the Senator from Kentucky the material I am now having a staff member study in connection with this bill, preparatory to submitting recommendations to me as to whether or not he would advise any modification of the language of the bill. As soon as that study is completed, I shall make it available to the Senator from Kentucky.

The purpose of the bill, as stated by the Senator from Kentucky, is exactly the same purpose he stated when the bill was introduced, a purpose of which I approve.

There is no question about the fact that the purpose of the bill is to meet the complaint on the part of some persons within our country who state that research with animals is not conducted in the most humane way possible. It certainly is not unsound or unfair for us to take the position that, consonant with research objectives, these experiments should be carried on in a humane manner. That is all that is sought by the bill; and if that objective can be accomplished with some modification of the bill, so far as I am concerned I would have no quarrel with any amendments.

But I am sure, may I say to the Senator from Kentucky, that he and I are dealing with one of those "hot potatoes," legislatively speaking, in which we are bound to displease some, no matter what course of action we follow. The Senator will recall that last year, or the year before, we finally passed a humane slaughter bill. The proposals that were made by some of those who have very deep feelings about problems of slaughtering were, in my judgment, so extreme that, if we were to comply with the wishes of some of them, all of us would become vegetarians, because to adopt their policy would have involved the closing down of all the slaughterhouses in America. We could not possibly have operated slaughterhouses in America if we had carried out the proposals that were made in regard to how animals were going to be slaughtered. That is, it would not have been possible to conduct slaughterhouses on the basis of the American free enterprise system; and I would be the first, in this field, as in any other, to oppose nationalization of any segment of our economy, may I say, as a liberal.

So what we tried to do in the slaughterhouse bill was to find an area that answered the question in regard to humane proposals for slaughtering actually being advocated. To the extent that they were followed, we thought they ought to be incorporated in the bill. We passed the bill. Perhaps the Senator from Kentucky or some other Senator has heard of some calamity which has followed the passage of the bill, but I have not heard about any.

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. MORSE. I think it has come to be recognized that we did at least a fairly good job in meeting a problem which needed to be met.

The Senator from Kentucky has referred to the antivivisectionists. One of the communications I received in regard to the bill was from a distinguished doctor in this Nation. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky will recognize the name the moment he takes a look at the letter. It was a pretty rough letter on both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Oregon. In fact, it said that we had surrendered to the antivivisectionists.

When someone writes to me in that vein I am inclined to suspect that there is a great big hole in his case, because if he has the evidence and the facts which support his position he does not have to accuse Senators of engaging in some form of surrendering to or "buckling under" to some legislative group in the country.

I replied to the good doctor by pointing out to him that I had always made clear I did not adopt the point of view of the antivivisectionist; but the fact is, as I said, that some of our finest citizens in all the communities of America share the antivivisectionist point of view. They are as sincere as are those who are opposed to their point of view, and as sincere as those of us who feel that our responsibility as legislators is to try to find the middle ground between the antivivisectionists and those who feel that no legislation in regard to humane treatment of animals, in respect to experimentation and laboratory tests, should be passed at all.

I said that I happen to be one who believes it is essential, in the interest of protecting human existence, to make use of animals in experimentation in the medical field, and in endeavors to help us bring to an end some of the great disease scourges which plague mankind, but I also hold to the point of view that there is this much which can be said for the position of the antivivisectionists, although they want to go much further: They are certainly correct in pointing out that if there is any lack of humane-ness, if there is any unnecessary suffering and cruelty inflicted upon animals in the carrying out of experimentations, then it is necessary to devise proper controls and improvements in laboratory techniques to keep the suffering to a minimum.

I shall discuss this matter at greater length later, when I bring to the Senate the study I am having made by a staff member.

Let the RECORD show that the senior Senator from Oregon is not going to support the extreme position taken by the antivivisectionists, which, when all is said and done, would have the effect of saying, "Pass legislation which stops the use of animals in this whole matter of experimentation in the laboratories which are seeking to carry on investigations to solve some of the great disease problems which plague mankind."

That is the position I take. I should like to confer with the Senator from Kentucky in the next few days about his bill, before he introduces it, if he

thinks it is feasible to wait for that period of time.

Mr. COOPER. I will be glad to do so, and I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Oregon.

I am not an antivivisectionist, and of course I do not adhere to that point of view. I know we have to have experiments and we have to use animals in these experiments.

I am sure that in most places over the country those who are engaged in these experiments observe, as best they can, humane procedures, but the charge is made that some do not.

Even to have the bill introduced, to bring it before the committee, and to allow hearings to be held upon it, will certainly establish whether any law is needed. If none is needed, the committee can decide the point. If the bill which I have introduced is not proper for the purposes we both seek, the committee can make whatever modifications are necessary. I have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I know it is a good committee.

I have received letters from deans of medical colleges and universities which have said flatly the bill would stop all research. After I had written to them explaining the purposes of the proposal, I have also received letters from several which said, "We think it is all right. Let the matter be heard."

I know this much about the Senator from Oregon—he is not afraid of any outcry which may be raised about a bill before it has even been discussed and considered by a committee. I know he knows I am not.

Let the matter be heard. I agree with the Senator. I remember the situation which occurred when the humane slaughter bill was introduced. A great outcry was heard all over the country, that the passage of such legislation would stop the processing and distribution of food. It was claimed that passage of such legislation would put people out of business, especially the small packers, and that it was a move to help the great packing industry—although that part of the industry was not in favor of the proposed legislation either, and fought it. The Senator remembers that. It took about 2 years to pass the bill.

Finally, a reasonable bill was passed. I have asked what has happened since then. I have learned that the Department of Agriculture has already secured 87 percent compliance in this field, and secured that in less than half a year that the act has been in force.

I am sure the Senator also remembers a bill which was called the wild horse bill. I always liked the title. Although I am from Kentucky, which is a horse State, when the bill was first brought to my attention, I was puzzled by its reference to wild horses. I learned that there was a problem in the West in regard to catching wild horses. I think the horses were being chased by airplanes, and various inhumane ways were used to capture them.

That bill was fought. It was said that it was necessary to do the things being done to capture the horses. The committee considered the bill. The Congress

passed the bill. I do not believe it has ruined the wild horse industry.

The Senator is a horseman, and can tell me about the subject.

Mr. MORSE. It might have increased the cost of dog meat a little bit, but that was probably either necessary or desirable.

Mr. COOPER. I am very happy to have the Senator's contribution.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Kentucky that in answering the distinguished doctor I took the liberty of stating it was my position—and I was sure it was the position of the Senator from Kentucky—that when hearings were held on the bill, if evidence could be brought forth that the bill needed either modification or defeat the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Kentucky would follow where the evidence led, but that the proponents of the bill, being responsible citizens of this country, had a right to petition their Government for consideration of the subject matter of the bill, and that right alone justified the introduction of a bill for hearing, as the Senator from Kentucky has indicated this afternoon.

I happen to be a member of the committee to which the Senator refers. If the bill is introduced and is referred to our committee for hearings, I will see to it that all sides of the question receive a full and adequate hearing, so that they can present their evidence in support of their respective positions.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the bill will be referred to the subcommittee of which the Senator is chairman. I had the honor of serving with the Senator from Oregon on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for 5 years. I served on a subcommittee with him, and remember very well one bill which we considered for 2 years, the Railway Labor Act. Whatever agreement or disagreement others may have with the Senator from Oregon—and we all differ at times with each other on various subjects—I may say that I never saw a chairman of a committee or of a subcommittee who took more pains to give everyone on both sides a chance to be heard, to hear the evidence, and then to consider the evidence submitted and work out bills properly based on that evidence, than did the Senator from Oregon. I know his conscientious methods from intimate association with him on committees, and I am glad to have the opportunity to tell what I have observed during my various terms in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Kentucky is very kind and gracious. His leaving the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a great loss to the committee, and I wish I had the power of suasion which would induce him to return to the committee, because I would very much like to have him on the committee again.

#### REFORESTATION—A NATIONAL CHALLENGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last year the Senate considered and passed unanimously Senate Joint Resolution 95. It was cosponsored by our majority leader,

the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; the Republican whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the ranking Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; as well as by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], my late colleague, Mr. Neuberger, and myself.

We were all motivated by the warning well expressed in 1958 by the chief of the Forest Service when he said:

Within the next 10 years 48 billion trees need to be planted, mainly on small ownerships, if the wood requirements of a larger population are to be met by the year 2000.

In the period between the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 95, and prior to the time it was reported favorably by the Senate Interior and Agriculture Committees, the Senate received reports from the executive branch which were, in my judgment, both misleading and inaccurate. In a moment I shall discuss the reports, but I am happy to mention at this point that the Senate ignored those reports, as it should have.

Last fall I proceeded to dig deeper into the reforestation needs in the national forests in the State of Oregon. The Forest Service responded to this request—and I might add here that the response was thorough and accurate.

#### MISLEADING THE CONGRESS MUST STOP

I wish to express my gratitude that President Kennedy has said in such forthright terms that his administration will not hide from the truth. By way of contrast, let me give you this example of how the executive branch leadership of the Eisenhower administration attempted to mislead the Congress and the American people.

In a letter dated September 1, 1959, the Bureau of the Budget, speaking of tree planting on Federal lands, said Senate Joint Resolution 95 was not necessary because the "existing authorization is adequate for Federal lands." The Bureau further said:

Reforestation . . . can proceed on a systematic basis (S. Rept. No. 1653, pp. 11-12).

I submit, and the record will show, that this report by the Bureau was in no way responsive.

The Department of Agriculture report of September 28, 1959, on Senate Joint Resolution 95 was equally unresponsive. It spoke of plans to reforest 3,900,000 national forest acres but the Department's budgets had been totally inadequate to meet even one-tenth of the job. On November 23, 1959, a Bureau of the Budget letter referred to the "current accelerated trends"—Senate Report No. 1653, pages 12-13.

The Bureau contended that "If planting continued—at the 70,000-acre rate of 1958—about 80 years would be required to plant or seed the more than 5 million acres of Federal lands needing restocking."

I quote in particular this statement, which is a masterpiece of misstatement.

However, during the last 5 years substantial gains have been made in the rate of planting Federal lands over previous periods.

The committee report showed quite conclusively, with respect to the national forests, that planting to reduce the backlog of land needing reforestation was at an annual rate of 103,000 acres in the decade of the 1930's and that, on a comparable basis, the average in the last decade was less than 23,000 acres.

I am pleased that President Kennedy stated forthrightly in his state of the Union message that he will cause his executive office of the Bureau of the Budget and the departments to be so operated that they supply proper information to legitimate questions. It is my judgment that the national interest was ill served over the last several years by executive efforts to mask the facts.

#### THE QUEST FOR THE FACTS

I was so concerned about our lack of progress in reforestation that I directed further inquiries to the Forest Service relative to the situation in Oregon. Timber is Oregon's No. 1 business and the condition of our national forest is of vital importance to our welfare. I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence I have had with the U.S. Forest Service be set forth in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

#### THE LACK OF PROGRESS IN REFORESTATION

Mr. MORSE. In contrast to the Bureau of the Budget's contention that there has been progress on the reforestation, I find that, in fact, we have been actually slipping backward on the national forests.

In fiscal year 1953, on non-timber-sale areas in Oregon there were 393,000 national forest acres suited to the commercial growth of timber that needed planting. On timber sale areas there were 8,076 acres. By 1960, the timber sale acres needing planting had grown to 56,810 acres and funds were not available to plant 22,204 acres. In 1953 there were 401,076 national forest acres needing planting and today there are 437,620 acres for which reforestation funds are not on hand. In the space of 8 years the national forest acreage needing planting in Oregon alone has grown almost 10 percent. I submit this is not progress as the American people understand the meaning of the word.

The average rate of reforestation with appropriated funds for the last 7 years has been a mere 1,385 acres yearly which is less than was done in fiscal year 1953. Reforestation on timber sale areas can be largely accomplished under the Knutson-Vandenberg law which permits a portion of timber sale receipts to be allocated to this work. Collections have not been sufficient here to accomplish this work on a timely basis. I am pleased to see, however, that the record shows better recognition of this problem the last few years.

My purpose in making these remarks at this time is twofold. First, I want to register my emphatic disapproval of the preceding administration's practice of

looking at a bleak picture with rose colored glasses, as in this case. What we do in reforestation affects our national well-being. We fool only ourselves when it is falsely proclaimed that all is well in our forests. I want our new and capable Budget Director, Mr. David Bell, and our excellent new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, to know that this practice reached out to cover almost anything that the old administration wanted to obscure.

The ability of the Kennedy administration to face up to problems and the American people's ability to understand the complex problems will be only as good as the facts that are presented. I am most heartened by the fresh, clean approach President Kennedy has put forward. I am delighted to hear that we are returning to a government which has as its guiding principle the words found in John 8:32 "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

#### OUR CONSERVATION NEEDS INCREASE

My second concern relates to the subject of conservation. We should not for a moment overlook the fact that we face a conservation test. America's position in the year 2000 will be as much affected then by the things we do—or fail to do today—as by the decisions made in that eventful year. If we do not march forward now to fulfill our obligations we cheat our children of the destiny which should be theirs. A child who is not educated in the sixties cannot take his rightful and proper place in our society 40 years from now. A citizen who can be President of this Nation in the year 2000 may be born this very year. We must educate him for the year 2000 and the challenge of that bright century. The forests and forest resources our people will need in the year 2000 must be started now. They too require time and training to develop just as does presidential timber.

So I say that the vigor with which we approach natural resource development and protection will be the measure of how well and how faithfully we are guiding ourselves to meet the future's needs.

I have every confidence in democracy's ability to meet mankind's spiritual, moral, and material hopes. The revolution of ideas we started in 1776 can and must be the revolution that wins men's hearts and minds. We carry freedom's cause. If it should falter too much or fail it will not be because another form of government is superior. It will come to pass because we failed to meet our responsibilities.

My plea today is that our National Government act vigorously to meet on a timely basis the challenges that confront us. My hope is that the vital work of reforestation receives proper recognition as an important national objective.

#### EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,  
August 15, 1960.

DR. RICHARD E. McARDLE,  
Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. McARDLE: It would be most helpful to me for use in the 87th Congress before the Senate Appropriations Committee

if you could provide me with the following material:

1. An estimate of the acreage in Oregon within the national forests which has been damaged by forest fires in the past 10 years and which has not been reseeded.

2. The cost of a crash program to restore trees to this area if the work were to be completed within a 2-year period.

3. The amounts currently budgeted for reforestation and the time it would take under presently budgeted amounts to restore past damage alone.

Your courtesy in providing these estimates to me will be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1960.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our regional office in Portland, Oreg., has furnished us with the information requested in your letter of August 15, 1960, concerning reforestation of burns in Oregon.

During the 10-year period calendar years 1951-60 (to September 1, 1960), a total of 105,676 acres of national forest land was burned in Oregon. Most of the commercial forest land in this burned area has been planted or has restocked naturally, but as of September 1, 1960, there remain 19,885 acres which will need to be restored to timber productivity by seeding or planting.

The region estimates cost of a 2-year crash program to restore trees to this area at \$994,250, based on an estimated cost of \$50 per acre. Of course completion of the job in the 2-year period would hinge on the availability of planting stock. Normally it requires two growing seasons in the nursery to produce stock of sufficient size for out-planting. To insure meeting the objectives of a 2-year crash program, we would need to step up our nursery production schedule not later than the spring prior to the 2 fiscal years in which the project was to be completed.

For the current fiscal year, the regional forester has advised that approximately \$168,000 has been programmed for the reforestation of burns in Oregon. It is estimated it would take about 6 years to complete the job of reforesting the 19,885 acres of burns at this annual rate of spending.

We should like to point out that the 19,885 acres presently in need of reforestation will, unless proper provision for reforestation is made, continue to build up at the approximate rate of 2,000 acres per year. The 2,000-acre figure represents the average annual acreage of commercial forest land burned over during the past 10-year period, which it will be necessary to plant or seed in order to restore the land to timber production.

We certainly appreciate your interest in our reforestation job in the State of Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. MCARDLE,  
Chief.

OCTOBER 18, 1960.

DR. RICHARD E. MCARDLE,  
Chief, U.S. Forest Service,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MCARDLE: Thank you very much for your letter of October 10 in which you supplied certain data on reforestation needs in the State of Oregon.

A review of my August 15 request, which prompted your reply of October 10, leads me to believe that my request may not have been entirely clear. It is true that reforestation statistics are voluminous and can be applied from different base points. In view of that fact, it appears that what I need is an up-to-date recapitulation. When I go before

Senator HAYDEN'S Appropriations Committee I like to have my facts precise and well documented.

If it is possible to do so without too much trouble, I would appreciate your reassembling the situation as it has developed since 1952 when the data for timber resources for America's future was collected. What I would like to have are separate year by year and cumulative analyses of the reforestation needs on commercial and noncommercial timberlands in Oregon. With respect to commercial timberlands, I would also like to have the reforestation situation resulting from timber cutting.

The tables requested herein should show the beginning acreage in need of reforestation in all three categories, the amount added each year due to fire and other causes of loss, and through logging, the acreage planted, its total cost and per acre cut, the net acreage remaining to be planted, and the rate of increase or decrease for each year.

In the case of logging to the extent that the Knutson-Vandenberg Act collections are insufficient to permit completion of the job with those funds, this acreage and cost should be shown.

In general, I would like to be in a position to demonstrate both the amount that must be available to deal with current losses and the amount needed to reduce the backlog of old burn areas. To illustrate this point it would be helpful to have a scheduling out of the program of the national forests for the 12-year period in Oregon and the extent to which Oregon's needs will be met, based upon the average allocation made to Oregon over the past 5 years.

It is a matter of deep concern to me that the acreage needing planting continues to grow. We are not making real progress as long as this situation exists.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Forest Service,  
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in further response to your letter of October 18, 1960, requesting information on reforestation needs in the State of Oregon.

We asked Regional Forester Stone to furnish us with certain statistical data not available here. This information has been received and is presented in attached tables 1, 2, and 3. Although you will find most of the tables self-explanatory, some comment may be helpful.

Table 1 reflects the progress made in reforestation of clear-cut sale areas. We have found that from 80 to 90 percent of these clear-cut areas must be reforested artificially if we are to avoid long delays in reproducing the forest and prevent loss in sustained-yield production. During the past 8 years, progress made in reforesting the clear-cut portions of sale areas has been fairly good. Nevertheless, we recognize the need for better financing with Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds, plus a modest amount of supplemental financing with appropriated funds, to insure that all areas will be reforested promptly. The 56,810-acre backlog of planting includes 34,606 acres on which planting is scheduled from Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds already collected. It will be necessary to finance planting of the remaining 22,204 acres with appropriated funds. Lack of sufficient Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds to finance needed reforestation work on clear-cut areas results when there is (1) increase in the cost of goods and services between the time the sale is made and the reforestation work actually is done, (2) insufficient timber value on the sale to permit collection of adequate Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds to do the total reforesta-

tion job, and (3) failure of initial planting or seeding effort.

Table 2 shows the unsatisfactory progress being made in reforesting nonstocked and poorly stocked nonsale areas. Unlike the timber sale areas in table 1, financing of this particular reforestation job is dependent entirely on appropriated funds. The amount of reforestation work accomplished during the 8-year period was in direct relation to the amount of money appropriated by Congress for such work, bearing in mind of course the total reforestation needs of all the national forests.

During the 8-year period the total nonsale area in need of planting or seeding increased by some 33,514 acres, practically all as a result of burns. During that same period we succeeded in reforesting only 11,098 acres. As a result, the 1952 backlog of 393,000 acres was increased by 22,416 acres.

Referring to table 3 you will note that average planting cost per acre has risen sharply since fiscal year 1953. Part of this increase may be attributed to the steady rise in costs of materials and services. An even more important factor in the rising cost of reforestation work has been the increasing amount of ground preparation done prior to the actual planting or seeding operation. Experience shows adequate ground preparation in Oregon is essential to assure success and it pays off. We have found that total ground preparation as contrasted to none or only partial ground preparation results in a higher percentage of plantation success, hence less need for costly replanting or reseeding.

Concerning your request for an analysis of reforestation needs on noncommercial timberland in Oregon, may we point out that the reforestation of noncommercial forest land is not being considered now or in the foreseeable future. Our immediate concern, and our chief concern for many years to come, will be the reforestation of the commercial forest land, a job on which we are still far from making satisfactory progress. Table 19 in USDA Forest Resource Report No. 14, entitled "Timber Resources for America's Future," shows 185,000 acres of deforested noncommercial forest land on the national forests in Oregon, as of 1952. Primarily as a result of the 1959 and 1960 fires, we now estimate this figure has increased to 200,000 acres.

Reforestation of noncommercial timberland in Oregon basically has not been explored. The large area of commercial forest land in need of reforestation is one of the primary reasons for deferment of reforestation of noncommercial lands. The primary purpose of reforestation of noncommercial lands in Oregon would be for watershed protection. Natural vegetation, even though not timber species, usually provides sufficient cover for noncommercial deforested areas (primarily burns) to hold soil in place under most Oregon conditions. Where erosion control problems develop after burns, we usually find that the most effective rehabilitation measures are contour trenching, channel clearing, and grass sowing. Funds appropriated by Congress for "rehabilitation of burns" are in part used for these latter purposes and are being so expended on 1960 burns on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

You indicated a desire for a reforestation schedule for Oregon, based on the program of the national forests. The 12-year program calls for the reforestation of 487,000 acres of commercial forest land, composed of nonstocked and poorly stocked land, recent and current burns, and fill-in planting in understocked stands to bring them up to satisfactory stocking. This estimate does not include the acreage which will be planted on clear-cut sale areas during that period, to be financed primarily by Knutson-Van-

denberg Act funds, and which we estimate will total about 480,000 acres. Such a program would require the average annual reforestation of 40,583 acres with appropriated funds and 40,000 acres with Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds, or a total of 80,583 acres

annually. We have not yet prepared an annual breakdown for reforestation objectives in the short-term phase of the program for the national forests.

We are most appreciative of your interest and concern for our reforestation problems

in Oregon and are hopeful that much greater progress can be made in this important job in the years immediately ahead.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. McARDLE,  
Chief.

TABLE 1.—*Reforestation progress on clear-cut sale areas*

[Acres]

	Estimated area clear cut annually	Reforestation accomplishments			Remaining area in need of planting or seeding			Estimated area clear cut annually	Reforestation accomplishments			Remaining area in need of planting or seeding	
		Planted or seeded	Naturally reforested	Total reforested	Annual	Cumulative			Planted or seeded	Naturally reforested	Total reforested	Annual	Cumulative
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1953	14,410	5,734	600	6,334	8,076	8,076	1958	23,140	16,362	620	16,982	6,158	40,630
1954	18,565	9,423	1,550	10,973	7,592	15,668	1959	33,055	24,221	1,860	26,081	6,974	47,604
1955	22,305	12,199	850	13,049	9,256	24,924	1960	42,745	33,539		33,539	9,206	56,810
1956	22,940	12,747	1,530	14,277	8,663	33,587	Total	201,450	136,210	8,430	144,640		156,810
1957	24,290	21,985	1,420	23,405	885	34,472							

<sup>1</sup> Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds are available, and plans are made, for planting or seeding all but 22,204 acres of this total. Planting of the 22,204 acres will have to be financed with appropriated funds.

TABLE 2.—*Reforestation progress on nonsale areas*<sup>1</sup>

[Acres]

Fiscal year	Estimated area in need of planting or seeding		Planted or seeded <sup>2</sup>	Remaining area in need of planting or seeding—cumulative	Fiscal year	Estimated area in need of planting or seeding		Planted or seeded <sup>2</sup>	Remaining area in need of planting or seeding—cumulative
	Added annually	Cumulative				Added annually	Cumulative		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
As of—					As of—				
1952			393,000	393,000	1958	1,498	403,465	1,268	396,975
1953	1,599	394,599	1,399	393,200	1959	9,843	413,308	2,208	404,610
1954	538	394,937	218	393,520	1960	13,206	426,514	2,400	415,416
1955	3,860	398,297	790	395,590	Total	33,514	426,514	11,098	415,416
1956	1,995	400,292	1,140	396,745					
1957	1,675	401,967	1,675	396,745					

<sup>1</sup> Nonstocked and poorly stocked, including recent burns which have not restocked naturally.

<sup>2</sup> Financed by appropriated funds.

<sup>3</sup> Backlog of nonstocked and poorly stocked commercial forest land on Oregon national forests, as of 1952 (from table 10, "Timber Resources for America's Future,"

USDA Forest Resource Report No. 14, January 1958). This is made up largely of old burns but includes an unestimated small acreage of old cutovers on sale areas and on lands acquired in a deforested condition. These old cutovers have failed to regenerate naturally and in some cases past plantations failed.

TABLE 3.—*Summary of annual reforestation accomplishment and costs, Oregon, fiscal years 1953 to 1960, inclusive*

Fiscal year	Average planting cost per acre	Appropriated funds (P. & M.)		K-V funds <sup>1</sup>		All funds	
		Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost	Total acres	Total cost
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1953	\$24.90	1,399	\$34,835.10	5,734	\$142,776.60	7,133	\$177,611.70
1954	28.25	218	6,158.50	9,423	266,199.75	9,641	272,358.25
1955	29.11	790	22,996.90	12,199	355,112.89	12,989	378,109.79
1956	28.83	1,140	32,866.20	12,747	367,496.01	13,887	400,362.21
1957	31.28	1,675	52,394.00	21,985	687,690.80	23,660	740,084.80
1958	34.34	1,268	43,543.12	16,362	561,871.08	17,630	605,414.20
1959	38.37	2,208	84,720.96	24,221	929,359.77	26,429	1,014,080.73
1960	46.11	2,400	110,664.00	33,539	1,546,483.29	35,939	1,657,147.29
Total		11,098	388,178.78	136,210	4,856,990.19	147,308	5,245,168.97

<sup>1</sup> Funds collected and available for expenditure on timber sale areas under authority of sec. 3 of the Knutson-Vandenberg Act of June 9, 1930.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I read with interest the recommendations of the President to deal with the short-term and long-term aspects of the balance-of-payments problem. I think it is a very comprehensive and helpful statement.

In his message he notes the desirability of expanding agricultural exports. I would suggest, in this connection, that

the administration and Congress give consideration to strengthening the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture, the function of which is to study means, and to take action to encourage agricultural exports. It has done exceedingly well in the last 8 years, when agricultural exports have risen to their highest level.

This action would be consistent with the President's recommendation to strengthen the commercial attachés of the Department of Commerce. I would

also urge that the representatives of the State Department at the GATT negotiations examine closely the restrictive quotas and tariffs placed against the export of many U.S. agricultural commodities, and work for their reduction.

I point to a specific example. The common market countries of Europe have agreed to place heavy ad valorem duties on the import of some agricultural crops not produced in their countries. The common market countries are today the chief dollar markets for many agricultural commodities. If their restrictions go into effect, I believe we will see a great reduction in our dollar market for farm products.

I discussed this matter with Mr. Douglas Dillon, when he was Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. I did so at that time because it applied to tobacco in my own State. Tobacco has had a 30 percent ad valorem duty placed upon its importation. But it applies to other agricultural products as well. He knows the problem. Last year he directed our representatives at the GATT meetings in Geneva to seek a reduction of the heavy ad valorem duties that were to be imposed by the common market countries.

Some of these duties will become effective this year, and then will rise gradually over a period of years. This subject needs immediate attention and very

forceful representation at the GATT meetings on the part of the State Department.

Unless immediate attention is given to this problem by the State Department and strong representations are made at the GATT meetings, I believe we will see a loss in our greatest dollar market for farm products.

I bring up this question because the President has given great stress in his recommendation to an increase in the export of agricultural products.

I should like to make another comment on the President's message concerning the balance of payments problem. Many of his recommendations are designed to immediately curtail the flow of dollars overseas for services and for investment. This will reduce the balance of payments gap and deter the flight from the U.S. dollar.

However, in the long run, one basic requirement for a solid and lasting solution of the problem depends on the increase of our exports. If this is to occur, our products, as the President states, must be made more competitive in the world market.

Several methods are suggested in his message to make our products more competitive. Some of them would involve a long period of time. For example, proposal for tax reform, to encourage modern plants and tooling, for increased productivity and lower unit cost, could not quickly show results. This is true of some of the other recommendations that have been made and perhaps will be made. I am thinking of what will occur in the interim period, before these basic steps to make our products more competitive can become effective.

The President suggests in his message an answer that I think should be emphasized very strongly. It is that business and labor in this immediate period should exercise great restraint about price and wage policies. If there should be great advances in price at this time, or in wages without valid cause, exports will fall, and competitive imports increase. The emergency measure proposed might become ineffective.

The second important matter in connection with the balance of payments problems is simply one of confidence. If the American people have confidence in our economy, if they have confidence in the proper management of our fiscal and monetary affairs and our budget then the movement of dollars overseas for investment will be reduced. If other countries do not have confidence in the management of our governmental affairs, and our fiscal and monetary affairs, they will withdraw their investments and make their claims against our gold stocks.

This is nothing new. When I was in Europe after the election, I talked to people in several European countries. At the NATO Conference I talked with many representatives from those countries. In England I talked to members of the House of Commons. Many of them said, "Although any emergency action you take with regard to the bal-

ance of payment problem will be immediately adverse to us, yet we know that such action must be taken, because in the long run our economic and fiscal situation is related to the strength of the American economy and upon the proper management of its fiscal and monetary affairs."

I have read very carefully the recommendations made by the President concerning the economic problems of our country. I certainly find no objection to, and support his emergency recommendations, because the emergencies created by unemployment must be met as a human problem. We must also attempt to solve the long term problems of our country. However, we cannot escape the necessity of maintaining expenditures at a reasonable level as compared with revenues to prevent inflation and the lack of confidence caused by recurring deficits. If attention is not given to the problem, then people, here and abroad, will lose confidence in the ability of our country to manage its affairs. In that case, whatever short term measures are taken, I doubt if we could really solve the balance of payments problem.

The emergency problem of the unemployed must be faced, defense and long term needs commenced; but great restraint must still be exercised in the making of expenditures which are not essential and necessary to the emergency and basic needs of the Nation.

The President's message emphasizes the necessity of great sacrifices on the part of the American people. I concur in the necessity for sacrifice. However, his first message to Congress dealing with economic measures, particularly to meet emergency problems, does not, in my judgment, call for great sacrifices by the American people or Congress.

The sacrifices by the Congress and the people will be evidenced by the kind of expenditures which are made; whether they are essentially for emergency purposes; whether they are for defense and long-term needs and interests of the country; or whether we simply use the call for action as an excuse to add expenditures not related to basic needs—creating unnecessary deficits and inflation.

I say this approving very strongly of the necessity for emergency expenditures to solve the problem of unemployment. I say this supporting very strongly the need for meeting the issue of the long-term needs of the country in the field of education.

The sacrifice will be evidenced by the willingness of management and labor, faced with the problem of the balance of payments and an economic downturn, to restrain higher prices and wages unless based on valid reasons.

And if I may say so—because I think the administration has started well—the administration can give the leadership toward sacrifice, by resisting measures which do not deserve first priority, by building confidence in its fiscal, monetary, and budgetary policies as it moves toward its goals. For confidence in the leadership of the United States will be the greatest asset of our country.

#### OPPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA INTO THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD BE CLEARLY STATED AND VIGOROUSLY PURSUED

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the proposed admission of Communist China into the United Nations is still a vital and crucial issue. So is the attitude and policy in this regard of our administration and of officials of our Government in high positions.

There was widespread and justified concern and distress at the expression of apparent futility in continued U.S. resistance to admission for the assigned reason that such resistance was foredoomed to failure.

An opinion too often heard expressed is that Communist China will soon have enough votes and that America had better prepare for that defeat.

Mr. President, the fact and the truth still remain that to admit Red China would be a monumental mistake. It would bring into virulent action a great many factors and troubles which would forebode serious setbacks and ills for the cause of the free world.

By way of brief reminder only, the admission of Red China into the United Nations would result in the following: First, admission to membership of a government which was imposed upon a country with the help of a foreign power; two, membership of a government which is against the principles of the United Nations; three, membership in the United Nations of a government which is at war with the United States, even though the present status of that war is one of a shaky armistice; and four, a country's United Nations membership which would weaken Japan enormously; impair and perhaps destroy the will of many small nations to resist attachment to the Communist world; and, of course, be a gross betrayal and impairment of our historic and treaty obligations to Taiwan.

It is not inevitable, Mr. President, that this happen if a forceful and vigorous position is taken on the issue. The admission of Communist China can be defeated in the United Nations Assembly if the proper presentation of the merits of America's position is made in good faith; and if there is a pledge that we will continue our opposition in the United Nations Security Council if necessary to carry the issue.

To do otherwise than to clearly state and vigorously prosecute this point of view would be to abandon moral force, which the United States has always understood to be the foundation and core of our participation in United Nations activity.

It would be wrong and harmful for Red China to be admitted to the United Nations. It is even greater error and more harmful to be defeatist about the issue and to meekly suggest submission to the bludgeoning efforts of Red China and her protagonists, for the assigned reasons that we are bowing to the inevitable.

It is not my intention at this time to go into the many and complex ramifications of this subject, Mr. President. This has been done before, on this floor, and much more competently than I could do.

The purpose of my remarks at this time is twofold: First, to restate and reaffirm the proposition and position previously taken by the Senate in declaring its sense to be against admission of Red China to the United Nations; and, second, to bring to the attention of this body and of those who follow its activities two very splendid statements on the subject at hand.

One is an editorial by David Lawrence published in the February 6, 1961, issue of the U.S. News & World Report. The editorial is entitled, "Defeatism?"

The other statement of position is part of the testimony given last week, before the Senate Internal Subcommittee, by Jay Lovestone, on the "Meaning of the New Communist Manifesto" of December 1960.

Mr. Lovestone is considered an outstanding authority on the history, objectives, and procedures of the Communist Party and of communism.

Some 40 years ago he was a member of the Communist Party, and, in fact, served—in the early 1920's, as I recall—as general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Before he was expelled from the party in 1929, he served as a member of the executive committee of the Communist International; and, as such, he participated in the formulation of documents similar to the manifesto of 1960, to which he addressed himself in the course of his testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member.

Since 1929, he has devoted his efforts and energies to constant and painstaking study, investigation, and analysis of Communist programs and actions. He has cooperated energetically, fully, and constructively in activities exposing, publicizing, and legislating against such programs and actions.

Although Mr. Lovestone is now consultant on international affairs for the AFL-CIO, his appearance before the Internal Security Subcommittee was not in that capacity, but, rather, was as an individual who was giving his opinions and evaluations based on his years of study and practical experience in the subject field.

His responses to questions about Red China's admission to the United Nations and the deplorably defeatist attitude of some of our Government's highly placed officials merit the careful attention of Members of this body, as well as of all others who are concerned with this most vital issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Lawrence's editorial to which I have referred, as well as selected excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Jay Lovestone.

There being no objection, the editorial and the excerpts from the testimony were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 6, 1961]

#### DEFEATISM?

(By David Lawrence)

For several weeks now a spirit of defeatism has been permeating some of the comments on Far Eastern problems by prominent men in this country.

An opinion often heard expressed is that Red China will soon have enough votes in the United Nations to secure a seat on the Security Council and that America had better prepare for that defeat.

The new administration in Washington is, of course, being watched from abroad to see whether there is any sign of softening in our policy toward the Communists. Unfortunately, the viewpoint of the British and other governments which have recognized Red China is that the United States should change its position.

This would be a fatal error. It would mean trouble for everybody in the Far East. To bow to Red China would demoralize South Korea, the Philippines and the Chinese on Formosa. All together, these have a sizable military force which it would be senseless for us to weaken or discard. British sympathizers with Red China have never ventured to say whether England would supply the military forces that our side would lose if Red China is admitted to the Security Council of the U.N.

The real chance of a new war is in the Far East. America has kept the peace largely by a policy of firmness embodied in what is known as the Eisenhower resolution. It was passed by both Houses of Congress by an almost unanimous vote.

Red China knows we have drawn a line in the Far East. Will we defend it? Regrettably in the recent political campaign the question of urging the Nationalist Chinese to withdraw from Quemoy and Matsu was debated. It was a mistake ever to let this question come into the political forum.

President Kennedy, however, has shown no signs of weakening on the main issue, though his speeches did leave the impression that he wasn't certain about holding Quemoy and Matsu.

More disconcerting perhaps than any other factor in recent days has been the comments by some of Mr. Kennedy's principal advisers. They have been talking about the "inevitable" admission of Red China into the United Nations. One adviser—Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who has been appointed to the White House staff—even speaks of the admission of the Peiping regime to the U.N. as "a reasonable price to pay" in order to get Red China and the Soviet Union into "a system of reliable arms control."

Both Adlai Stevenson, who is now the American Ambassador to the United Nations, and Chester Bowles, the new Under Secretary of State, have expressed their views indicating a belief that Red China will eventually be admitted to the U.N. To predict it is a sign of weakness. Many people in the free world will come to regard such comments as part of a trend toward the abandonment of moral force.

It is not customary for an athletic team to go into a game announcing in advance that its defeat is inevitable. Where is our faith in the power of American idealism? Why do we concede we cannot win a debate in the U.N. on the merits of this question? Has Red China changed since the U.N. itself declared by formal resolution that the Peiping regime was the aggressor in Korea? Have we in America forgotten the 157,000 casualties we suffered there? Will the United

Nations have any real influence in the world if it sacrifices its own self-respect and yields to the Communist bloc?

An American statesman once made this plea:

"Moral power can be a powerful force in the world. That is not a mere pious hope. It is the judgment of every realist throughout history. It was Napoleon who said that 'in war, moral considerations make up three-fourths of the game.' It was Admiral Mahan who said that physical force was useful only 'to give moral ideals time to take root.'"

"The need is for more effective political use of moral power. The moral law, happily, is a universal law."

These words of the late John Foster Dulles, in a paper submitted to the Amsterdam assembly of the World Council of Churches in September 1948, are as valid today as when they were written.

Why should we retreat on the moral issue of Red China? Why can't we convince our allies that idealism wins far more battles than materialism?

President Kennedy at his first news conference said "there has been a rather belligerent attitude expressed toward us in recent days by the Chinese Communists."

Yet some of the advisers to the President and some of his principal supporters in the press still seem to favor appeasement of the Red Chinese.

This is not the road to peace but the road to war. Defeatism on our side causes the enemy to miscalculate—to assume we will not fight for our policies.

What is needed is not defeatism, but a counteroffensive in behalf of idealism—a strong manifestation of moral power. Otherwise, we will find the United Nations gradually stripped of the only force that can save mankind.

#### EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY ON FEBRUARY 2, 1961, OF JAY LOVESTONE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

Senator JOHNSTON. So your position, then, is that we must hold onto Berlin and not weaken in the least, because if we do we are liable to lose all of Europe, isn't that true?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I will go further than that. If we weaken we are not liable to lose it, we are very likely to lose it.

Senator JOHNSTON. And we wouldn't be long about it?

Mr. LOVESTONE. No; it wouldn't be long, because it is like a snowball, it is like an avalanche, the people say, "You have got to be realists," and "realists" means you have got to yield to the other fellow, you have got to accept the other fellow's position when you want to avoid an issue. And that is what we have.

Senator HRUSKA. Don't we have a little bit of that in connection with the admission of Red China to the United Nations right here in this country? What are your views on the admission of Red China to the United Nations, Mr. Lovestone?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I think it would be a major disaster for our country if we were to admit Red China in the United Nations, if we were to allow it to be admitted—and I will tell you in a moment why. There is an Afro-Asian bloc there. That bloc doesn't have a very effective leadership. That bloc is divided. In that bloc there is an enormous amount of influence exercised by Tito, who, though he supports Moscow on every practical question, still is a sort of a warning to Nasser, "listen, be careful, you know you can do business with him but be a little careful."

If Communist China comes in, Communist China becomes the leader of the Afro-Asian bloc. And let me say to you, the first

country where we would be weakened enormously is Japan, which is still the most important country in the Far East from the standpoint of economic and potential military strength.

What would happen to the smaller countries, Burma, Nepal, Afghanistan, let alone countries like Malaya, Ceylon, or Indonesia? They will say, "If United States has thrown in the sponge, why should we stick around and get socked? There is no point in being hostile."

And there would be, not a headline but a pushing line of everybody wanting to do business and submitting to Mao Tse-tung.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say we must not allow China in the United Nations. Do you mean we should not give up our opposition to it, or do you have in mind that there is some way in which we alone can literally stop it?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I will tell you what I wouldn't do. I wouldn't announce in advance that Communist China is sooner or later coming into the United Nations. I think that sort of talk is useless, even if that were the case. It would be useless.

Senator HRUSKA. Is it harmful?

Mr. LOVESTONE. It is harmful. You hurt your own case and cause, assuming that is our case and cause, that we are opposed. If we are not, I think we ought to say so openly. But the argument has been made that you cannot ignore the existence of a country with this population. And here I beg leave to read a page or so that I have on this question in my original report, because I think that covers it:

"Neither our country nor any other nation can ignore the existence of a country with the population, area, strategic importance, and Communist aims and activities of Mao Tse-tung China. Our national security demands that we do not ignore it, but be ever vigilant against its subversive efforts and ever stronger to meet its potential aggression. In this light, our Government has negotiated with Chinese Communist representatives in Korea, Poland, and Switzerland. But this has not required our Government to accord the Peiping regime diplomatic recognition. Even if Communist China were to become a signatory along with other powers, let us say to an international disarmament treaty, that would not require our Government granting Peiping diplomatic recognition. Let us forget, years before our Government recognized the Soviet Union, we did not ignore it and signed jointly with it and others the Kellogg Pact on disarmament.

"It would be a catastrophe for our country—on the basis of such differences between Moscow and Peiping—to do anything which would, in effect, help reduce, let alone eliminate, the irritations or overcome the disputes between Moscow and Peiping. Recognizing Communist China, voting it into U.N. membership, or providing it with the technological and economic assistance which Moscow cannot provide, would strengthen Peiping and thus seriously weaken our country's international position and prestige. Such steps would only help remove the friction and jealousies between the two Communist giants and weld their ranks and strengthen their vast armies geared for further aggression."

And I maintain that it should be the policy of our Government not to eliminate, not to soften, not to do anything which would remove those contradictions and irritations, but rather pursue a course which would promote the contradictions in the enemy camp, just as they do against us.

Now, you will say to me, what do you say we must do at all costs?

I will tell you what I would do, positively. I would say to every ally, and I would say to every country in Europe, "We consider the admission of Communist China a blow to our most vital interests, and we insist, and

we will take note of your conduct, that you vote against or do not vote for," and bring it down that way, instead of yielding to the pressure of some of our weaker allies and announcing in advance that we are going to admit them anyway, they are going to come in anyway sooner or later, I would stand firmly, and I would work for this position.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say that with the knowledge, of course, Mr. Lovestone, that this Government has taken the view that the admission of Red China is a matter of representation and, that it is a question of whose credentials are to be accepted, and this must be decided at the General Assembly and, by vote, isn't that correct?

Mr. LOVESTONE. That is a very interesting question you are raising. And it involves, I think, a need for a fundamental reexamination of some of the principles of diplomacy. It has been said that effective controls by the government of any country is the test for recognition, not the mere credentials, but effective control. Now, I maintain that that was all right in the days of Grotius, and that was all right even up to World War I. But something has happened in the world which invalidates that. And what is that? Today the test of effective control is no longer valid, because Communists in any country can get the assistance of a foreign government to establish a dictatorship and rule by terror, and that means effective control, and it no longer means representation but repression of the people.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lovestone, I am sure I didn't get my point across. I believe you are talking about recognition in the sense that one nation recognizes another. I was referring to your statement that we should do this thing, I paraphrase you, to coerce our allies into voting against the admission of Red China in the United Nations.

Mr. LOVESTONE. I say convince them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Now, you know that the United States has taken the position, has accepted the view that getting Red China into the United Nations is not a matter of admitting a new country to the United Nations, but is a matter of saying, Red China is truly China, China is in the United Nations, we will recognize the credentials of the Red Chinese, we will put Mao Tse-tung in, he is China, that is the present situation, is it not?

Mr. LOVESTONE. There is a division of opinion on that. I know what you say is true—

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, if it were not a matter of representation, of credentials to accept, if it were a matter of letting the new nation in, it would go before the Security Council, would it not, and we have a veto in Security Council, and if it were a matter of letting a new nation in, we could use that veto to keep Red China out without going through this rigmarole you were talking about of convincing others to get their votes, because if we lose—if they are two-thirds in favor of letting them in in the General Assembly then they are in.

Mr. LOVESTONE. It is a question of what you consider the problems to be, procedural or substantive. If they are substantive, we have the veto power. If they are procedural, we can get licked on a majority.

Mr. SOURWINE. Even though a number of years ago an American Secretary of State said this was a procedural problem, as you call it, is there any reason why this country couldn't reverse its stand, if it is a matter of national importance as you say it is, and declare that this is a matter of substance, and that it must be passed on by the Security Council?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I think this country not only can, but must take the position that this is the most substantive question that can face United Nations, and it should take the position that no government or no regime is eligible for membership in the

United Nations which (a) was imposed upon a country with the help of a foreign power; and which (b) is against the principles of the United Nations; and (c) which is at war with the United Nations—which the Mao Tse-tung regime is today, there has never been an end to the war, there has been an armistice, a shaky one. And I think on those three grounds our Government should take the position that this is the most substantive matter that can confront us in the United Nations.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday, at noon, at which time the money resolutions will be taken up.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned to Thursday, February 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 6, 1961:

##### IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

##### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Jonas Ely, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frank Hamilton Britton, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Thigpen Duncan, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, [REDACTED], Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Augur Hewitt, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ray Joseph Laux, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Curtis James Herrick, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore John Conway, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Warren Gray, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Henry Chase, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Ralph Yancey, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gardner Shinkle, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

##### To be brigadier generals

Col. Jackson Graham, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Michael Illig, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Rigby Glass, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.  
Col. William Andrew Enemark, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Edward Landrum, Jr., [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Roberts Calhoun, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.  
Col. Howard William Doan, [REDACTED], Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Alan Beresford Todd, [REDACTED], Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Albert Ollie Connor, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Patrick Howard Devine, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Bradford Rosson, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Edward Peters, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Eugene Albert Salet, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Col. James Howard Skeldon, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert George Fergusson, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Edward Kelly, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Jarvis Tolson, 3d, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Giles Stilwell, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Henry Chiles, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Travis Tabor Brown, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Albert Symroski, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Col. Milburn Neil Huston, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Colonel Horace Greeley Davisson, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Martin Worthington, [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, Jr., [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., [REDACTED], U.S. Army.

Col. William Pelham Yarborough, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Charles Haneke, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

#### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

#### To be colonels

Abrams, Creighton W., Jr., [REDACTED].

Adams, Donald L., [REDACTED].

Adams, Duval S., [REDACTED].

Albro, Robert D., [REDACTED].

Arnold, Leslie A., [REDACTED].

Arp, David H., [REDACTED].

Ashenfelder, William F., [REDACTED].

Atkins, Edwin L., [REDACTED].

Austin, Edward L., [REDACTED].

Bagley, Ray M., [REDACTED].

Baker, Jack B., [REDACTED].

Bankus, John T., [REDACTED].

Barkin, Albert, [REDACTED].

Barton, Douglas C., [REDACTED].

Bealke, Jacob W., Jr., [REDACTED].

Benson, Henry K., Jr., [REDACTED].

Bess, Walter B., [REDACTED].

Billingslea, Charles, [REDACTED].

Bishop, Loren E., [REDACTED].

Blair, Richard A., [REDACTED].

Bodine, Donald E., [REDACTED].

Boerner, Otto M., [REDACTED].

Bower, Harvey, [REDACTED].

Boyer, Oscar R., [REDACTED].

Breaks, Robert W., [REDACTED].

Bush, Robert B., [REDACTED].

Butler, Bradford, Jr., [REDACTED].

Cato, Raymond L., [REDACTED].

Chaffin, Andrew D., [REDACTED].

Chiles, John H., [REDACTED].

Clapper, John, Jr., [REDACTED].

Clifton, Chester V., Jr., [REDACTED].

Cole, Glenn, [REDACTED].

Cole, Roy W., Jr., [REDACTED].

Collier, Clay O., [REDACTED].

Conine, James C., [REDACTED].

Connerat, William H., [REDACTED].

Connor, William M., [REDACTED].

Cooke, Thomas W., [REDACTED].

Cordes, Clifford F., Jr., [REDACTED].

Covington, Carroll M., [REDACTED].

Crawford, Claude L., [REDACTED].

Crownover, Robert L., [REDACTED].

Cupello, Albert R., [REDACTED].

Curtis, Donald McB., [REDACTED].

Cuttino, Thomas E., [REDACTED].

Daly, John H., [REDACTED].

Davidson, Richard P., [REDACTED].

Dawalt, Kenneth F., [REDACTED].

DeMelker, Bert, [REDACTED].

Devine, Patrick H., [REDACTED].

Dews, Omer S., [REDACTED].

Dickens, Randolph C., [REDACTED].

Dilley, John H., [REDACTED].

Donnell, Thomas W., [REDACTED].

Doran, Roy E., [REDACTED].

Douglass, George A., [REDACTED].

Drain, Jesse C., Jr., [REDACTED].

Duncan, William D., [REDACTED].

Dunn, Edward C., [REDACTED].

Durbin, William F., [REDACTED].

Dyer, Kenneth R., [REDACTED].

Eason, James F., [REDACTED].

Edmunds, John D., [REDACTED].

Edwards, David L., [REDACTED].

Elliott, Ralph H., [REDACTED].

Evans, Benjamin F., Jr., [REDACTED].

Ferguson, Robert G., [REDACTED].

Field, Raymond F., [REDACTED].

Finley, George A., [REDACTED].

Franks, Robert B., [REDACTED].

Frazier, Leroy E., [REDACTED].

Frederick, Horace B., [REDACTED].

Funk, Myron A., [REDACTED].

Furphy, Foster LeR., [REDACTED].

Furrell, Alfred W., [REDACTED].

Galanti, Philip J., [REDACTED].

Ganns, Ralph R., [REDACTED].

Gaston, Frederick H., Jr., [REDACTED].

Gerard, Paul T., [REDACTED].

Gillette, Shelby L., [REDACTED].

Glover, Bob H., [REDACTED].

Gooding, Clarence E., [REDACTED].

Goodwin, James E., [REDACTED].

Goshorn, John A., [REDACTED].

Gramzow, John G., [REDACTED].

Grondona, Richard J., [REDACTED].

Grothaus, Donald G., [REDACTED].

Gullion, Maurice B., [REDACTED].

Hagerty, Harry E., [REDACTED].

Hahney, Everett G., [REDACTED].

Hall, Harry A., [REDACTED].

Hall, Lewis A., [REDACTED].

Hall, Sylvester A., [REDACTED].

Haneke, William C., [REDACTED].

Harrison, Joseph H., [REDACTED].

Harvey, Raymond J., [REDACTED].

Hauschultz, Earl H., [REDACTED].

Hayes, Thomas J., 3d, [REDACTED].

Hector, John R., [REDACTED].

Heintges, John A., [REDACTED].

Hemion, Roger H., [REDACTED].

Helster, David W., [REDACTED].

Hill, Richard F., [REDACTED].

Hill, William W., Jr., [REDACTED].

Hines, John D., [REDACTED].

Hirshorn, B. J. Leon, [REDACTED].

Hoffman, Paul O., [REDACTED].

Holderness, Stephen W., [REDACTED].

Holterman, Gordon H., [REDACTED].

Hoskot, Nathaniel E., [REDACTED].

Hughes, George E., [REDACTED].

Illig, James M., [REDACTED].

Isham, Carl T., [REDACTED].

Jacoby, Arthur M., [REDACTED].

Jeffrey, Jack C., [REDACTED].

Jenkins, Charles A., [REDACTED].

Johnson, Finis G., [REDACTED].

Johnson, Lester B., [REDACTED].

Jones, John P., Jr., [REDACTED].

Jones, Thomas B., [REDACTED].

Keist, Benjamin F., [REDACTED].

Kelly, John E., [REDACTED].

Kerkering, John H., [REDACTED].

Kessler, Robert H., [REDACTED].

Keyes, Richard W., [REDACTED].

Kieffer, Pierre V., Jr., [REDACTED].

Kinard, William H., Jr., [REDACTED].

King, Laurence T., [REDACTED].

Kuhn, William A., [REDACTED].

Lampert, James B., [REDACTED].

Landrum, James E., Jr., [REDACTED].

Landry, Wilmer C., [REDACTED].

Laughlin, George T., [REDACTED].

Laurion, Lawrence E., [REDACTED].

Layne, Clyde L., [REDACTED].

Layton, Charles B., [REDACTED].

Lee, Eugene M., [REDACTED].

Lee, Frank E., [REDACTED].

Leer, James B., [REDACTED].

Leidenheimer, John L., [REDACTED].

Lockhart, Eugene E., [REDACTED].

Lutz, Robert R., [REDACTED].

Lynch, John M., [REDACTED].

Malevich, Steven, [REDACTED].

Marden, Lyman P., Jr., [REDACTED].

Markey, Lawrence B., [REDACTED].

Marr, Lloyd M., [REDACTED].

McCabe, Robert E., [REDACTED].

McCarty, Roy D., [REDACTED].

McCormac, Weston A., [REDACTED].

McCormick, Harold D., [REDACTED].

McElheny, John D., [REDACTED].

McPhall, Thomas D., [REDACTED].

Merriam, Wheeler G., [REDACTED].

Michaelis, John H., [REDACTED].

Middleton, Marter D., [REDACTED].

Miller, Norbert C., [REDACTED].

Milliken, Charles B., [REDACTED].

Millson, Cyril A., [REDACTED].

Mohlere, Edward D., [REDACTED].

Montgomery, Waldo W., [REDACTED].

Moore, John J., [REDACTED].

Moore, Richard H., [REDACTED].

Morris, Howard A., [REDACTED].

Moynahan, James McC., [REDACTED].

Muth, Edwin A., [REDACTED].

Myers, George E., XXXXXX.  
 Norris, Ned T., XXXXXX.  
 Nowe, Charles F., XXXXXX.  
 O'Donnell, Robert J., XXXXXX.  
 O'Keefe, Keith T., XXXXXX.  
 Orton, Eugene M., XXXXXX.  
 Oswald, Paul F., XXXXXX.  
 Otto, Thomas W., XXXXXX.  
 Overby, Carl H., XXXXXX.  
 Page, Gordon B., XXXXXX.  
 Page, Reginald J. B., XXXXXX.  
 Palmer, Bruce, Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Partridge, Robert B., XXXXXX.  
 Peck, Allen L., XXXXXX.  
 Peeke, Charles M., XXXXXX.  
 Pennington, James C., XXXXXX.  
 Persons, Howard P., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Phelps, Preston V., XXXXXX.  
 Phillips, Burton K., XXXXXX.  
 Pillivant, Ray A., XXXX.  
 Porter, Roy V., XXXXXX.  
 Powell, Beverly E., XXXXXX.  
 Prall, Josef A., XXXXXX.  
 Pratt, Ford E., XXXXXX.  
 Prince, William R., XXXXXX.  
 Quinn, James F., XXXXXX.  
 Redfield, Robert S., XXXXXX.  
 Reger, Hamilton, XXXXXX.  
 Reichel, Michael J., XXXXXX.  
 Reisner, Raymond W., XXXXXX.  
 Ripple, Richard W., XXXXXX.  
 Robb, John E., XXXXXX.  
 Robinson, Leonard G., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Rochford, Allan B., XXXXXX.  
 Ryder, William T., XXXXXX.  
 Safford, Robert H., XXXXXX.  
 Saholsky, Bolick A., XXXXXX.  
 Salet, Eugene A., XXXXXX.  
 Sampson, George P., XXXXXX.  
 Satterwhite, Seymour B., XXXXXX.  
 Schoenfeld, Walter E., XXXXXX.  
 Selgler, Thomas J., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Shea, Leonard C., XXXXXX.  
 Shell, Robert H., XXXXXX.  
 Shuler, William R., XXXXXX.  
 Shurm, Vernon A., XXXXXX.  
 Sievers, William E., XXXXXX.  
 Slayden, William M., 2d, XXXXXX.  
 Slobe, Elmer L., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, James P., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, Selwyn D., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, Stephen E., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, Vernon M., XXXXXX.  
 Smoak, John R., XXXXXX.  
 Snyder, Howard M., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Springer, Robert R., XXXXXX.  
 Stanwix-Hay, Allen T., XXXXXX.  
 Stricklen, William A., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Summers, Robert R., XXXXXX.  
 Sutherland, Edwin Van V., XXXXXX.  
 Swain, Oren, XXXXXX.  
 Thurston, Clair H., XXXXXX.  
 Tibbs, Richard B., XXXXXX.  
 Tiffany, Raymond H., XXXXXX.  
 Tomlinson, Robert B., XXXXXX.  
 Torrey, John D., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Townsend, Dured E., XXXXXX.  
 Townsend, Horace E., XXXXXX.  
 Turnage, Benjamin O., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Van Fleet, Raymond, XXXXXX.  
 Vaughan, Curry N., XXXXXX.  
 Von Kaenel, Howard E., XXXXXX.  
 Walker, Fred L., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Walker, Robert T., XXXXXX.  
 Waters, Charles H., XXXXXX.  
 Watts, James K., XXXXXX.  
 Wells, James F., XXXXXX.  
 West, Bland, XXXXXX.  
 Westmoreland, William C., XXXXXX.  
 White, Emmett R., XXXXXX.  
 Whitney, Carl L., XXXXXX.  
 Wiechmann, Joseph H., XXXXXX.  
 Williams, Edward W., XXXXXX.  
 Williams, Jack L., XXXXXX.  
 Williams, John M., XXXXXX.  
 Withers, Edwin J., XXXXXX.  
 Wyatt, William O., XXXXXX.  
 Yarborough, William P., XXXXXX.  
 Yatsewitch, Gratian M., XXXXXX.  
 Yost, Joseph B., XXXXXX.  
 Zelgler, Clyde C., XXXXXX.

*To be colonels, Chaplain*

Gaskins, Steve P., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Hundley, Maury, Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Murphy, Charles J., XXXXXX.

*To be colonels, Medical Corps*

Anderson, Robert S., XXXXXX.  
 Benenson, Abram S., XXXXXX.  
 Bergman, Phillip A., XXXXXX.  
 Burry, William C., XXXX.  
 Crane, Francis S., XXXXXX.  
 Dickerson, Robert B., XXXXXX.  
 Draper, Stuart I., XXXXXX.  
 Eberhart, Claude M., XXXXXX.  
 Eyerman, Melvin F., XXXXXX.  
 Patton, Thomas E., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Shuey, Harold E., XXXXXX.  
 Spann, Franklin L., XXXXXX.  
 Sullivan, Benjamin H., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Wier, James A., XXXXXX.

*To be colonels, Dental Corps*

Avary, Hugh D., XXXXXX.  
 Brayshaw, Horace A., XXXXXX.  
 Gray, Eugene W., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Gullickson, Herbert L., XXXXXX.  
 Hagerman, Calvin G., XXXXXX.  
 McConnell, Leon G., XXXXXX.  
 McCracken, Gerald A., XXXXXX.  
 Miller, Paul A., XXXXXX.  
 Priebe, Winlaw A., XXXXXX.  
 Radford, Lawrence C., XXXXXX.

*To be colonels, Medical Service Corps*

Berry, Floyd L., XXXXXX.  
 Bohn, Gordon A., XXXXXX.  
 Carlquist, Phillip R., XXXXXX.  
 Clark, James F., XXXXXX.  
 Guenther, Augustus J. D., XXXXXX.  
 McMeen, Edwin D., XXXXXX.  
 Murphy, George E., XXXXXX.  
 Pappas, Allen, XXXXXX.  
 Parker, R. L., XXXXXX.  
 Read, Robert N., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, Glenn K., XXXXXX.  
 Webb, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Whitley, Fenner H., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Wingo, Ronald H., XXXXXX.

*To be colonel, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Robinson, Ruth A., J45.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants*

Adkins, Donald V., XXXXXX.  
 Alexander, Walter D., XXXXXX.  
 Amazeen, Charles P., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Amlong, William E., XXXXXX.  
 Arcari, Joseph J., XXXXXX.  
 Ault, John W., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Barge, Walter S., XXXXXX.  
 Barnebey, Hoyt W., XXXXXX.  
 Bartlett, William G., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Baxter, Wayne H., XXXXXX.  
 Benoit, Peter B., XXXXXX.  
 Bingham, Ellis D., XXXXXX.  
 Bloedorn, Garry W., XXXXXX.  
 Borneman, Frederick H., XXXXXX.  
 Bradley, John W., XXXXXX.  
 Brantley, Danon L., XXXXXX.  
 Brown, Oreal L., XXXXXX.  
 Brugger, Karl A., XXXXXX.  
 Brumbaugh, Larry W., XXXXXX.  
 Carr, Glenn P., XXXXXX.  
 Case, Ralph W., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Chapple, Gerald R., XXXXXX.  
 Clarke, Robert L., XXXXXX.  
 Cordonnier, David J., XXXXXX.  
 Coseo, Gregory F., XXXXXX.  
 Crowley, Bruce B., XXXXXX.  
 Daniel, Joe H., XXXXXX.  
 Daniel, William D., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Dardy, Leo J., XXXXXX.  
 Deas, Hal W., XXXXXX.  
 Deas, Carter L., XXXXXX.  
 Distefano, Herbert C., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Dodson, Charles R., XXXXXX.  
 Douglas, Henry A., XXXXXX.

Evans, James A., XXXXXX.  
 Field, Charles N., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Fitzwilliam, James C., XXXXXX.  
 Fraunfelder, Edgar R., XXXXXX.  
 Friedenwald, Robert L., XXXXXX.  
 Gardella, John L., XXXXXX.  
 Garoutte, Max W., XXXX.  
 Gibson, Nell F., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Goetzke, George R., XXXXXX.  
 Goodchild, Gerald B., XXXXXX.  
 Green, Marvin R., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Gregory, David T., XXXXXX.  
 Griffin, Clarence M., XXXXXX.  
 Hamilton, William A., XXXXXX.  
 Harman, Walter D., XXXXXX.  
 Harris, Donald M., XXXXXX.  
 Harris, William K., XXXXXX.  
 Hart, James E., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Haynie, William S., XXXXXX.  
 Henderson, James M., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Hill, Harvard H., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Hill, Robert P., XXXXXX.  
 Hittner, Leon B., XXXXXX.  
 Holland, Gerald R., XXXXXX.  
 Hurelbrink, Gerald W., XXXXXX.  
 Hurley, Paul C., XXXXXX.  
 Hummel, Theodore W., XXXXXX.  
 Iaconis, Emil P., XXXXXX.  
 Ivers, Larry E., XXXXXX.  
 Jackson, Norwood E., XXXXXX.  
 Jameson, Gene L., XXXXXX.  
 Jew, Soot M., XXXXXX.  
 Johnson, David W., XXXXXX.  
 Jones, John B., XXXXXX.  
 Kaine, George R., XXXXXX.  
 Kastenmayer, Walter W., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Kaufman, Patrick S., XXXXXX.  
 Kosmowski, Jerome A., XXXXXX.  
 Lane, George H., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Laubscher, Alan L., XXXXXX.  
 Lauby, Robert F., XXXXXX.  
 LeBourdais, Carl J., XXXXXX.  
 Lindsey, Richard C., XXXXXX.  
 Longabach, Gordon A., XXXXXX.  
 Loughboro, John P., XXXXXX.  
 Lowe, Larry E., XXXXXX.  
 Lowrey, Austin, 3d, XXXXXX.  
 Lowry, Louis L., XXXXXX.  
 Maddox, Bobby J., XXXXXX.  
 Mahalko, Gerald J., XXXXXX.  
 Malloy, Shaun T., XXXXXX.  
 Mann, Douglas J., XXXXXX.  
 Martin, Willard L., XXXXXX.  
 Massey, Lee T., XXXXXX.  
 Matthews, John B., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 McAllister, James H., XXXXXX.  
 McDermott, Joseph B., XXXXXX.  
 McKenzie, Peter P., XXXXXX.  
 McMullan, Frank W., XXXXXX.  
 Messick, Thomas R., XXXXXX.  
 Miller, Charles E., XXXXXX.  
 Miller, Richard H., XXXXXX.  
 Morgan, Clarold F., XXXXXX.  
 Muhlenfeld, William F., XXXXXX.  
 Murphy, James D., XXXXXX.  
 Myers, Charles M., XXXXXX.  
 Neely, Cecil N., XXXXXX.  
 Newbanks, Ronald R., XXXXXX.  
 Oliva, Albert J., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Palumbo, Patrick J., XXXXXX.  
 Parker, David M., XXXXXX.  
 Patterson, James L., XXXXXX.  
 Petesch, Gary L., XXXXXX.  
 Posz, John R., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Puccinelli, Ronald S., XXXXXX.  
 Rash, Stephen E., XXXXXX.  
 Rehm, Walter E., XXXXXX.  
 Rice, James W., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Richey, Charles G., XXXXXX.  
 Riscassi, Robert W., XXXXXX.  
 Rose, Rocco V., XXXXXX.  
 Schafer, Floyd J., XXXXXX.  
 Scher, Donald M., XXXXXX.  
 Schultz, Norman O., XXXXXX.  
 Segers, Joseph W., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Stegel, Eugene E., XXXX.  
 Sivils, Doye O., XXXXXX.  
 Skelly, James G., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, Fletcher B., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, Sam G., XXXXXX.  
 Smith, Samuel J., XXXXXX.

Spaulding, Richard A., XXXXXX.  
 Statler, James B., XXXXXX.  
 Stiner, Carl W., XXXXXX.  
 Taylor, Alfred E., XXXXXX.  
 Totin, John R., XXXXXX.  
 Tyler, James R., XXXXXX.  
 Walsh, Raymond M., XXXXXX.  
 Walter, John L., XXXXXX.  
 Warren, Peter J., XXXXXX.  
 Weiffenbach, William L., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Widmer, Edwin R., XXXXXX.  
 Wilkins, Jesse B., Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Wilmot, Richard W., XXXXXX.  
 Winzurk, William F., XXXX.  
 Wise, Paul E., XXXXXX.  
 Works, Richard E., XXXXXX.  
 Wright, Gregory F., XXXXXX.  
 Young, Wallace J., XXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Bates, Robert A., XXXXXX.  
 Bock, William, Jr., XXXXXX.  
 Fountain, Donald B., XXXXXX.  
 Piercy, John P., XXXXXX.  
 Waller, Donald A., XXXXXX.  
 Weaver, Joseph U., Jr., XXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps*

Jones, Addie B. L., XXXX.  
 Teele, Kathryn M., XXXXX.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

Morrow, Frank W. (Medical Service Corps), XXXXXX.

*To be major*

Myers, John W. (Medical Service Corps), XXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps*

Kays, John M. (Chemical Corps), XXXXXX.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

*To be captains*

Bachman, Clayton J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Boyd, David T., XXXXXXXX.  
 Brinkpeter, Paul F., XXXXXXXX.  
 Burton, Thomas M., XXXXXXXX.  
 Deibel, Robert E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Dillon, Robert E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Eisenbraun, John M., XXXXXXXX.  
 Felch, James F., XXXX.  
 Galloway, William W., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Ganevsky, Walter J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Gardiner, William P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Lugenbeal, Leo H., XXXXXXXX.  
 Martz, Donald W., XXXXXXXX.  
 Massengale, Eugene W., XXXXXXXX.  
 Moore, Clay P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Murphy, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Pride, Daniel H., XXXXXXXX.  
 Rhotenberry, R. M., XXXXXXXX.  
 Roscher, William G., XXXXXXXX.  
 Simms, Carl H., XXXXXXXX.  
 Skaggs, Ray F., XXXXXXXX.  
 Soldow, James J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Stephens, Rome O., XXXXXXXX.  
 Stranathan, Joseph W., XXXXXXXX.  
 Street, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Valdez, Benjamin F., XXXXXXXX.  
 Warden, Donald W., XXXX.  
 Watson, Shelley F., XXXX.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ament, Robert L., XXXXXXXX.  
 Appling, David A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Baker, Robert M., Sr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Bishop, Donald E., XXXXX.  
 Campbell, George E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Culbreth, Edward C., XXXXXXXX.  
 Davies, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Dunham, Edward K., XXXXXXXX.  
 Goode, David E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Keys, Robert W., Jr., XXXXXXXX.

LaCombe, William F., XXXX.  
 Luther, William H., XXXXXXXX.  
 Norbo, Gary J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Norton, James A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Pace, Donald L., XXXXXXXX.  
 Smith, James A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Strzok, Peter P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Studebaker, Robert L., XXXXXXXX.  
 Tucker, Lee W., XXXXXXXX.  
 Wilkins, Aaron E., II, XXXXXXXX.  
 Williams, Jerry A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Wolfgang, Albert E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Womack, Kenneth S., XXXXXXXX.  
 Woods, Roger B., XXXXXXXX.  
 Young, David C., II, XXXXXXXX.

*To be second lieutenants*

Abreu, Ronald P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Appleton, Forrest W., XXXXXXXX.  
 Baucom, Donald C., XXXXXXXX.  
 Beaumont, Marion E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Benson, Robert J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Bohach, John L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Butts, William T., XXXXXXXX.  
 Cercy, James C., XXXXXXXX.  
 Crysel, James W., XXXXXXXX.  
 Doherty, William J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Elledge, Don T., XXXXXXXX.  
 Finnerty, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Fowkes, Reginald B., XXXXXXXX.  
 Hancock, James B., XXXXXXXX.  
 Hardy, Teddy J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Hart, John B., XXXXXXXX.  
 Hartley, Bobby J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Hopper, Robert F., XXXXXXXX.  
 Jones, Charles C., XXXXXXXX.  
 Kane, John S., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Karegeannes, Harry G., XXXXXXXX.  
 Keegan, Ambrose J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Krausse, Stanley D., XXXXXXXX.  
 Little, William E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Manely, James E., XXXXXXXX.  
 McConnell, Gerald B., XXXXXXXX.  
 McDonald, Warren J., XXXXXXXX.  
 McMahan, Emmet K., III, XXXXXXXX.  
 Mount, William J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Myers, Charles T., III, XXXXXXXX.  
 Nalaboff, Lloyd P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Piecuch, Joseph J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Richardson, Odie B., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Schott, Joseph D., XXXXXXXX.  
 Secrest, Bobby P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Snell, Douglas H., XXXXXXXX.  
 Snowden, John R., XXXXXXXX.  
 Varnon, Jerry R., XXXXXXXX.  
 Vitale, Michael L., XXXXXXXX.  
 Wichert, Gilbert H., XXXXXXXX.  
 Williams, Stuart H., XXXX.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

*To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Arundel, Janice C., XXXX.

*To be captains, Army Nurse Corps*

Carr, Mary J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Rivera, Jeanne E., XXXXXXXX.

*To be captain, Chaplain*

Barry, Raymond E., XXXXXXXX.

*To be captains, Dental Corps*

Cavazos, Edmund, Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Ohlenbusch, Robert E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Strader, Robert J., Sr., XXXXXXXX.

*To be captains, Medical Corps*

Foster, Kendall W., Jr., XXXXXXXX.  
 Gillespie, Marion R., XXXXXXXX.  
 Knospe, William H., XXXXXXXX.  
 Michie, James L., XXXXXXXX.  
 Rugani, Peter R., XXXXXXXX.  
 Rusinko, Andrew, XXXXXXXX.  
 Ylitalo, Elmer W., XXXXXXXX.

*To be captains, Medical Service Corps*

Cardenas-Lartigue, Gilberto, XXXXXXXX.  
 Rada, Roy A., XXXXXXXX.

*To be captain, Veterinary Corps*

Stookey, James L., XXXX.

*To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Ozburn, Mary S., XXXXX.  
 To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps  
 Miller, Patricia M., XXXXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps*

Browne, John P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Nicholas, Talbot J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Renner, Robin L., XXXXXXXX.  
 Thornock, John R., XXXXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps*

Agullo, Juan M., XXXXXXXX.  
 Cordes, Charles K., XXXXXXXX.  
 Duncan, Malcolm P., XXXXXXXX.  
 Golser, John L., XXXXXXXX.  
 Gross, Joseph O., XXXX.  
 Holmes, Robert A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Levine, Seymour.  
 Linder, William R., XXXXXXXX.  
 McIntosh, Donald E., XXXXXXXX.  
 Parker, Jerry M., XXXXXXXX.  
 Powell, Kenneth A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Zalis, Edwin G., XXXXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Brekhus, Dennis A., XXXXXXXX.  
 Crawford, John C., XXXXXXXX.  
 Hill, William D., XXXXXXXX.  
 Lamb, William O., XXXXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps*

Bucci, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX.  
 Pulliam, James D., XXXXXXXX.

*To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps*

Caldwell, Doris L., XXXXXXXX.

*To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Brown, Donald W., XXXXXXXX.  
 Ives, Dan I., XXXXXXXX.  
 Stone, Leland M., XXXXXXXX.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

*To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Berlin, Theodore	Johnson, Reginald D. A.
Bevans, Nathan E.	Johnson, Reginald D. A.
Bowles, Robert L.	Kuchta, Frank H.
Brunsell, Rolland H.	Leahy, Raymond
Camp, Charles H.	Linehan, John C.
Cantrell, James E.	McGarry, Leo J.
Carter, Thomas N.	Pease, Hugh R.
Draganosky, Eugene A.	Perkins, Jacob H.
Fulton, Robert C.	Quash, Joseph A.
Garza, Daniel L.	Rozycki, Alan A.
Harbin, Robert L., Jr.	Ryan, Lawrence J., Jr.
Harrison, James B., Jr.	Salden, Dan R.
Hauer, Richard W., Jr.	Sava, Richard
Hill, Thomas W.	Schneider, Roy L.
Janke, Thomas A.	Steen, Tyrone L.
Jedlicka, Victor J.	Whitehurst, James T.
Jenkins, David L.	Yost, Harold S.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adam, Andrew H.	Anderson, Charles E.
Adamsky, Allan F.	Anderson, Eugene L.
Adler, Richard S.	Anderson, Robert S.
Alessandri, Pietro U.	Anderson, Steven B.
Alfaro, Daniel V.	Andrew, Edward L.
Alpern, Stephen I.	Andrews, James B., II
Alix, Richard	Anjler, Louis J., Jr.
Almes, Richard G.	Anthony, Ronald T.
Aitorfer, William G.	Appleby, Robert B.

- Archambeau, Jason R. Carter, Alfred H.  
 Arnold, Billy R. Casey, Francis B., Jr.  
 Arnold, John P. Celtruda, Joseph O.  
 Ashapa, Myron R. Cephas, Leonard M.  
 Atherton, Frederick S., Jr. Cerreta, Francesco M.  
 Aucouin, James S. Champagne, Shelton  
 Bailey, Gary L. J., Jr.  
 Bailey, James S., Jr. Chauvin, Charles E.  
 Bains, William J. Chauvin, Charles F.,  
 Baker, Barrie M. Jr.  
 Baker, Junius O., Jr. Childress, Robert L.  
 Baker, Tracy, II Chin, Richard C.  
 Baker, William P., Jr. Chittick, James E.  
 Balda, Jerome F. Christophersen, Fred-  
 Bangasser, Fredric D. erick N.  
 H. Cisneros, Marc A.  
 Bankson, Peter R. Clagett, Donald C.  
 Barber, Major J. Cleland, Robert J.  
 Barnes, Bruce A. Cleveland, Donald L.  
 Barnhart, William E. Clingan, Patrick A.  
 Barrett, Thomas A. Clinton, Daniel E.  
 Bartlett, Charles M. Cochran, Alexander S.,  
 Basta, James M. Jr.  
 Baxter, John W. Coffey, Frederick  
 Beebe, Neil L. Colitti, Michael J.  
 Beem, Gladwin G. Collins, Michael P.  
 Beers, Bradford B. Connal, Peter  
 Belcher, Frederick D. Connor, John J., Jr.  
 Berberich, Dennis E. Cooper, Victor D.  
 Bergen, John J. Copeland, William C.,  
 Berkley, Clyde J. Jr.  
 Berman, Jay M. Coston, Morris L.  
 Bernardi, Roger L. Cowburn, Frederick C.  
 Bertelsen, Geoffrey H. Cowling, Bobby W.  
 Beyer, Lawrence M. Creeden, Cornelius T.  
 Bickford, James V., Jr. Cronhimer, John F.  
 III Cronin, John J.  
 Biese, John J., Jr. Cronin, Michael J.  
 Billingsley, John D., Jr. Crowder, George L.  
 Binkewicz, Joseph B. Crumley, Dennis V.  
 Bird, Jo W. Crumley, Michael H.  
 Bird, Samuel R. Crump, Harry F.  
 Bitgood, John J. Culberson, Henry E.  
 Blackwell, Joseph W., Jr. Cummins, John B.  
 Jr. Cunningham, Wells E.  
 Bodziony, Ronald Daignault, David W.  
 Boehman, Richard J. Darby, Leonard M., III  
 Boiardi, John J. Davidson, John P., Jr.  
 Bonville, George P. Davidson, Paul R.  
 Borowsky, Kurt T. Davis, Charles L.  
 Bowe, Matthew A., Jr. Davis, Thomas J.  
 Bowles, Norborn S. De Blasio, Robert L.  
 Bowling, Ernest R. Delaney, Daniel V.  
 Bowman, Wade A. Delaney, John E.  
 Boyersmith, Joseph C. De Martini, John D.  
 Brabazon, John J. De Vito, Francis J.  
 Bradbury, Richard A. Devlin, Owen F.  
 Braddock, Robert C. Dial, William K.  
 Brady, John H., Jr. Diaz, James R.  
 Brannon, John D. Di Battista, Joseph  
 Brauer, Paul F. Di Caprio, Patrick R.  
 Breen, John F. Diehl, John L.  
 Breiten, John A. Dill, Anthony A.  
 Brennan, Lawrence DiNapoli, John A.  
 Brennan, Richard P. DiSabito, David M.  
 Brodie, William C. Doak, Peter  
 Brooks, Ronald E. Doleman, Edgar C., Jr.  
 Brown, Gary A. Domingo, Anselmo R.  
 Brown, James P. Donovan, John E.  
 Brown, Kenneth J. Dow, Richard H.  
 Brown, Ronald P. Dow, William A.  
 Brown, Wade G. Dranchak, Ronald J.  
 Brown, Willard G., Jr. Durel, Francis M., II  
 Broyles, Robert F. Durel, William E., Jr.  
 Bruno, Joseph D. Durham, Robert S.  
 Buck, Robert F. X. Dzwonkiewicz, John,  
 Buckley, Michael J. Jr.  
 Bulger, Donald H. Eaton, Hal S.  
 Burch, Edgar F., III Eaton, Roberto C.  
 Burgess, Douglas R. Eby, Clifford J.  
 Burke, Charles P. Eckel, Robert R.  
 Burnside, William F. Eng, Ping  
 Busby, John F. Etheredge, Thomas J.,  
 Buttner, Peter III  
 Byrnes, Thomas J. Evans, Floyd L.  
 Call, Duane T. Fairris, Marlon T.  
 Cameron, James E. Faison, James C., Jr.  
 Canellis, George W. Faison, Robert H.  
 Carlin, Francis J., Jr. Fang, Donald R.  
 Farquaharson, Glen D.  
 Farr, John F., Jr.
- Farrell, William G., Jr. Hoover, Roger K.  
 Featherston, Jimmy J. Horton, Charles R.  
 Federoff, Oleg V. Horvath, John M.  
 Feisthamel, George W. Houillon, Robert H.  
 Ferguson, Paul S. Householder, John M.  
 Fields, Dwight G. Howard, Ronald G.  
 Fitch, Kenneth L. Hudanich, Raymond  
 Fitzgerald, Robert C. F.  
 Fitzpatrick, Richard H., Jr.  
 Flanigan, Desmond W. Hudson, Bruce A.  
 Fletcher, Tyrone P. Huff, Daniel P.  
 Floyd, Charles W. Hughes, Billy M.  
 Fonken, Stanley L. Humphrey, David B.  
 Foster, Edward S., Jr. Hutton, Stewart P.  
 Foster, Harry G., III Hyatt, Harold S.  
 Foster, Stephen Ingersoll, John T.  
 Freeman, Reed H. Itooss, Paul R.  
 Frusciante, William J., Jr. Jackson, Michael G.  
 Fuqua, James R. Jacobs, Terrance M.  
 Gabarro, John J. Jarrell, Norman D.  
 Gage, James R. Jefferson, Walter  
 Gallagher, William J., Jr. Jennison, Kenneth R.  
 Jr. Jobe, Thomas R.  
 Gallucci, John V. Johannesen, Nils P.  
 Gardner, William C. Johnson, Stephen E.  
 Garland, Franklin P. Johnson, Carl H., Jr.  
 Garner, Joe A. Johnson, Ronald A.  
 Gates, Daniel J. Johnson, Theodore W.  
 Gentry, Denton E. Jolley, John R.  
 Ghiselin, Richard G. Jones, Malcolm W.  
 Gibbon, Jerome L. Jones, Richard C.  
 Ginsburg, Norman I. Jones, Thomas A.  
 Glabus, Edmund J. Jones, Thomas C.  
 Glenn, Richard T. Jones, Thomas H.  
 Godin, Roger A. Josephson, Robert G.  
 Goff, Gordon D. Jungmann, Monroe J.  
 Golvach, Duane J. Kawamoto, Dennis F.  
 Goodwyn, Richard B. Kawamura, Norman I.  
 Gordon, Robert A. Keach, William H.  
 Gore, Perry L. Keegan, Mel G.  
 Gors, Kenwood J. Kellim, Ronald R.  
 Goss, Joseph B., Jr. Kensler, Daniel L., Jr.  
 Gough, Samuel N., Jr. Kerscher, Thomas E.  
 Graham, Barry F. King, Francis A.  
 Gray, Peter A. King, Frederick L.  
 Gracyar, Edward W. King, James R.  
 Grazulis, Louis A. Kirwin, Patrick J.  
 Greenwood, Ronald L. Kish, Robert S.  
 Gregory, Joel E. Kluwe, George E., Jr.  
 Gunther, Donald J. Knipling, Edward B.  
 Helbleib, Duane W. Knox, Dean W.  
 Hale, Robert J. Koehler, Leo, Jr.  
 Halperin, S. Rafael Koestner, John R.  
 Hampton, Don H. Korhonen, John E.  
 Hanner, Erik R. Korn, Leonard E., Jr.  
 Harman, Richard A. Kot, Mitchell R.  
 Harmon, David, Jr. Kovacs, Jerome P.  
 Hatch, George S. Kraus, Robert H.  
 Hatch, Robert W. Kraus, Robert J.  
 Haugland, Harlan K. Kroeger, Henry F., Jr.  
 Haulsee, Richard W. Kroeger, Robert H., Jr.  
 Haveman, Kenneth J. Kuhlman, George W.,  
 Hawkins, Karl D., Jr. Jr.  
 Hayes, Richard D. Kurstedt, Harold A.,  
 Jr.  
 Haynes, Frederick D. Kuta, Raymond F.  
 Heaton, Charles E., Jr. LaBorde, John F., Jr.  
 Hehir, John J., Jr. Laffoon, Glenn A.  
 Helton, Michael E. Lamando, Chester J.,  
 Hemingway, Peter W. Jr.  
 Hemmer, Paul S. Lampshire, Bradford  
 Henk, Harold A. G.  
 Hern, Jay R. Landolfa, Anthony R.  
 Herndon, Doyle L. Lane, John J.  
 Herts, Charles R. Langhorne, Thomas O.,  
 Herzog, Lawrence A. Jr.  
 Hibbs, William N. Langley, Jerry L.  
 Hiller, Herbert L. Langway, Richard M.  
 Himmelsbach, Robert B. Larkins, Aaron J.  
 Hitzfelder, Jerome L. LaSorsa, John M.  
 Hobart, Charles W. Lauritzen, John A.  
 Hodge, James D. Lawler, James O.  
 Hodgson, George G. Leadbetter, Richard A.  
 Hoffman, Vernon C., Jr. Ledbetter, William N.  
 Hoffmann, Ludwig C., III Leeds, John R.  
 Holaday, Richard K. LeFon, Charles A.  
 Holter, John H. Leidenheimer, John L.,  
 Jr.  
 Lenfest, William F.  
 Leonard, James H.
- Lezaj, Edwin G. Momorella, Joseph J.  
 Lillenthal, Peter F., II Monford, Ronald T.  
 Limbach, Edward W. Montano, Peter D.  
 Liming, Franklin G., Jr. Montefusco, John A.  
 Lingo, Johnny P. Moore, Billy F.  
 Lisko, Donald W. Moore, Jack D.  
 Lockwood, Robert H., III Moore, Virgil C.  
 Loftus, Peter G. Moore, William E.  
 Lolocono, Patsy J. Moore, William G., Jr.  
 Longino, Lester R. Morehead, William C.  
 Loud, Brewster M. Morrison, William H.,  
 Lovellette, Lindell J. III  
 Lowdon, Graham N., Jr. Morse, Joseph G.  
 Jr. Moseman, James F.,  
 Jr. Moss, Peter J.  
 Loy, Brian A. Mowery, Robert W.  
 Lucheta, Roger A. Mueller, Mark B.  
 Luster, Stephen Mueller, Roy M., Jr.  
 Lutz, Donald A. Mullally, John S.  
 Lynn, Clyde D. Mullens, Frederick T.  
 Mabus, Leonard J. Mulvey, Peter B.  
 MacDowell, Carl M., Jr. Murphy, John M.  
 Jr. Myers, David P., Jr.  
 Mach, William C. Nagle, Bruce D.  
 MacIntyre, John A., Jr. Nash, Norman W.  
 Maggio, Stephan Naughton, Richard L.  
 Magnus, William L. Nelson, Anthony C.  
 Mahecha, Edward H. Nelson, Raymond J.  
 Maher, Patrick J. Newsome, Joseph D.  
 Mahon, Thomas J. Nicholas, Denis  
 Maksimowski, Richard Nickisch, Craig W.  
 J. Nieberding, Michael  
 W.  
 Manly, Charles L. Nolan, John A.  
 Mann, William R. Norris, Thomas H.  
 Mannion, Donald H. North, John L.  
 Marr, Francis C. Novak, Ladislav J.  
 Martin, William H. Nowlin, John B.  
 McBride, Dennis P. Nunes, Gilbert S.  
 McCann, Richard W. Nunziato, Carl A.  
 McCarden, Carl M. A. O'Brien, John E., Jr.  
 McClure, Richard B. O'Brien, Richard T.  
 McCormack, John C. O'Connor, Paul M.  
 McCormick, Robert D. O'Dea, Lawrence P.  
 McCorn, Fred E. Offer, Robert D., Jr.  
 McDannald, Eugene R., Jr. Ohmart, Robert D.  
 Jr. Okumoto, Stanley K.  
 McDaris, Lawrence F., Jr. Ollie, Louis W.  
 Jr. Olsen, John W.  
 McDevitt, James J. Olson, David E.  
 McDonald, Edward J., III Olson, Jerome A.  
 McDonald, James R. Olson, Robert A.  
 McDuffy, Clifford Opteck, Robert J.  
 McGrath, Walter J. Orton, Robert D.  
 McGuire, Arthur B., Jr. Overstreet, Joseph S.  
 Jr. Owen, Jerry D.  
 McKee, Anthony J. Owens, Ronald C.  
 McKee, Arthur J. Paben, Paul T.  
 McKee, Harris B. Painting, Joseph P.  
 McMahan, James J. Palladino, George F.  
 McMurray, Donald B. Park, Richard P., Jr.  
 McNiff, James J. Parke, Robert F.  
 McNiff, John J. Parks, Edwards S., Jr.  
 McNulty, Stewart J. Parsons, Wayland D.  
 McNutt, Joseph K. Pascoe, Philip T.  
 McSherry, Leo J., Jr. Pasto, James F.  
 McWilliams, James L. Patla, Norbert I.  
 Mello, Charles W. Pendergast, Robert W.  
 Meredith, Bruce A. Perriello, David G.  
 Mermelstein, Lee Perry, Marlon G.  
 Merritt, George K. Perry, Wilson D.  
 Merritt, William E., Jr. Pesek, Thomas H.  
 Jr. Petersen, Elwin A.  
 Metscher, Theodore A. Petry, David L.  
 Meyer, Edward C. Philippovic, Gordon  
 Meyer, Robert C. Phillips, James S  
 Milhorn, Charles L. Phillips, John C  
 Miller, Charles A. Phipps, Oren P.  
 Miller, John D. Pierce, Donald L.  
 Miller, Richard W. Pierson, Prince E.  
 Millott, James F. Pinson, Jon M.  
 Minshall, Charles W. Piotrowski, Karl P.  
 Mitchell, Dana W. Pleasant, Arnold R.  
 Mitchell, David G. Podmilsak, Ronald W.  
 Mitchell, Robert C. Poirier, Robert D.  
 Mitchell, William R. Pojmann, David M.  
 Mitchum, John A. Polonko, Joseph J.  
 Moffett, Joseph U. Pons, Donald G.  
 Moi, Arne N. Poorbaugh, Donald J.  
 Molino, Michael A. Pope, George D.

Postillion, John F.  
Powell, William E.  
Prentice, Leland E.  
Purtill, Michael S.  
Quandt, Donald L.  
Racine, Armand E.  
Raffiani, Joseph  
Ramirez, Archimedes  
Raymond, Conley T.  
Reagan, Wesley F.  
Reicher, Neil  
Rembert, Donald M.  
Renfro, Ronnie J.  
Reublin, Robert J.  
Ribaudo, Charles A., Jr.  
Rice, John T.  
Richards, John F.  
Richardson, James K., Jr.  
Richfield, Robert F.  
Rickman, Jack R.  
Riddick, Larry G.  
Riles, Norbert P.  
Riley, James A.  
Riley, John W., Jr.  
Ringmacher, Nelson E., Jr.  
Rives, Jack D.  
Roberts, Kenneth J.  
Robertson, William F.  
Robinson, John D.  
Rogers, Lee E.  
Rollins, George N.  
Romero, Robert, Jr.  
Roney, James A.  
Roof, William R.  
Rosenberg, Louis T.  
Rotrock, Glen K.  
Rowe, Robb W.  
Rudnick, James J.  
Runkles, Charles E.  
Runnion, Lawrence G.  
Russell, Melvin W.  
Russell, William E.  
Saarel, Douglas A.  
Sackowitz, Russell M.  
Sadusky, John J.  
Salerno, Joseph T.  
Salmon, Joseph F.  
Samojlowicz, Adrian A.  
Sande, Ralph C.  
Sarf, Thomas E.  
Satterfield, Hammond H.  
Schlam, Elliott  
Schmidbauer, James P.  
Scott, Howard H.  
Seddon, Alfred E.  
Semelka, Frederick, Jr.  
Semester, James S.  
Semt, Michael C.  
Serafini, Terry A.  
Seto, Stanford P., Jr.  
Sgouros, Pantelis  
Shanower, Frank D.  
Shappee, Robert D.  
Shea, Robert E., Jr.  
Sheehan, John A.  
Shell, John C., II  
Shepard, William S.  
Sherman, John R.  
Shiner, Clyde E., Jr.  
Shoemaker, George G.  
Shoffner, Wilson A.  
Shuba, Louis J.  
Shultz, Robert E.  
Sica, Robert A.  
Silva, Joseph L.  
Simmons, Herbert S.  
Sims, Larry P.  
Skane, Martin B.  
Skjervheim, LeGrant B.  
Skrzyniarz, Robert J.

Slack, Duane A.  
Slaney, William E., Jr.  
Small, Michael C.  
Smethurst, Robert G.  
Smith, Charles D.  
Smith, Clay R., Jr.  
Smith, Courtland L.  
Smith, Donald J.  
Smith, Douglas W.  
Smith, Robert A.  
Smith, Robert H.  
Smith, Thomas A.  
Smith, Timothy E.  
Smith, Virgil R.  
Smith, William R., Jr.  
Snodgrass, Wilder M.  
Snyder, Charles R.  
Snyder, John F.  
Spataro, William J.  
Speed, Thomas C.  
Spencer, Roger W.  
Spisak, John J.  
Sponski, John J.  
Spreha, Henry A., Jr.  
Spurgeon, Thomas E.  
Stanley, Richard P.  
Stanton, James W.  
Stawiany, William B., Jr.  
Steele, Harry W.  
Steele, Rowland G.  
Stevens, James T.  
Sterneckert, Richard W.  
Stevens, Thomas G.  
Stewart, Michael M.  
Stombres, Richard A.  
Stone, Donald C.  
Stonehocker, Herbert F., Jr.  
Strack, John R.  
Strand, Ronald R.  
Stringas, Thomas  
Stuerman, Duane H.  
Stuhlmuller, Kimball R.  
Sturm, William F.  
Sullivan, Donald B.  
Summers, James B.  
Surro, Robert A.  
Sutton, John M., Jr.  
Swango, Robert W.  
Sykes, Henry A.  
Sykes, Worthy F.  
Szeman, Edward R.  
Tacelosky, Robert J.  
Taggart, Carl D.  
Tarrall, Mahone T., III  
Tastad, Joel M.  
Tate, George W.  
Tate, Van B.  
Taylor, Glenn A., Jr.  
Taylor, John B., Jr.  
Telska, John J.  
Theologos, John J.  
Thompson, Claude S., Jr.  
Tigue, John J., Jr.  
Timmermeyer, Richard P.  
Tomarchio, Anthony J.  
Tompras, Nicholas C.  
Toomepuu, Tonu  
Towler, John C.  
Truxillo, Edmond J.  
Trzos, Frederick  
Turberg, Joseph R., Jr.  
Twiss, Dennis C.  
Tykal, Robert W.  
Udick, Ralph A.  
Underwood, Harry W.  
Valleant, John H.  
Venberg, Walter W.  
Ventantonio, James B.  
Viccione, Daniel M.  
Vreeland, Richard W.  
Wacker, Stuart A.  
Wadeson, Otto T. P.  
Wagner, Clifford C., Jr.  
Wagner, David W.

Wallace, William F., III  
Walter, Stephen  
Ward, Albert N., III  
Ward, Peter H.  
Warren, Henry E., III  
Waterston, Robert J., III  
Webb, James R.  
Webb, Richard G.  
Weld, Seth L., III  
Wells, Joe K., Jr.  
Welsh, Fred M.  
Westmoreland, James A.  
Wheeler, Eugene C.  
White, Charles H., Jr.  
White, Dewey E.  
White, Gerrit A.  
White, James W.  
White, Robert A.  
Whitley, Lee R.  
Whitlock, Charles L.  
Wilcock, Walter D.  
Wilkie, Robert L.

Wilkinson, Gordon R.  
Willard, Myron J.  
Williams, Frank L., Jr.  
Williams, John F.  
Williams, Stanton  
Williams, Timothy P.  
Williamson, Donald A.  
Wills, Alton G.  
Wilson, David C.  
Wilson, Robert B.  
Witten, John D.  
Wolf, Gerald S.  
Wood, Eldridge D., Jr.  
Wood, James B.  
Yager, Lawrence W.  
Yamachika, Roy T.  
Yorio, Ralph J.  
York, Val D.  
Young, Glen C.  
Young, Robert B.  
Yurasits, Robert F.  
Zaruba, Robert M.  
Zeh, Dale W.  
Zerries, Alfred W.

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Abram Chayes, of Massachusetts, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

## DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

## UNITED NATIONS

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Ivan A. Nestingen, of Wisconsin, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

## INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mortimer M. Caplin, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be Assistant Attorney General.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Kenneth E. Belieu, of Oregon, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

## IN THE U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

## To be general

Lt. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell, XXXXXX U.S. Army.

## To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, XXXXXX U.S. Army.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3307, 3442, and 3447:

Brig. Gen. Charles Lowman Decker, XXXXXX U.S. Army, to be the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Hall McCaw, XXXXXX U.S. Army, to be Assistant Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

## To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Tom Victor Stayton, XXXXXX U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Mervyn MacKay Magee, XXXXXX U.S. Army.

## To be brigadier generals

Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, XXXXXX, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Paul Sampson, XXXXXX, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Norman Basil Edwards, XXXXXX U.S. Army.

Col. John Graham Zierdt, XXXXXX, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Willoughby Totten, XXXXXX, U.S. Army.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 6, 1961:

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

## AMBASSADORS

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to Ecuador. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

W. Wendell Blanche, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad, the Central African Republic, and the Gabon Republic. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Joseph Palmer 2d, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Nigeria. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

R. Borden Reams, of Nevada, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey, and the Republic of Niger. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Francis H. Russell, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Henry S. Villard, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Thomas K. Wright, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Col. Beverley Evans Powell, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Hess Burba, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 3284 and 3307:

*To be major general, Medical Corps*

Maj. Gen. Thomas James Hartford, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Juan Cesar Cordero, [XXXXXX], Army National Guard of the United States.

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Russell Boyt, [XXXXXX], Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Anthony Long, [XXXXXX], Army National Guard of the United States.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593 (a).

*To be major generals*

Col. Paul Milton Booth, [XXXXXX], Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Arthur Young Lloyd, [XXXXXX], Army National Guard of the United States.

The nominations beginning Alvie O. Ashley to be first lieutenant, and ending Jimmy Wayne Wolliver to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on January 17, 1961.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

1 Chronicles 16: 31: *Let men say among the nations, the Lord reigneth.*

O Thou who hast laid upon our President, our Speaker, and the Congress Thy hand of high commission, may they be true to the stewardship of responsibility and opportunity which has been entrusted to them.

In these perilous times may they have a clear vision of the vast domain of Thy divine sovereignty and of that eternal kingdom of righteousness and peace whose sun never sets.

Hear us in our prayer of intercession as we bring to Thy listening ear and understanding heart our care and concern for Thy needy children who are standing with their backs against the wall in a desperate struggle, almost overwhelmed with despair.

Grant that our Nation, which Thou hast blessed so abundantly, may be delivered from self-complacency and self-interest and may our hearts expand with sympathy and our hands extend in helpfulness to all the poor and distressed members of the human family.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 2, 1961, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

### U.S. DELEGATION OF MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, he did, on Thursday, February 2, 1961, appoint as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guadalajara, Mexico, from February 6 to February 12, 1961, the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. SAUND, California, chairman; Mr. RUTHERFORD, Texas; Mr. MONTOYA, New Mexico; Mr. NIX, Pennsylvania; Mr. McDOWELL, Delaware; Mr. INOUE, Hawaii; Mr. NORBLAD, Oregon; Mr. SPRINGER, Illinois; Mr. BROYHILL, Virginia; Mr. DERWINSKI, Illinois; Mr. NELSEN, Minnesota.

### RESIDENT COMMISSIONER TO THE UNITED STATES FROM PUERTO RICO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 146) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 146

*Resolved*, That Antonio Fernós-Isern, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, be, and he is hereby, elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 147) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 147

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley (chairman), North Carolina; W. R. Poage, Texas; George Grant, Alabama; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Clark W. Thompson, Texas;

Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Harlan Hagen, California; Lester R. Johnson, Wisconsin; Ross Bass, Tennessee; W. Pat Jennings, Virginia; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida; Merwin Coad, Iowa; J. Floyd Breeding, Kansas; Frank A. Stubblefield, Kentucky; Harold B. McSween, Louisiana; Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii; Ralph R. Harding, Idaho.

Committee on Appropriations: John M. Slack, Jr., West Virginia.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; Clyde Doyle, California; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; Richard E. Lankford, Maryland; George Huddleston, Jr., Alabama; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; A. Paul Kitchin, North Carolina; Daniel B. Brewster, Maryland; Frank Kowalski, Connecticut; Samuel S. Stratton, New York; Jeffery Cohelan, California; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; Otis G. Pike, New York.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence (chairman), Kentucky; Wright Patman, Texas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Abraham J. Multer, New York; Hugh J. Adonizio, New Jersey; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Martha W. Griffiths, Michigan; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; Charles A. Vanik, Ohio; J. T. Rutherford, Texas; William S. Moorhead, Pennsylvania; Clem Miller, California; Jacob H. Gilbert, New York; Edward R. Finnegan, Illinois; Robert G. Stephens, Jr., Georgia; Fernand J. St. Germain, Rhode Island.

Committee on District of Columbia: John L. McMillan (chairman), South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; James C. Davis, Georgia; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; William L. Dawson, Illinois; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Abraham J. Multer, New York; John Dowdy, Texas; J. Carlton Loser, Tennessee; George Huddleston, Jr., Alabama; Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina; Frank W. Burke, Kentucky; Jeffery Cohelan, California; Fernand J. St. Germain, Rhode Island.

Committee on Education and Labor: Adam C. Powell (chairman), New York; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Phil M. Landrum, Georgia; Edith Green, Oregon; James Roosevelt, California; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Elmer J. Holland, Pennsylvania; John H. Dent, Pennsylvania; Roman C. Pucinski, Illinois; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; John Brademas, Indiana; Robert N. Gialmo, Connecticut; James G. O'Hara, Michigan; Ralph J. Scott, North Carolina; Neal Smith, Iowa; Charles S. Joelson, New Jersey.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Thomas E. Morgan (chairman), Pennsylvania; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Omar Bursleson, Texas; Edna F. Kelly, New York; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Alabama; J. L. Pilcher, Georgia; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Leonard Farbstein, New York; D. S. (Judge) Saund, California; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Delaware; William T. Murphy, Illinois; Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; Thomas F. Johnson, Maryland; John S. Monagan, Connecticut.

Committee on Government Operations: William L. Dawson (chairman), Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Jack Brooks, Texas; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; John E. Moss, California; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas; Dante B. Fas-

cell, Florida; Martha W. Griffiths, Michigan; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia; Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan, Pennsylvania; John S. Monagan, Connecticut; Neal Smith, Iowa.

Committee on House Administration: Omar Burleson (chairman), Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Lesinski, Michigan; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Watkins M. Abbott, Virginia; Edith Green, Oregon; Robert A. Everett, Tennessee; John J. McFall, California; Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut; Hugh L. Carey, New York.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Wayne N. Aspinall (chairman), Colorado; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; Gracie Pfof, Idaho; James A. Haley, Florida; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; J. T. Rutherford, Texas; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; D. S. (Judge) Saund, California; Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico; Ralph J. Rivers, Alaska; Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina; David S. King, Utah; Harold T. Johnson, California; Julia Butler Hansen, Washington; Arnold Olsen, Montana; Hugh L. Carey, New York; Richard H. Ichord, Missouri.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Oren Harris (chairman), Arkansas; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Walter Rogers, Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; John E. Moss, California; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; Robert W. Hemphill, South Carolina; Dan Rostenkowski, Illinois; James C. Healey, New York.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler (chairman), New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank Chelf, Kentucky; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; E. L. Forrester, Georgia; Byron G. Rogers, Colorado; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Jack Brooks, Texas; William M. Tucker, Virginia; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; John Dowdy, Texas; Lester Holtzman, New York; Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina; Roland V. Libonati, Illinois; J. Carlton Loser, Tennessee; Herman Toll, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Herbert C. Bonner (chairman), North Carolina; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; John D. Dingell, Michigan; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; Alton Lennon, North Carolina; Victor L. Anuso, New York; Thomas N. Downing, Virginia; Bob Casey, Texas; Thomas F. Johnson, Maryland; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Vanik, Ohio.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray (chairman), Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; James C. Davis, Georgia; John Lesinski, Michigan; Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan, Pennsylvania; Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; Dale Alford, Arkansas; David N. Henderson, North Carolina; Arnold Olsen, Montana; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York; Richard H. Ichord, Missouri; M. Blaine Peterson, Utah.

Committee on Public Works: Charles A. Buckley (chairman), New York; George H.

Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; Iris Faircloth Blitch, Georgia; Jim Wright, Texas; W. R. Hull, Jr., Missouri; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; John J. McFall, California; Gracie Pfof, Idaho; John Young, Texas; Frank W. Burke, Kentucky; Harold T. Johnson, California; Robert E. Cook, Ohio.

Committee on Rules: Carl Elliott, Alabama; B. F. Sisk, California.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Overton Brooks (chairman), Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Victor L. Anuso, New York; Joseph E. Karth, Minnesota; Ken Hechler, West Virginia; Emilio Q. Daddario, Connecticut; Walter H. Moeller, Ohio; David S. King, Utah; Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico; Bob Casey, Texas; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; John W. Davis, Georgia; William Fitts Ryan, New York; James C. Corman, California.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Francis E. Walter (chairman), Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Clyde Doyle, California; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; William M. Tucker, Virginia.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Olin E. Teague (chairman), Texas; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; James A. Haley, Florida; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Robert A. Everett, Tennessee; Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; Roland V. Libonati, Illinois; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Delaware; Julia Butler Hansen, Washington; G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia; Horace R. Kornegay, North Carolina; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—GOLD OUTFLOW—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The gold outflow of the past 3 years has dramatically focused world attention on a fundamental change that has been occurring in the economic position of the United States. Our balance of payments—the accounting which shows the result of all of our trade and financial relations with the outside world—has become one of the key factors in our national economic life. Mainly because that balance of payments has been in deficit we have lost gold.

This loss of gold is naturally important to us, but it also concerns the whole free world. For we are the principal banker of the free world and any potential weakness in our dollar spells trouble, not only for us but also for our friends and allies who rely on the dollar to finance a substantial portion of their trade. We must therefore manage our balance of payments in accordance with our responsibilities. This means that the United States must in the decades

ahead, much more than at any time in the past, take its balance of payments into account when formulating its economic policies and conducting its economic affairs.

Economic progress at home is still the first requirement for economic strength abroad. Accordingly, the first requirement for restoring balance in our international payments is to take all possible steps to insure the effective performance of our own economic system—to improve our technology, lower our production and marketing costs, and devise new and superior products, under conditions of price stability. The real wealth of a nation resides in its farms and factories and the people who man them. A dynamic economy producing goods competitively priced in world markets will maintain the strength of the dollar.

Thanks to our international reserves we have time, if we use it wisely, in which to strengthen our domestic economy and make it fully competitive with that of other nations. Our situation is one that justifies concern but not panic or alarm.

In my message on February 2, I dealt with the measures for reviving our domestic economy. The steps I now propose will strengthen our dollar position and insure that our gold reserves are employed effectively to facilitate the commerce of the free nations and to protect the stability of their currencies. Because these steps supplement the policies for strengthening our domestic economy, and because we can take them calmly and deliberately, they are not for that reason any less important or less urgent. Those that are within the present authority of the Executive will be the subject of vigorous action. Where action by the Congress is required I urge early consideration and approval.

For the past decade our international transactions have resulted in a deficit—payments that were in excess of receipts—in every year except that of the Suez crisis, 1957. The surplus of our exports over our imports, while substantial, has not been large enough to cover our expenditures for U.S. military establishments abroad, for capital invested abroad by private American businesses and for Government economic assistance and loan programs. All of these outlays are essential. Our military establishments in foreign countries protect the national security. Private investment promotes world economic growth and trade and, through the return of profits to our country, will strengthen our balance of payments in future years. Our economic assistance programs, much the smallest of these three items in its effect on payments balance, is vital in the continuing struggle against tyranny and oppression, and the poverty on which they feed.

Over the period 1951 to 1957 the deficit in our balance of payments averaged about \$1 billion annually. These did not result in a net outflow of gold from the United States; foreign monetary authorities, banks, and private individuals held these earnings as dollars or claims on dollars. Thus our gold reserves were \$22.8 billion at the end of 1950 and \$22.9 billion at the end of 1957. But during

these years the dollar holdings by foreign countries increased from \$3.4 billion at the end of 1950 to almost \$15 billion at the end of 1957.

These earlier deficits in our balance of payments were, in fact, favorable in their world effect. They helped to restore foreign monetary systems by enabling foreign countries to earn the dollars which they needed to rebuild their international reserves. They made it possible for the industrialized countries of Western Europe to restore the convertibility of their currencies, thus freeing world trade and payments from exchange control. This was of benefit to the export trade of the United States. However, this growth in foreign dollar holdings placed upon the United States a special responsibility—that of maintaining the dollar as the principal reserve currency of the free world. This required that the dollar be considered by many countries to be as good as gold. It is our responsibility to sustain this confidence.

In 1958 and 1959 the deficit in our balance of payments sharply increased—to \$3.5 billion in 1958 and to \$3.8 billion in 1959. This came about mainly because of lagging exports and rising imports. There was no significant increase in our outlays for military expenditures, private investment, or Government economic assistance. However in these years, unlike the period 1951–57, the deficit resulted in large transfers of gold to foreign accounts as well as a further increase in foreign dollar holdings. For the 2 years together, 1958 and 1959, gold transfers to foreign accounts were \$3 billion while foreign dollar holdings by foreign countries increased by another \$4.3 billion. These gold transfers did not make the underlying balance of payments fundamentally worse. They did reflect a decision by foreigners to take more of their earnings in gold and to hold less in dollars.

Last year, 1960, the surplus of our exports of goods and services over our imports increased from \$2.2 billion in 1959 to \$5.8 billion. This was caused, principally, by an increase—amounting to more than \$3 billion—in our exports. This once more reduced what may be called our basic deficit—it was only about \$1.5 billion for the year. However, during 1960 there was a large movement abroad of short-term capital. Favorable interest rates abroad, a high rate of growth and good investment prospects in Europe, and some speculative fears concerning the future value of the dollar all played a part. It is estimated that this outward flow of short-term funds was between \$2 and \$2.5 billion, and this was the crucial factor in raising the overall deficit to \$3.8 billion. Of this, \$1.7 billion were transferred in the form of gold and \$2.1 billion took the form of increased foreign dollar holdings.

An outward movement of short-term funds such as that which occurred in 1960 should not be considered a part of the basic deficit. Such movements are quickly reversible in response to changes in interest rates and other business factors here and abroad. Moreover, insofar as short-term funds transferred to foreign financial centers consist of U.S. owned capital, they create U.S.

claims against the recipient country. In the new era of convertible currencies upon which we have entered, we may expect that short-term money will continue to flow back and forth. I have requested the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to work for still closer cooperation between the monetary and financial authorities of the industrialized free nations with a view toward avoiding excessive short-term money flows which could be upsetting to the orderly development of international trade and payments.

In sum our basic deficit of \$1.5 billion is of manageable proportions. And it is this basic deficit which affects the real strength of our currency. But the time has come to end this deficit. It must be ended by responsible, determined, and constructive measures.

There are other factors which lend basic support to our monetary and financial position. Our gold reserve now stands at \$17.5 billion. This is more than 1½ times foreign official dollar holdings and more than 90 percent of all foreign dollar holdings. It is some two-fifths of the gold stock of the entire free world.

Of this \$17.5 billion, gold reserves not committed against either currency or deposits account for nearly \$6 billion. The remaining \$11.5 billion are held under existing regulations as a reserve against Federal Reserve currency and deposits. But these, too, can be freed to sustain the value of the dollar; and I have pledged that the full strength of our total gold stocks and other international reserves stands behind the value of the dollar for use if needed.

In addition, the United States has a quota in the International Monetary Fund of \$4.1 billion. This can be drawn upon if necessary and our access to the Fund's resources must be regarded as part of our international reserves.

Finally beyond its liquid international reserves, the Government and citizens of the United States hold large assets abroad. Western European countries whose currencies are now strong owe us long-term governmental debts of \$2.9 billion. Our private short-term assets abroad now are estimated at \$4½ billion. Our long-term private investments in foreign countries—including both plants owned directly by American companies and securities of foreign business and governments owned by Americans—total over \$44 billion, exceeding foreign investments in the U.S. economy by some \$28 billion. In any reckoning of international assets and liabilities, the United States has a strong solvent position.

In short, powerful resources stand behind the dollar. Our gold and monetary reserves are large; so are the physical and monetary assets we hold throughout the world. And, in the years ahead, if the program I previously outlined is pursued, the dollar will have the added strength of the reviving power of the American economy itself.

Certain firm conclusions follow:

1. The U.S. official dollar price of gold can and will be maintained at \$35 an ounce. Exchange controls over trade and investment will not be invoked. Our national security and economic assist-

ance programs will be carried forward. Those who fear weakness in the dollar will find their fears unfounded. Those who hope for speculative reasons for an increase in the price of gold will find their hopes in vain.

2. We must now gain control of our balance-of-payments position so that we can achieve overall equilibrium in our international payments. This means that any sustained future outflow of dollars into the monetary reserves of other countries should come about only as the result of considered judgments as to the appropriate needs for dollar reserves.

3. In seeking overall equilibrium we must place maximum emphasis on expanding our exports. Our costs and prices must therefore be kept low; and the Government must play a more vigorous part in helping to enlarge foreign markets for American goods and services.

4. A return to protectionism is not a solution. Such a course would provoke retaliation; and the balance of trade, which is now substantially in our favor, could be turned against us with disastrous effects to the dollar.

5. The flow of resources from the industrialized countries to the developing countries must be increased. In all that we do to strengthen our balance of payments, we must be especially mindful that the less developed countries remain in a weak financial position. Help from the industrialized countries is more important than ever; we cannot strengthen our balance of payments at the expense of the developing countries without incurring even greater dangers to our national security.

6. The United States must take the lead in harmonizing the financial and economic policies for growth and stability of those industrialized nations of the world whose economic behavior significantly influences the course of the world economy and the trend of international payments.

To carry forward these policies I propose a program for action, which may be divided into two parts. The first part describes those measures which will improve domestic monetary arrangements and strengthen international cooperation in economic and monetary policy. These measures will help us better to meet short-term demands on reserves such as those of recent years. The measures in the second group are designed to correct the persisting basic deficit in our balance of payments.

#### I. MEASURES TO EASE THE SHORT-TERM DEMAND PROBLEM

##### 1. MEASURES TO IMPROVE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY INSTITUTIONS

Increasing international monetary reserves will be required to support the ever-growing volume of trade, services, and capital movements among the countries of the free world. Until now the free nations have relied upon increased gold production and continued growth in holdings of dollars and pounds sterling. In the future, it may not always be desirable or appropriate to rely entirely on these sources. We must now, in cooperation with other lending countries, begin to consider ways in which international monetary institutions—espe-

cially the International Monetary Fund—can be strengthened and more effectively utilized, both in furnishing needed increases in reserves, and in providing the flexibility required to support a healthy and growing world economy. I am therefore directing that studies to this end be initiated promptly by the Secretary of the Treasury.

#### 2. USE OF U.S. DRAWING RIGHTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The United States has never made use of its drawing rights under the International Monetary Fund to meet deficits in its balance of payments. If and when appropriate, these rights should and will be exercised within the framework of Fund policies. The United States will also support continued efforts in the Fund to facilitate drawings by other members in the currencies of industrialized countries whose payments positions are in surplus and whose reserves are large. This will help to reduce the burden now borne by the dollar.

#### 3. SPECIAL INTEREST RATES FOR DOLLAR HOLDINGS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND MONETARY AUTHORITIES

(a) The Federal Reserve Act should now be amended to permit the Federal Reserve System to establish separate maxima for rates of interest paid by member banks on time and savings deposits held in this country by foreign governments or monetary authorities (sec. 19, par. 14). This authority when exercised, would enable American banks to make a maximum competitive effort to attract and hold dollar balances which might otherwise be converted into gold. At the same time domestic rates, when desirable for reasons of domestic policy, could be held at a lower level. I will shortly send to the Congress a draft of the needed legislation.

(b) I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to use, whenever it appears desirable, the authority already extended to him by the Second Liberty Bond Act to issue securities, at special rates of interest, for subscription and holding exclusively by foreign governments or monetary authorities. The exercise of this authority could provide an additional inducement to hold foreign official balances in dollars.

(c) As a final means of holding or attracting foreign dollars, the Congress should enact a measure designed to unify the tax treatment accorded the earning assets of foreign central banks. At present, income derived by foreign central banks of issue from bankers acceptances and bank deposits is exempt from tax under section 861 of the code. Income from U.S. Government securities, however, is taxable to foreign central banks in the absence of applicable tax treaty provisions or a special ruling exempting a particular bank from taxation under particular circumstances. Suggested legislation will shortly be forthcoming.

#### 4. PROHIBITION OF HOLDING OF GOLD ABROAD BY AMERICANS

The recent Executive order forbidding the holding of gold abroad by Americans will be maintained. It was fully justified on grounds of equity. It will also help to prevent speculation in the gold market. I am directing the Secretary

of the Treasury to keep me advised on steps being taken for effective enforcement. I place everyone on notice that those few American citizens who are tempted to speculate against the dollar will not profit in this manner.

#### II. MEASURES TO CORRECT THE BASIC PAYMENTS DEFICIT AND ACHIEVE LONGER TERM EQUILIBRIUM

##### 1. ACTION BY THE SENATE TO APPROVE THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

I earnestly request early action by the Senate approving U.S. membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The OECD, in which the industrialized countries of Western Europe, the United States and Canada will be joined, is of vital importance for assisting, on a cooperative basis, the developing countries of the free world. It will also provide a solid framework within which we can carry out intensive and frequent international consultations on the financial and monetary policies which must be pursued in order to achieve and maintain better balance in the international payments position.

##### 2. EXPORT PROMOTION

The Department of Commerce will provide energetic leadership to American industry in a drive to develop export markets. Firms and industries will be encouraged to step up their efforts to develop exports and given every assistance in doing so. As American industry comes to realize the vital role of export earnings for our foreign policy, I have little doubt of its response.

We will promptly increase our commercial representatives and facilities abroad. This is a joint program of the Departments of Commerce and State which must proceed with drive and conviction in order to produce effective results. The budget which has already gone to Congress requests \$1,250,000 for the State Department to add 41 Foreign Service commercial attachés overseas, together with 48 experienced foreign nationals and supporting American staff.

The new budget requests will also allow an increase in oversea commercial facilities. The Commerce Department is doubling its trade mission program from 11 to 18 per year and will provide more useful information to our oversea posts. I am ordering rapid completion of our two new foreign trade centers at London and Bangkok and have requested the departments to explore whether three more could be added next year in Africa, Latin America, and Europe.

##### 3. COST AND PRICE STABILIZATION

Our export promotion efforts, no matter how well devised or energetically pursued, will not be effective unless American goods are competitively priced. Our domestic policies—of government, of business and of labor—must be directed to maintaining competitive costs, improving productivity and stabilizing or where possible lowering prices. Measures to achieve these ends which are important for the domestic economy are even more vital for our international competitive position. I have already stated my intention of creating an Advisory Committee on Labor and Man-

agement Policy to encourage productivity gains, advance automation and encourage sound wage policies and price stability.

##### 4. EXPORT GUARANTEES AND FINANCING

Our Export-Import Bank must play an increasingly important role in our export promotion efforts. Last year the Export-Import Bank announced a widening of the facilities which it offers for extending credit to American exporters. Despite the improvements made, these facilities are not yet adequate, nor are they comparable to those offered by foreign countries, especially those offered to small and medium-sized exporting concerns and those offered for the financing of consumer goods. I am directing the president of the Export-Import Bank, by April 1, to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Treasury, as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, a new program under the Export-Import Bank to place our exporters on a basis of full equality with their competitors in other countries. Also, I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate and submit by the same date a study of methods through which private financial institutions can participate more broadly in providing export credit facilities.

##### 5. FOREIGN TRAVEL TO THE UNITED STATES

Foreign travel to the United States constitutes a large potential market hitherto virtually untapped. American travelers annually spend some \$2 billion in foreign countries. Foreign travelers only spend about \$1 billion in this country. Economic conditions in many foreign countries have improved to the point where a strong travel promotion effort by this country can be expected to yield significant results. The Department of Commerce, in cooperation with the Departments of State and Treasury, will announce shortly a major new program to encourage foreign travel in the United States along the lines envisaged in S. 3102, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON at the last session of the Congress. This program will include the establishment of travel offices abroad; new advertising campaigns; action to simplify our visa and entry procedures for temporary visitors; and efforts to relax foreign restrictions on travel to the United States. The program will be energetically administered in the Department of Commerce. I am asking the Secretary of Commerce to report in full on plans and prospects by April 1.

##### 6. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Our agricultural industry, which is of unparalleled efficiency, must make its full contribution to our payments balance. I am directing the Secretary of Agriculture to report on all feasible and internationally desirable means of expanding our exports of farm products, and to emphasize the need for great expansion as a primary objective of our new farm programs.

##### 7. POLICY ON ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Our foreign economic assistance programs are now being administered in such a way as to place primary emphasis on the procurement of American goods.

This assistance, accompanied as it is by the export of American products, does not therefore have a significantly adverse effect on our balance of payments. (Not more than 20 percent of the funds expended for economic grants, development loan assistance, technical assistance, and contributions to international organizations, which amounted to \$2.6 billion in 1960, is today available for expenditures outside the United States, and we intend to keep an even closer review of these items.) These restrictions will be maintained until reasonable overall equilibrium has been achieved. Then the United States will discuss with other capital-exporting countries the desirability of instituting common policies for worldwide procurement in the administration of economic development or assistance programs.

#### 8. TARIFFS, RESTRICTIONS AND DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST AMERICAN EXPORTS

Quota discriminations against American exports have largely disappeared with the return of currency convertibility. We will press for prompt removal of the few restrictions that still exist, as well as for the maximum liberalization of remaining nondiscriminatory quotas in other industrialized countries, which apply mainly to agricultural exports. In the tariff negotiations now going forward under GATT we shall seek the fullest possible measure of tariff reduction by foreign countries to the benefit of our exports.

#### 9. PROMOTION OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

We shall press those Western European countries with strong reserve positions to eliminate the restrictions they still maintain limiting the opportunities for their citizens to invest in the United States and other foreign countries. Also, we are initiating, through the Department of Commerce, a new program to bring investment opportunities in the United States to the attention of foreign investors in the industrialized countries.

#### 10. ABUSE OF "TAX HAVENS." TAXATION OF AMERICAN INVESTMENT ABROAD

I shall recommend that the Congress enact legislation to prevent the abuse of foreign "tax havens" by American capital abroad as a means of tax avoidance. In addition, I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to report by April 1 on whether present tax laws may be stimulating in undue amounts the flow of American capital to the industrial countries abroad through special preferential treatment, and to report further on what remedial action may be required. But we shall not penalize legitimate private investment abroad, which will strengthen our trade and currency in future years.

#### 11. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE CONTRIBUTION TO THE LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES AND THE COMMON DEFENSE

It is indispensable that the industrialized countries of the free world join in undertaking systematic budgetary contributions for economic assistance to the less-developed countries and the common defense. These contributions should be fully commensurate with their economic and financial positions. Some countries

are fulfilling this responsibility; it is a matter of disappointment that others have not yet undertaken to do so. Such actions are important in the short run to achieve a better balance in international trade and payments. Even more important, they are essential to the continuing and effective discharge of our common responsibilities for free world security, economic growth and stability.

#### 12. REDUCTION OF CUSTOMS EXEMPTION FOR RETURNING AMERICAN TRAVELERS

After World War II, as part of our efforts to relieve the dollar shortage which then plagued the world, Congress provided for two additional increases of \$300 and \$100 in the duty-free allowance for returning travelers, for a total of \$500. The primary purpose for this change having vanished, I am recommending legislation to withdraw this stimulus to American spending abroad and return to the historic basic duty-free allowance of \$100.

#### 13. CENTRALIZED REVIEW OF DOLLAR OUTLAY

Through the Bureau of the Budget, we have long been our sound financial practice to centralize the review of total spending of the departments and agencies of the Government of the United States, including their spending abroad. Under present circumstances, foreign outlays must be examined in a new perspective. Accordingly, I am instructing the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, to develop special procedures for analyzing that part of the requests of departments and agencies for spending authority which will involve overseas outlays to insure that our budgetary decisions will be taken with full understanding of their projected impact on the country's balance of payments.

#### 14. U.S. MILITARY EXPENDITURES ABROAD

National security expenditures abroad constitute one of the largest items in the outflow of dollars, amounting to about \$3 billion a year. We must maintain a fully effective military force wherever necessary and for as long as needed. While it is clear that we must exercise maximum prudence in our dollar outlays abroad, it has become clear that the present limitation on dependents was not the best way to accomplish this savings, and that this limitation was seriously hurting morale and recruitment in the Armed Forces. At the same time, the Secretary of Defense has informed me that equivalent dollar savings could be made through other measures, including limitations on expenditures abroad by military personnel for tourism and the purchase of durable consumer goods. Accordingly, I have directed him to rescind the limitation on dependents and instead to put these measures into effect immediately.

I have also asked him to review the possibilities for savings in the logistic support of our forces, including the combined use of facilities with our allies. We shall also, where appropriate, urge the purchase of the newer weapons and weapons systems by those of our allies who are financially capable of doing so. We shall continue the policy inaugurated last November of emphasizing U.S. pro-

curement for our military forces abroad wherever practicable, even though some increased budgetary cost may be incurred. Since foreign procurement of this nature has amounted to almost \$1 billion a year, significant savings in dollar outflow can be expected—and I am asking the Secretary of Defense to report on these and the other savings by no later than April 1, to see if further steps are needed then.

#### CONCLUSION

These measures, combined with increasing confidence in the dollar abroad and steady economic growth at home, can cure the basic long-term deficit in our balance of payments and check the outflow of gold. They symbolize a new dimension of this Nation's foreign and domestic economic policies—a new area of difficult problems—but they are problems which can be met by forceful and timely legislative and executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The White House, February 6, 1961.

#### PROPOSAL ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND AID-TO-DEPENDENT-CHILDREN PROGRAM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an explanation of H.R. 3864 and H.R. 3865.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am setting forth below for the information of the Members some details as to items covered in the press release which was issued on February 3, announcing that the Committee on Ways and Means, beginning on February 15, 1961, will hold hearings on the proposals of the administration to provide a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, H.R. 3864, and to extend the Federal-State aid to dependent children program to include unemployed parents, H.R. 3865.

The explanations of the two bills follow:

#### STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF H.R. 3864 TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEMPORARY PROGRAM OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO INCREASE THE WAGES SUBJECT TO THE FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would provide a prompt, though temporary, extension of unemployment compensation for workers who have exhausted their rights to regular unemployment compensation and are still unemployed. Prompt action is essential. In January, 5.4 million workers were without jobs. About 3.4 million were receiving unemployment compensation, and a half million who had already drawn all the compensation to which they were entitled were still unemployed. It is estimated that under this bill about 3 million workers could receive temporary extended unemployment compensation totaling about \$950 million.

Unemployment compensation payments provide workers with necessary purchasing power. The aggregate effect of unemployment compensation payments on consumer expenditures is great. For January, compen-

sation payments are estimated to have been \$430 million. When compensation is exhausted, this purchasing power ceases. This represents a serious hardship for the individual, and when the number of exhaustions is high, the cumulative effect depresses the overall economy.

Unemployment, particularly recession unemployment, is a national problem. The Employment Act of 1946 makes the Federal Government responsible for maintaining the Nation's economic well-being particularly with respect to maximizing employment. Given this responsibility, the Federal Government cannot ignore the need for taking action to meet the problem of mass unemployment arising from a national recession, the costs and effects of which clearly reach across State lines.

This bill would provide temporary extended unemployment compensation to individuals who exhausted regular unemployment compensation after October 31, 1960 (or such later date as the State may select), and before April 1, 1962. Workers who had established their entitlement before April 1, 1962, could draw the extended compensation for weeks of unemployment after such April 1, but in no event would such compensation be payable for any week of unemployment beginning after June 30, 1962.

The amount of temporary extended unemployment compensation payable under the bill would equal 50 percent of a worker's regular unemployment compensation, up to a combined total (Federal and State) for any individual of 39 weeks for total unemployment. In order to avoid treating inequitably States which have already extended duration beyond 26 weeks for at least some workers, the Federal Government will reimburse such States for unemployment compensation paid to a worker, in excess of 26 times his weekly benefit amount, still subject, however, to the overall maximum of 39 times his weekly benefit amount. This reimbursement would apply both to regular State duration in excess of 26 weeks and to extended State unemployment compensation paid only in times of high unemployment.

Temporary additional unemployment compensation would be paid only in States which choose to enter into agreements with the Secretary of Labor under which they would act as agents for the Federal Government.

The temporary program proposed would be financed out of the proceeds of an increase in the taxable wage base for the Federal unemployment tax. The program is a Federal program born of the Federal interest in the effects of unemployment. It is suitable, therefore, that the cost of financing this program be spread among employers in all the States. States which usually bear a disproportionate share of recession unemployment would not have to bear the total financial burden of the temporary extension of unemployment compensation. The proposed financing would serve, with more equitable effects among States, to pool the risk and costs of recessionary unemployment, which is more a national than a State problem.

There are other advantages to financing the program in the manner proposed by the bill. Such a federally financed program can be put into operation in all States much more quickly than one financed out of State funds. It would be possible under this bill to start paying temporary additional compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning 15 days after enactment of the program. Only 17 States paid their workers extended unemployment compensation under the 1958 program. In some of these States, legislative action was needed and would be needed now were a similar program to be enacted. Moreover, financing extended duration should not increase the interstate competitive tax burden on employers in States with heavy unemployment. The unequal burden may tend

to discourage the vitally needed expansion of industry in those States which need it most.

The bill would amend the definition of wages in section 3306(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Under the amendment the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax would be \$4,800 a year instead of \$3,000. Although moneys from the general funds of the Treasury will be made available for the immediate financing of the temporary extended unemployment compensation program, such moneys will be returned to the general funds out of the proceeds of the increased Federal revenues that will result from the increased taxable wage base proposed.

If the increase in the taxable wage base is made effective for the calendar year of 1962 and thereafter, it will result in additional revenues through fiscal year 1966 of about \$695 million, an average of something less than \$175 million a year. This, combined with additional revenues resulting from the recent increase in the Federal unemployment tax by 0.1 percent beginning with respect to taxable year 1961, will make it possible to pay for the temporary extension of unemployment compensation proposed by this bill by June 30, 1966, and at the same time to pay for the administrative costs of the entire employment security program, and build up a substantial balance in the Federal unemployment account for advances under title XII to States in financial difficulty.

The increase in the taxable wage base is a desirable improvement, apart from its role in financing these temporary benefits. It is the best way to increase the revenue under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. The increased revenue would build the Federal unemployment account and the employment security administration account to their specified levels faster than under the present law, thereby saving interest on advances from the revolving account to the administration account.

An increase in the wage base is long overdue. When the \$3,000 base was established in 1939, it covered 97 percent of payrolls taxed under the unemployment insurance program; today it covers only about 60 percent of payrolls. The taxable wage base under the OASDI program has been increased several times in recognition of increases in wages, and now stands at \$4,800, the base proposed for the Federal unemployment tax.

An increase in the wage base will also assist those States that are hard pressed for revenue. Continued use of the \$3,000 wage base has contributed to a steady decline in State reserve funds because contributions on this limited base do not increase in proportion to increasing benefit liabilities of the program.

States are hesitant to increase their taxable wage base without similar action being taken in all other States for fear of being placed at a competitive interstate disadvantage. Those States that do not need increased revenue to finance an adequate unemployment compensation program can adjust their tax rates downward under their experience rating systems. A tax base more representative of wages will permit experience rating schedules with more spread in employer rates and thus better indication of variations in employer experience.

#### PROPOSED CHANGES IN AID TO CHILDREN TO INCLUDE UNEMPLOYED PARENTS, H.R. 3865 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

It is proposed to broaden the coverage of title IV of the Social Security Act, under which grants are made to States for aid to dependent children, so as to provide assistance with Federal help to children who are in need because of the unemployment of a parent. This proposal would:

(a) Enable the States to include in their Federal-State aid to dependent children pro-

gram not only the children deprived of care and support because of death, continued absence, or incapacity of a parent, but also the families where a parent is unemployed.

(b) Provide that States desiring to extend their Federal-State aid to dependent children program to the families of the unemployed be required to enter into cooperative arrangements with the State employment service to assure maximum utilization of that service in returning the unemployed parent to work. These arrangements would include provision for appropriate registration with the public employment service.

(c) State the intent of Congress that the additional funds made available be used for assistance to needy unemployed families who are either ineligible for assistance or who receive inadequate amounts of assistance and that the additional Federal funds are not intended to replace State and local funds now aiding needy persons.

(d) Become effective as of April 1, 1961, and would expire June 30, 1962.

(e) Temporarily increase the limitations on Federal funds which may be paid to Puerto Rico for public assistance.

#### REASONS FOR PROPOSAL

(a) Federal grants to States under present law provide assistance only to the needy aged, blind, and disabled, and to dependent children who are deprived of parental support or care solely because of the death, continued absence, or the physical or mental incapacity of a parent. Where a family is in need because the father is unemployed, the family cannot receive assistance under the federally aided program of aid to dependent children.

(b) Assistance to other needy persons, such as the unemployed, must come from State and local funds without Federal sharing in the cost of such assistance.

(c) States make varying provisions for needy persons not included under the four federally aided categories, and in many States assistance is not available to persons in need because of unemployment or is inadequate because State and local funds are limited.

(d) The proposed change in the Federal law to include children of unemployed parents would enable the States to provide assistance with Federal help to families in need because of a parent's unemployment.

(e) The provision for the establishment of cooperative arrangements with the public employment service will further the objective of helping these needy families to again become self-supporting.

(f) This measure will help meet the needs of a substantial number of unemployed families, including those not covered by the unemployment compensation program and those who have exhausted their benefits under that program.

(g) Without an increase in the existing limitation on public assistance funds, Puerto Rico would not receive additional Federal funds.

#### PROGRAM DATA FOR AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN Current data:

Number of families receiving assistance, November 1960..	795, 012
Number of children receiving assistance, November 1960..	2, 341, 615
Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1960.....	\$665, 700, 000
Increases under proposal to aid unemployed (assuming passage by Apr. 1, 1961, and participation by all States):	
Average monthly number of families—more than.....	250, 000
Average monthly number of children—more than.....	750, 000
Increase in Federal funds for the 15 months period Apr. 1, 1961 through June 30, 1962 .....	\$305, 000, 000

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 6, 1961

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the immediate program and what he might tell us, those of us particularly on my side of the aisle who are wanting to get away some time this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know of no further program this week, except possibly some committee resolutions like today. Of course, there will be some messages from the President. There will be one tomorrow I expect on minimum wage legislation and there is one I think expected on Thursday on social security, as I am reminded by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the Speaker, and myself, had a brief conference last week in connection with the matter of Lincoln Day speeches. We have agreed that when the House adjourns next Thursday it will adjourn to meet on the following Monday; and when it meets on the following Monday we will adjourn until the following Wednesday. In other words, I may say to my Republican friends that they could start now. I know of no one who is going to raise the point of no quorum; I hope not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his consideration. He has extended to us his usual fine courtesy.

### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tomorrow to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

### INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 75 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies with respect to the following matters within the jurisdiction of the committee:

(1) the administration, management, and operations of the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(2) the mallability of articles and printed matter generally, including, among other things, the mailing of obscene matter and the mailing of unsolicited articles and matter with requests for payment or contributions;

(3) the application, operation, and effect of the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the management of civilian personnel of the Federal Government, including matters relating to (A) compensation, (B) position classification, (C) examination, (D) appointment, (E) assignment of positions excepted from the competitive service to schedules A, B, and C under rule VI of the Civil Service Rules, (F) allocation of positions to, and distribution of positions in, grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, (G) actions taken pursuant to section 505(1) of such Act, as amended by Public Law 85-462, (H) promotions, (I) reduction in force, and (J) separation from the service by action other than reduction in force;

(4) the desirability and effect of contracts, agreements, or arrangements for the performance, by and through sources outside the Federal Government, of personal, administrative, and management services;

(5) the effect of the contracting practices of the Federal Government on the availability and utilization of personnel qualified for the performance of essential functions of the Federal Government;

(6) the organization, management, and operations of the United States Civil Service Commission, including the delegation of authority to the department and agency Boards of Civil Service Examiners and the audit and control thereof;

(7) operations under the Classification Act of 1949 and other laws relating to the compensation of civilian officers and employees of the Government;

(8) actions taken and directives issued as a result of the investigations and studies, conducted by the committee under authority of H. Res. 32, Eighty-third Congress, H. Res. 304, Eighty-fourth Congress, and H. Res. 139, Eighty-fifth Congress, with respect to the utilization and dual supervision of civilian employees in or under the Department of Defense;

(9) dual supervision of civilian employees, creation of civilian positions, number of civilian positions, and other matters relating to conservation of manpower, in such departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government as the chairman of the committee may designate;

(10) (A) the organization, management, and operations of the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce and (B) Government statistical and related activities other than those of the Bureau of Census;

(11) insurance plans and programs of the Government for Government employees and related matters; and

(12) the operation and effect of training programs under the Government Employees Training Act. *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and

may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself now such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the few resolutions that are brought in at the beginning of every session giving to the standing committees and certain select committees the jurisdiction to issue subpoenas and require the production of papers. It is necessary in connection with the investigations which the standing committees are required to make.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the minority approves this resolution. I have no requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 23 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the continental United States and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States and Canada, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the continental United States and Canada, except that two subcommittees thereof, not exceeding six members and not exceeding two staff members each, as authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, are hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places without the United States, in connection with highway conferences.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a similar resolution, applying to the Committee on Public Works. I might add, as I did not with reference to the last resolution, that all of these resolutions which I am presenting now and which will be presented in the future unless otherwise noted are identical with the resolution applying to the particular

committee involved as obtained in the 86th Congress, and giving such resolutions the same authority as they have heretofore had.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this resolution on the minority side and, therefore, on behalf of the minority approve the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE—PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 46) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1961, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of fifteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of the potentialities thereof; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and (4) to study and investigate problems of small business enterprises generally, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided*, That the committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

Sec. 3. The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such

chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Sec. 5. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], a member of the committee.

JOHN E. HORNE, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the Senate's confirmation of John E. Horne, former administrative assistant to Senator Sparkman, as the new Administrator of the Small Business Administration—an agency which can, under proper direction and an understanding of the intent of Congress in creating SBA, be of vast aid to the national economy.

Mr. Horne's appointment seems an excellent one.

I make particular reference to the Small Business Administration because I have had contact with the agency several times since the Congress created it in 1953. For the most part, my experiences with SBA have been unsatisfactory. I found what appeared to be a startling disinterest, even a lack of understanding of the agency's purposes and possibilities on the part of the Administrators and some of their top deputies and assistants. This ineptitude and inefficiency has extended to many of SBA's regional offices over the country.

It is customary for these top Washington jobs to be filled by political appointees under what is known as a schedule C classification. I have no objection to that system; in fact, I think it is reasonable and desirable for the administration in control to be allowed a choice of men for key positions who are in tune with the objectives of their political party and of their President. However, these appointees to major policymaking offices should be qualified for and interested in the work they are to undertake. President Kennedy has been selecting such men.

Until this appointment of Mr. Horne, it seems evident that SBA has not been under the direction of men who really had an interest in or an understanding of the agency. Records of the three men who have been Administrators of SBA since 1953 will bear out that statement.

#### INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. Speaker, I supported legislation creating the Small Business Administration, just as I voted in 1958 to make the agency permanent and to enlarge its functions and authority by creation of an additional branch—the Small Business Investment Division, now known as the SBIC.

The Investment Act was championed by my esteemed Texas colleague [Mr. PATMAN], who has long been active and a leader in the House Small Business Committee. When the SBA investment division was set up, it was hailed as an

ideal means of channeling vast amounts of private capital into small business enterprises everywhere. Wendell Barnes, then Administrator at SBA and, incidentally, a man who had no small business background prior to his appointment, predicted there soon would be many hundreds, or thousands, of small business investment companies licensed by SBA all over the land.

#### KILL SBA DEPARTMENT BY APPOINTMENT

The record shows that, after 2 years, there are only about 180 of these investment companies. The whole project is flattening out. There seems to have been no sound or orderly effort to explain or exploit the SBIC project to holders of private capital who might have become interested. Barnes and associates goofed—they failed "to get the ship off the ground."

I have heard it said many times, and experiences related to me by some of my constituents bear it out, that it is easier for a small businessman to get a loan from a commercial bank than from SBA. We all know that Congress never intended the SBA to be a giveaway or gravy train operation whereby loans are made indiscriminately to unsound or unworthy applicants. But it definitely is the duty and should be the policy and practice of SBA to sincerely counsel with every reputable and responsible small businessman seeking SBA assistance.

#### CONGRESS IGNORED

One of the most questionable actions by ex-Administrator Barnes—one that, in my opinion, disregarded and flaunted the intent of Congress—was his so-called confidential, but I prefer the word "furtive" memorandum of August 1959, to all SBA regional directors wherein he ordered them to cut down on loans to small businesses everywhere. I call that action furtive because no member of the Senate or House Small Business Committee was advised, so far as I can ascertain, of this memo's content or intent before it was sent out. Did Mr. Barnes fear that his order would be frowned upon by the Congress? Obviously, that must have been his reason for keeping it secret.

The impact of that Barnes cutback order still is being felt, as was pointed out a few days ago by the Senate Small Business Committee. SBA loans have steadily decreased as the turndown of loan applicants has increased. That has been a factor in the present downturn of our national economy, I contend. I have in my files correspondence from a constituent who is a reputable and long-time businessman. He wanted an SBA loan and his local commercial bank was ready to participate with SBA on a sizable basis and administer the loan.

My constituent took his case to the Chicago SBA office and "encountered a calm resistance at every hand." Those are his own words. He had prepared a prospectus showing his assets and his ability to liquidate the loan he sought. The Chicago SBA officials gave it only a slight glance and turned him down.

Can we blame this businessman for being disgusted and embittered?

I daresay that scores of Members of this Chamber have had similar complaints from small businesses in their districts.

The disinclination of SBA under ex-Administrator Barnes and his own hand-picked successor, a nonbusinessman named Philip McCallum, to go promptly into complaints submitted to them by Members of Congress has been annoying and frustrating. If there ever has been an SBA congressional liaison officer to help Congressmen with their constituents' complaints, I have never seen him or heard from him.

Consider how other agencies spring into action to help a Member of Congress get to the bottom of the American people's complaints and you can see how derelict SBA has been, under Barnes and McCallum.

I wish to emphasize at this point, Mr. Speaker, that my criticism of past SBA management is in no manner intended to reflect upon or cast doubt upon the fine career civil service employees of SBA. With very few exceptions, they are sincere, dedicated, and competent people who sought against heavy odds to do good jobs. They have been obliged to follow the policies and the orders of their bosses—"gravy train" appointees—who knew little and cared less about SBA, the intent of Congress, or helping to keep the national economy in high gear.

This must have been a frustrating and discouraging state of affairs for the civil service people at SBA.

#### IGNORE CONGRESS ORDER BY SBA BUREAUCRAT

I personally know of one case in point. It concerns a man who was for several years a Congressman's top assistant. He is well and favorably known to a great many Members here, on both sides of the aisle, as well as to their staff people and staff people of our committees.

This man decided to become a career Federal employee. He attained civil service status and joined SBA. One of his first orders from the schedule C appointee who ran his department was that he was to have no contacts with Capitol Hill. This is hard to believe and impossible to justify, considering the man's background and wide knowledge of House procedures and personalities. Actually, his Hill contacts could have been invaluable to SBA—but they were tossed aside.

This is just one example of the unrealistic handling of SBA since 1953.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, it is good that a man of John Horne's background and acquaintance on Capitol Hill is taking over at SBA. Having worked a long time for Senator SPARKMAN and having constant contact with the Senate and House Small Business Committees, he has known that agency since its inception. Too, he knows what Congress expects of SBA and he knows what Members of Congress have been up against in their dealings with the agency.

I am confident that a new era of sensible and sincere guidance is dawning for the Small Business Administration. I know my colleagues join me in saying "it is about time."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and now yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the author of the resolution, for the purpose of offering an amendment which has been agreed to by the leadership on both sides.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN of Texas: Page 1, line 2, after the words "composed of," strike out "fifteen" and insert "thirteen."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as indicated by our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], this amendment has the approval of the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the ranking minority member. The amendment reduces the membership from 15 to 13, as proposed in the resolution, which is the same as the number provided in the last two Congresses. I hope the amendment is adopted.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the committee be composed as it has been in the past?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This select committee is nonpolitical and non-partisan. The committee has never handled its work in a partisan way, and the division has been fairly close within the committee between the two parties. Mr. PATMAN. The committee has been very satisfactory, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It has rendered rather able service through the membership of the committee regardless of political affiliation, and I think it is very important that the gentleman point out that the committee will remain as it has in the past. This is a wise action. The membership will be divided 7 to 6; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADDRESS BY CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, within the near future the 87th Congress will again be faced with the very important and most interesting subject matter on the program of Federal aid to education and especially the question of whether or not Federal aid to education should be provided to private schools and schools of various religious denominations.

Much has been written and said on the Federal aid to these private educational institutions and I have had the pleasure of reading an excerpt from an address by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York. So that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to read his remarks, I include his statement:

#### EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

In the lead editorial in the Chicago Catholic New World of January 14 it is stated: "One of President-elect Kennedy's task forces—pointedly described by some as a tax force—has proposed a \$9,300 million program of Federal aid to education." Of the total amount, \$5,800 million would be allotted to public elementary and high schools.

No Catholic schools or schools of other religious denominations are included in the task force proposal. For many millions of American parents, this means that they will be taxed more than ever before for the education of their children but that they cannot expect any return from their taxes, unless they are willing to transfer their children to a public grade or high school.

The Task Force Committee consists of six of our country's distinguished educators, which outlined a general program of financial assistance for all public schools as follows:

1. To provide \$30 per annum a pupil, based on average attendance in public schools. The boards of education should be authorized to use the funds for construction, salaries or other purposes related to the improvement of education.

2. To provide \$20 per child for States with personal income per student in average daily attendance in public schools that is below 70 percent of the national average.

3. To provide an amount equivalent to \$20 per child in average daily attendance in the public schools of the great cities (over 300,000 population) which are facing unique and grave educational problems.

I believe and I state that these recommendations are unfair to most parents of the Nation's 6,800,000 parochial and private school children. Such legislation would discriminate against a multitude of America's children because their parents choose to exercise their constitutional right to educate them in accordance with their religious beliefs. Under these proposals parents would be compelled to surrender both freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the education of their children as a condition for sharing in Federal education funds, which is in direct violation of the liberties guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

In this day when, according to communism's chief salesman Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Union is fighting to enslave the world by conquering men's minds, it is imperative that our Nation provide every child with the teachings necessary to develop his moral and intellectual abilities to their highest potential. The requirements of the national defense as well as the general welfare of our country demand that, in educational opportunities, no child be treated as a second-class citizen. Hence, it is unthinkable that any American child be denied the Federal funds allotted to other children which are necessary for his mental develop-

ment because his parents choose for him a God-centered education.

To me it is also unthinkable that Congress would deny a child funds to study mathematics, science, and languages simply because his parents supply additional funds for the study of religion. This would be penalizing both the child and his parents because of their religious beliefs.

As an American whose loyalties have been challenged only by Communists, I cannot believe that Congress would accept the proposals of the task force and use economic compulsion to force parents to relinquish their rights to have religion taught to their children. I cannot believe that Congress would discriminate against Lutheran, Baptist, Catholic, or Jewish parents—Americans all—in the allocation of educational funds.

I cannot believe that Congress would enact a program of financial assistance to elementary and secondary education unless all children were granted equal educational privileges, regardless of the school they attend. This procedure would insure the civil rights of independent school children and of their parents, and would then incorporate in the task force programs, the first amendment principles of religious and academic freedom in the pursuit of truth.

Our Constitution not only demands that all children be treated alike regardless of their exercise of religion in the choice of school, but Congress has established many precedents of this equal treatment. To quote just a few:

In the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952 Congress provided for direct grants to veterans to enable them to pay tuition in the school of their choice. Many GI's used these funds to pay tuition in the Nation's 474 Protestant, 265 Catholic, and 5 Jewish institutions of higher education.

In the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 Congress provided for direct grants to students whose fathers died as a result of the Second World War or the Korean conflict. Many of America's orphaned students are using these grants to pay tuition in church-related colleges. And, in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 Congress provided for direct grants to graduate fellows many of whom are pursuing their studies in universities under religious auspices.

A number of States have also adopted the method of direct grants to students in extensive scholarship programs which give the award winners freedom of choice in education.

It is a matter of record that programs of direct grants to students and children attending church-related schools do not breach the wall of separation of church and state. Discussing the GI bill, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School observed that it "does not believe that this assistance to veterans was designed to help, even indirectly, the institutions." This means that Congress can subsidize children and students without subsidizing the schools.

The Task Force Committee on Education calls for a flat grant of \$30 annually for each public school child for all States. By denying this measure of equality to church-related schoolchildren and their parents, the task force proposals are blatantly discriminating against them, depriving them of freedom of mind and freedom of religion guaranteed by our country's Constitution whose first amendment was adopted to protect the individual person from government repression, the very danger implicit in the proposed program of the task force.

If Congress were to comply with the task force proposals as outlined by its committee (and once again I express my faith that Congress would not do so), and compel a child to attend a State school as a condition for sharing in education funds, it would

be engaging in thought control, which, as Justice Jackson remarked, "is a copyright of totalitarianism, and we have no claim to it."

Therefore, dear friends, in the hazardous present and the increasingly perilous future that we face, I beg your prayers that Americans may forever be free to worship God as conscience directs; prayers for our beloved country, her leaders and her people; prayers that, as we go forward to the great tasks ahead, we may rededicate ourselves to God with a single will for peace and righteousness for all.

#### PRESIDENTIAL ASSISTANT SCHLESINGER AND THE WELFARE STATE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week newly appointed Presidential Assistant Arthur M. Schlesinger speaking as a private citizen and not as an administration spokesman at Newton College of the Sacred Heart in Massachusetts made the statement that a welfare state is the best defense against communism.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this Harvard College history teacher whom President Kennedy has appointed as an intimate White House aid and adviser believes and is telling our youth that the welfare state is the best defense against communism.

Mr. Khrushchev's own statement on the other hand contradicts Presidential Adviser Schlesinger. And who will say Mr. Khrushchev is not something of an authority on the subject? Mr. Khrushchev recently stated:

We cannot expect Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism until they suddenly awake to find they have communism.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me Mr. Khrushchev has a real ally in White House Adviser Schlesinger—well intentioned though he may be. Small doses of socialistic welfare as preached and promoted by the Americans for Democratic Action is the way Mr. Khrushchev plans his international conspiracy.

God save the President and this Nation from some of his socialistic friends. That President Kennedy and the Congress will see to it the United States has the strength to stand up and defend ourselves from without I have no doubt. But can this Nation withstand the subtle misguided Trojan Horse idealists from within?

President Kennedy's adviser calls the welfare state a defense against communism.

Mr. Khrushchev—who ought to know—says the welfare state is the beginning of communism.

The way it looks to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the welfare state is the one sure way to make the Khrushchev boast come true—that our grandchildren will be raised under communism.

#### RESETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960—Public Law 86-648—a law enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, the Attorney General has forwarded to the Congress a report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization on the initial 6-month operations undertaken under the new law.

In view of a new wave of highly misleading information pertaining to the number of refugees desiring to enter the United States, I wish to make this report available to all Members of the Congress.

The report reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
IMMIGRATION AND  
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Operations under the act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86-648), were carried out by the Immigration and Naturalization Service during the period ending December 31, 1960, in Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, determination having been made by the Department of State on July 18, 1960, that refugee situations existed in the first five countries named, and on December 12 with respect to Lebanon.

On July 23, 1960, the Secretary of State furnished an advisory report pursuant to section 2(a) of Public Law 86-648 setting forth the statistics available at that time, and on October 3, 1960, furnished a further report advising that for the period July 1, 1959, through June 30, 1960, a total of 22,285 refugee-escapees, as specified in section 1 of the act, had availed themselves of resettlement opportunities offered by nations other than the United States. Accordingly, based upon the 25-percent formula set forth in the act, not more than 5,571 refugees, within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, could be paroled into the United States during the first 6-month period ending December 31, 1960. Certifications furnished by the High Commissioner's representatives are accepted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as evidence of mandate status.

During the latter part of July and the first week of August, a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and of the Department of State traveled to various locations in the five countries, to confer with appropriate officials, with a view to working out arrangements for speeding the implementation of the parole program.

By the first week in August the registration of refugees falling within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees had begun. Through the cooperation of the local authorities, international organizations, and voluntary agencies, registration forms were made available throughout each country in which the parole operation was placed in effect. While all organizations having contact with or interest in refugees were invited to assist in the registration, it was recognized that the work of registering the refugees would be carried out in the main by the voluntary agencies. All

persons and organizations involved were informed of the need for registering the refugees as rapidly as possible because under the terms of the law, the number of refugees who could be paroled during the first 6-month period would be calculated on the basis of the number of mandate refugees resettled during the period of World Refugee Year, July 1, 1959 to June 30, 1960, whereas the number who could be paroled in any succeeding 6-month period would be calculated on the basis of those resettled during the immediately preceding 6-month period.

A system of priorities was established for the processing of refugees who registered under the law. First priority was to be given to in-camp refugees, in accordance with the year in which they became refugees, highest priority being given to those who had been refugees for the greatest number of years. Out-of-camp refugees were to be given a lower priority, but here again the refugees within this group were to be given priority in accordance with the year in which they became refugees. However, in view of the small number of registrations, it was not necessary to follow the priorities.

In order to carry out the provisions of Public Law 86-648 relating to the parole of refugees, the force of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Europe was increased by the addition of five officers and five U.S. citizen clerical employees. Examination of all parole applicants consists of the identical medical examination, including X-rays by physicians from the U.S. Public Health Service, as is accorded normal immigrant visa applicants, and interrogation and fingerprinting of each principal applicant and accompanying member of his family under the age of 14, by U.S. immigration officers. The records of security, intelligence and other agencies of this Government are examined, as are the records of the countries in which the refugees are processed. Refugees are not interviewed in any country until the Secretary of State has advised of the completion of negotiations with the foreign government to establish, (1) the right of return of any refugee whose parole would be revoked within 24 months of arrival in the United States; (2) the right of officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate any parole applicant or other refugees; and (3) the right of access to records within the control of the foreign government which would have a bearing on the eligibility and admissibility of the parole applicants.

As of December 31, 1960, a total of 6,334 refugees had registered. Action taken with respect to these refugees as of that date is as follows:

Found qualified by immigration officers	5,141
Rejected	339
Applications closed for other reasons	354
Pending	500
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,334</b>

The 339 refugees were rejected for various reasons, as follows:

Not within criteria	16
Security grounds	82
Criminal grounds	29
Medical reasons	33
Immoral	11
Undesirable	22
Resettled	66
Spouses and children of the above	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>339</b>

The 354 cases in which the applications were closed represent cases in which the refugees after registering took advantage of resettlement opportunities offered by other countries or withdrew their applications for other reasons.

The 500 cases pending as of December 31, 1960, were mainly refugees who had failed

to appear for interview or who for some other reason could not be interviewed prior to December 31, 1960.

Prior to December 31, 1960, documents relating to 972 refugees had been delivered to the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration, which arranges for the transportation of the parolees to the United States, and 387 refugees had physically arrived in the United States. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a) of the act of July 14, 1960, there are enclosed reports containing statements of facts in the case of each of these refugees.

Upon arrival at a U.S. port of entry, the refugee-escapee is furnished a form I-94 showing date and port of parole. The form is retained by the alien as evidence of his status in the United States and as evidence of his compliance with the alien registration requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The relating file is forwarded to the district director having jurisdiction over the alien's intended place of residence in the United States. The refugee's place of residence is verified and a control is established in the district office, to insure examination after 2 years to determine eligibility for permanent residence status.

No refugees were paroled into the United States prior to December 31, 1960, under section 2(b) of Public Law 86-648 as "difficult to resettle" cases. Aliens afflicted with tuberculosis, who would be eligible for admission under the provisions of section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957, will be paroled under section 2(a) of the act. A number of these aliens will be paroled into the United States during 1961.

The registration of mandate refugees desiring to go to the United States is essentially complete as of this time in the countries in which the parole program has been operating. The voluntary agency representatives in each country have been striving to locate refugees to register. It appears that registrations hereafter in these countries will be primarily from recent arrivals and from refugees who for one reason or another do not wish to register at this time but later decide to do so. With respect to new arrivals, approximately 70 percent of the persons arriving in Italy and claiming to be refugees, approximately 12 percent of those entering Austria, and approximately 9 percent of those who enter Germany, are granted mandate status. From all reports, the economic situation in Germany, Austria, and France is such that refugees in those countries, other than those who are handicapped or who especially desire to go to the United States, are not anxious to embark upon an immigration venture and hence generally are not interested in registering. Jobs are available in all three countries, since all are in need of workers. In addition to the placement of 200,000 refugees from the East, Germany is reported to have imported 330,000 workers from other countries during the past year. In France, where jobs are plentiful, there is reported to be a housing shortage which no doubt has prompted some refugees to register for parole, who otherwise might not have done so.

Various public and private surveys have included in their estimates of in-camp refugees any nonnational who is residing in public housing. The majority of these people feel that they are established in the country and do not desire to migrate for the reasons set forth above. The Service's attention has been focused on refugees who have been furnished not only housing, but food, clothing and possibly allowances and who have no private income, and who desire to migrate. It is this last group that World Refugee Year and the Public Law 86-648 was designed to eliminate.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,  
Commissioner.

#### EXTENSION OF THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new extension of the Sugar Act. My bill establishes an effective period of 6 years which should be sufficiently long to determine the economic feasibility of growing sugar in new areas of the country as well as to provide independent capital an opportunity to protect its investment in the necessary sugar processing plants.

My legislation offers further opportunity to implement the President's policy of developing new frontiers. These frontiers are at our own back doors where some prospective sugar farmers have been denied the right to grow and sell sugar within their own country to fulfill our domestic needs. It will add new jobs across the Nation. It will promote the economic growth of our country. It will raise farm income which, in the words of our President, has declined 25 percent in the last decade.

My bill will expand the production in old beet growing areas, the mainland cane areas, and, in addition, allow new producers a small share in this important industry.

I urge my colleagues to review this legislation which I have introduced today so all of us can work together to promote this segment of the New Frontier.

#### TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE USO—FEBRUARY 6, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the 4th of February marked the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Service Organizations—the USO.

There is not a veteran of World War II or Korea who does not remember the work done by this organization. To all Americans the USO has meant a place where men and women of our armed services could find a bit of America—a home away from home. But while the USO is associated in the minds of many with wartime conditions, the fact is that this organization has continued its effective operation during the time of peace. Today, as before, its program continues.

In major cities abroad, at seaports, you will find a USO club ready to assist members of the Armed Forces. Not only do they maintain a healthy atmosphere for recreation but they render assistance and give advice. They arrange sightseeing tours, accommodations, and educate our visitors with the local customs. Thus, they are performing a task of creating good will toward Americans in uniform.

In these faraway places you will find the dedicated and trained members of the USO staffs. Their great work for the countless Americans who have sought haven in their clubs continues today on the same high level of accomplishment.

I think it right to commemorate the anniversary of the USO and to extend the good wishes of this distinguished body for continued success to the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, and the National Travelers Aid Association, who, united to form the USO, have, and shall continue to fill, a great need and perform a noble service for which all Americans, civilians or military, are grateful.

#### TIMES DO CHANGE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1861, the northern radicals had what amounted to a psychiatric obsession—to free the slaves. In 1961, the northern radicals have what amounts to a psychiatric obsession—to enslave the free.

#### THE LEAD AND ZINC ACT OF 1961

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I joined in sponsoring the Lead and Zinc Act of 1961 through the introduction of H.R. 3768, which is commonly referred to as a bill to stabilize the lead and zinc mining industry.

It should first be made clear that the term "stabilization of lead and zinc" is not apropos in reference to the bill and, in my opinion, tends to minimize the dire emergency now existing in the lead and zinc domestic mining industry. It is not a bill to stabilize the industry alone. It is not a bill which should be referred to as a tariff or subsidy measure, but is a bill which must be passed by this body and signed into law in order to "save" a great industry in these United States.

The so-called lead belt area in my district produces one-third of the lead mined in the United States. Formerly, it was a prosperous area with the outlook for a still better future, but today, with 50 percent of the lead consumed in the United States being imported, with lead selling at the price of 11 cents a pound, and with the resulting unemployment, it has become an area of vacant store buildings and one which lives in constant fear of still another mine being shut down.

Last week, National Lead Co., at Fredricktown, Mo., announced the cessation of its mining and milling operations, which will result in 160 more men being

out of jobs. The shutting down of operations is an old story for St. Joseph Lead Mining Co., the Nation's largest producer. In 1952 St. Joseph Lead Mining Co. employed 3,064 men in my district. During 1960 it employed only 2,203 men, which number has further decreased in recent weeks.

Almost 30 percent of the miners have lost their jobs. The area has been designated by the Department of Labor as an area of persistent substantial labor surplus, a depressed area. This Congress cannot fail to act any longer. Administrative inaction has been shocking. As a matter of fact, the preceding administration has even refused to follow the recommendations of its own tariff commission, which recommendations, if they had been adopted and implemented, would have prevented the deplorable conditions now existing.

Let me say that I am an adherent of a free trade policy. I realize that our Nation must import in order to export. It is fundamental that if another nation with whom we trade can make bicycles cheaper than we, we should manufacture automobiles for their purchase, and let them make bicycles for our purchase, and both nations will benefit. But it is equally fundamental that we can not indulge in laissez-faire free trade policies when we no longer indulge in laissez-faire domestic policies. And if we continue to so foolishly indulge, we should gird ourselves for a still greater gold crisis and the designation of the United States of America as a great importing nation, rather than an exporting one. It is not only a problem of higher labor costs, but also a problem of higher tax cost, which we assess upon ourselves to pay the tremendous price of our foreign aid program, which program, to a great extent, has been a contributing factor in the increased lead and zinc importations.

The purpose of this bill is to save the domestic lead and zinc mining industry—to restore the industry to a sound and stable condition, while promoting a fair and more reasonable balance between foreign and domestic supplies.

The Lead and Zinc Act of 1961 provides for the following: First. A limited subsidy to be paid from tariff receipts on imported lead and zinc and not at the cost of the American taxpayer, with controls as follows:

(a) The subsidy payment is limited to sales of new production of domestic ores and concentrates up to 2,000 tons of lead and 2,000 tons of zinc in any 12-month period.

(b) The payment is based on the difference between 16 cents per pound for each metal and the actual market price.

(c) Any company or any individual miner may receive only one subsidy on production up to a maximum of 2,000 tons of lead and 2,000 tons of zinc per year regardless of the number of mines he may own, lease, or operate.

Second. An import tax on lead and zinc concentrates and metal consisting of (a) a permanent tax of 2 cents per pound on lead and zinc metal and 70 percent of this, or 1.4 cents per pound on ores and concentrates; and (b) a remov-

able tax of the same amount on both metals that is applied if the domestic market price of either metal goes below 13½ cents per pound and is removed when the market prices rise above 14½ cents per pound.

Third. A compensatory tax on the lead and zinc content of imported manufactured goods. This is 2 cents per pound in addition to present levies with an increased amount on two-zinc items. Lead and zinc entering the United States as manufactured goods directly displaces domestic mine production. These duty rates are proposed by the U.S. manufacturers of lead-zinc products.

Mr. Speaker, this is one piece of legislation which must be adopted to assure the continued employment of miners and the exploration, development, production, and continued growth of domestic lead-zinc mines. We do not want charity, grants, relief, or aid. We want the means of helping ourselves without expense to the Government of the United States. This bill will make available those means, and I might also add, at the same time, it will help to alleviate our gold crisis as importations of zinc and lead are now a \$200 million business each year.

#### AN AUDIT OF THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my good fortune on a number of occasions during the past several years to confer on agricultural matters with Mr. Carl H. Wilken, director of research for the National Foundation for Economic Stability, with headquarters at 1757 K Street NW., here in Washington.

Using official reports of various agencies and departments of the Federal Government, Mr. Wilken has made an analytical study, which essentially is an audit, of the economic record of the United States from 1910 to 1960.

On the basis of this study, he concludes that prices of farm products and other raw materials must be in balance with wages and capital costs. Without a raw material income in balance with the rest of the economy, he asserts we cannot earn the income required to buy the production needed to meet payrolls and capital costs.

In a speech on January 23, 1961, before the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, Mr. Wilken offered a synopsis of his audit of our economy. In my opinion, no individual is better qualified to speak on the economic problems of the United States, and I include his important message as part of my remarks.

I would particularly call to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Wilken's statement that agriculture in 1960 was

underpaid \$28 billion in ratio to payrolls and capital costs:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to have this opportunity to meet with you as one of your guest speakers and to give you the results of an analytical study, which was essentially an audit, of the economic record of the United States as a whole from 1910 through 1960.

I would like to stress, first, that the study is based on the official record of the United States as compiled and published by the different agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Second that the study is impartial and was made independently of any organized group, political or otherwise.

To illustrate the importance of the study, I would like to point out that the United States in 1960 operated at less than 90 percent of capacity in productive facilities, as compared to the labor force and capital investment. In addition, the United States had an overall operating loss of approximately \$46 billion on the goods and services we did produce.

As a result of the economic errors which led up to the lack of production and operating loss in 1960, the State of Iowa in 1960 was underpaid \$1.95 billion for her farm production, a sum equivalent to \$700 per capita for the people living in Iowa.

This loss will continue in 1961 and can increase very rapidly unless something is done about it.

During this period of 50 years in which many of us have lived we have had seven distinct depressions. As a result of these depressions we have had periods of unemployment, loss of production, and loss of income. In addition, millions of our citizens have lost their savings and equities in homes and other properties.

But in this period of time we lost none of our natural resources. We had an ever-increasing population which, in turn, produced an increase in both consumers and producers. We lost none of the facilities with which to produce. But, the audit reveals that we lost over \$1,500 billion, a sum which is more than five times the total public debt at the present time.

I have gone through all of those depressions and, in my opinion, on the basis of the economic record of the United States, we have the finest and most productive economy in the world, and the greatest economic confusion in history. For example, in the last 9 years the American people have been told that we were in an era of great prosperity. My audit of the record proves that in the 9-year period we poured out billions of dollars of income throughout the United States and the world.

But we did not earn all of the income we spent. The record reveals that in the past 9 years the United States has been operating at a loss. In not one single year since 1951 have we had enough national income to meet the increases in total wages and capital costs involved in operating the United States. Starting in 1951, with a small surplus of national income, as compared to total wages and capital costs, we have reached a point where approximately 30 percent of our national income is being created by debt expansion.

The proof of this conclusion lies in the fact that from the end of 1950 to the end of 1960 we have added approximately \$480 billion to the total debt (public and private), an average of \$48 billion per year. If we were prosperous, why did we add this fantastic sum to the mortgage against the wealth of the United States? I will return to this period and point out in detail why the debt was incurred.

#### ANSWER TO OUR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The important question I would like to have you ask yourself is, why didn't we learn our lesson from the seven depressions? Obviously our textbooks on economics do not contain the answers.

However, the answer can be found in the most widely read book in the world—the Bible. It can also be found in an audit of the United States, which has the most complete economy and the most complete economic record of any nation in the world. I am going to point out in my discussion how an audit proves the accuracy of the answer in the Bible.

The Bible states very specifically that, "Every laborer is worthy of his hire." I would like to stress that it says "his hire" and does not say that same hire. It means that every segment of our economy should be compensated in direct proportion to the amount of goods and services produced for society.

I will translate this into the answer to our economic problem. The secret to having a fully operating economy on an earned basis is to maintain price balance between farm products and other raw materials, total wages and salaries paid out, and the capital costs involved in operating the various segments of the economy. Having given you the answer in one sentence, I could say "thank you" and sit down.

But, the answer I have given you brings up the question, why is it the answer? It is the answer because we have an economy that is a twofold operation, production and marketing. We apply labor and capital to our natural resources to produce farm products and other raw materials. Then we move these raw materials to the factory and process them into finished goods. This is the production cycle.

To keep the production cycle going, the goods produced have to be sold and used. We measure the many items which make up the cost of producing raw materials, and the various steps in our economic system with price. If we pay a proper price in the different steps from raw materials to consumption, we automatically create the income to use what we produce.

If, however, we underpay agriculture, which is directly and indirectly responsible for the income of approximately 40 percent of our population living in towns of 5,000 and under and the area surrounding them, this segment of our economy cannot buy its share of the goods which must be sold to meet the payrolls and capital costs. If labor is underpaid, then the labor force cannot buy its share. Finally, if we do not have an adequate return for capital costs, we cannot earn the savings, and profits or new capital for the economic expansion required to keep up with our increase in efficiency and population.

To prove that this is the case, I am going to give you a synopsis of the economic record from 1929 to 1960. It will illustrate the confusion and the many errors we have made and the results in terms of dollars of income.

#### TRADE TURN OF GROSS FARM INCOME

In 1941 a summary of my research work was published. It pointed out to society that agriculture was the gear wheel which determined how fast the economy of the United States could operate and expand on an earned basis. The gear ratio was set forth in specific terms. It emphasized that for each \$1 of gross farm production we would create in the primary market to make it possible to pay \$1 of factory payrolls. Further, that as this new dollar of earned income passed from hand to hand in our economic cycle it would generate \$7 of national income. In reverse, it pointed out that if we underpaid agriculture \$1, we would lose the \$1 of factory payrolls and \$7 of national income.

I have had some interesting experiences with this ratio. In 1948 the late Vice President Barkley used it in addressing an audience at Des Moines, Iowa. I have heard other Members of Congress use it.

On the other hand, I have read articles written by economists, newspaper columnists, and editors which ridiculed the ratio as some strange mystic theory. When I read these articles I immediately knew that the writer of them did not know what the record is nor has he used it in arriving at his conclusion.

#### THE OPERATION OF THE RATIO

In 1929 the United States had a national income of \$87.3 billion, the highest income ever reached up to that time. Economists far and wide were telling the American people that we would never have another depression because we had learned how to prevent them.

Four years later, in 1933, the value of our farm production was \$6.8 billion less than in 1929. The average economist and businessman pays little attention to agriculture, and seems to think that farm production is free, or just something that happens. He reasons that if agriculture is underpaid \$1 billion, society will save \$1 billion on its food bill and have \$1 billion with which to buy some other products. This is the theory that has created a complete misconception which has prevailed throughout our Nation since 1951, relative to the drop in farm prices.

Commonsense should tell us that with agriculture, which after all is part of the economy as a whole, being paid \$6.8 billion less in 1933 than in 1929 it should have at least reduced the national income \$6.8 billion even though it had no further effect on the rest of society.

But, that is not what happened. In 1933 the national income had dropped to \$40.2 billion, a loss of \$47.6 billion for the Nation as a whole or approximately seven times the underpayment to agriculture.

How about the factory payrolls? In 1953 the U.S. Department of Agriculture published a chart which proves that from 1919 to 1951 for each \$1 of cash farm income in the United States we did have approximately \$1 of factory payrolls. From 1929 to 1933 factory payrolls dropped almost dollar for dollar with the drop in gross farm income. I would like to add that in 1929 to 1933 the income of the State of Iowa dropped 55 percent, or in proportion to the drop in the value of Iowa's farm production.

The drop in farm prices in 1929 was blamed on a surplus of farm production, but the record proves that there was no surplus produced at the time in the United States. The reduction of national income, as a result of the seven times turn of the farm dollar, as farm prices were permitted to drop, created a shortage of money with which to buy our output. In 1932 we had the interesting situation of having nickel sandwiches and 12 million people out of work without the nickel to buy one.

In the period 1933 to 1940 we killed little pigs and permitted acres of farmland to grow up in weeds. We had two severe droughts to help get rid of the surplus, and we had low farm price supports. We solved absolutely nothing. We merely stabilized the depression at a little higher level than in 1933.

In 1940 we had 11 million more consumers than in 1929; we had \$6 billion less income, about the same amount of total debt against the economy that we had in 1929, and we had 9 million unemployed.

How about the surplus? In spite of all our efforts, aided by two droughts, we had 1 billion bushels of wheat and 10 million bales of cotton in storage. Why? Because we never had the courage to bring back the farm price structure so that we could create the income to utilize our production.

In 1939 the war broke out in Europe. The competitive effect of imports was removed and the speculative markets by the latter part of 1942 had increased farm prices to the 1925-29 level. Then, and not until then, did we get back to a fully operating economy. With the restoration of farm prices, our national income in 1942 moved up to \$137.7 billion a gain of \$56 billion in 2 years.

I would like to stress that the income we had in 1942 was not the result of inflation. It was reflation and a return to the 1925-29 price level which we should have had the good commonsense to maintain.

Had we maintained the 1929 price level we would have moved up from \$87.8 billion of income to \$137.7 billion in 1942 without the depression following 1929, and again from 1937 to 1938.

Using the 2 years as the end years of a 14-year period, the audit reveals that in the 12 years from 1930 to 1941 we paid agriculture an average of approximately \$6.5 billion less than the average of the 2 years 1929 and 1942. During the 12 years we lost \$562 billion of national income, or approximately 7 times the underpayment to agriculture.

#### THE 90-PERCENT PRICE SUPPORT

In 1941, I sent a copy of my publication to the 48 State secretaries of agriculture. They had a national organization and asked me to meet with them. Mark Thornberg was your Secretary of Agriculture at the time. I went over the record with the leaders of this group, and they took the lead in inducing Congress to enact the 90-percent price support bill in 1942. I might add that it was opposed by many leading economists who are taught that farm prices in the United States should be at world levels. It was also opposed by some farm leaders, and by President Roosevelt.

The purpose of the bill was twofold. First, by paying the farmer a price in balance with wages and capital costs it would assure the farm production with which to win the war. Of equal importance, by protecting the income from farm production the bill would protect the national income so that we would have the income to finance the war.

The year 1943 was the first year that the 90-percent price support became effective. Let us take a look at the record. The national income moved up from \$81.6 billion in 1940 to \$170.3 billion in 1943, an increase of approximately 109 percent. How about total wages and salaries? Total wages moved up from \$52 billion to \$109.6 billion, or 110 percent. How about gross farm income? It moved up from \$11 billion in 1940 to \$23.4 billion in 1943, an increase of 112 percent. This illustrates how national income, total wages, and gross farm production should move approximately in balance. In this rapid rise of income the national income increased approximately \$7 for each \$1 of increase in gross farm income.

How about farm surplus? With the increase in income the Government established price ceilings to prevent a level too high for farm products and even rationed the supply of food which consumers could buy in order to protect the supplies for the military forces.

The 90-percent price supports worked effectively and efficiently in the 10-year period 1943-52. During this period, we did not produce any surplus of farm products, and the price of farm products at wholesale averaged almost exactly 100 percent of parity as compared to other products at wholesale. In the past 25 years the American people have discussed parity prices, but few people really know what it means. I am going to give you a simple and permanent formula:

The Department of Labor publishes monthly the record of wholesale prices. If you will get this record and compare the price of farm products at wholesale with the prices of other than farm products at wholesale you will have the most accurate parity

equation that can be compiled. The 1943-52 period was the most recent, the most accurate, and the longest period in history of parity or price balance between rural America and industrial America.

To illustrate this formula, in the period 1910-51 the wholesale price of farm products averaged almost exactly the same as the price of all products at wholesale. At every point in this period that farm prices dropped below parity or the price level of other products, we had depressions, unemployment, and loss of income.

During 1960, the prices of other products at wholesale were approximately 128 percent of 1947-49, and farm prices averaged approximately 89.1 percent. Dividing 128 into 89.1 percent, the parity for agriculture in 1960 was approximately 70 percent. This means that in 1960 we were losing 30 percent of the source of the earned income the United States should have had to meet payrolls and capital costs.

In 1946-50 farm prices averaged approximately 100 percent of parity, and we exported an average of \$90 million per year more farm products than we imported. There was no surplus problem. Then something happened which seems to have been missed by our economists and business leaders. Great Britain in 1949 devalued the pound from \$4.05 to \$2.80. This reduced the buying power of people paid in British pounds 30 percent below our parity level. On the other hand, it reduced the price of commodities produced in many parts of the world 30 percent in terms of our parity level.

The direct result was to reduce our exports of farm products and increase our imports. In the fiscal year 1950-51 we imported \$1.7 billion more farm products than we exported. Since the devaluation of the British pound we have imported approximately \$6 billion more farm products than we exported. About two-thirds of the so-called surplus was produced in the rest of the world, and not in the United States.

Net imports of approximately \$4 billion in the 4 years 1950 to 1953, plus errors of administration by the Office of Price Stabilization in 1951, forced farm prices downward.

Normally, the drop in farm prices following 1951 would have forced a reduction in national income in direct proportion. But in 1950 the Korean war broke out. In 1946-50 the debt expansion in the United States averaged \$20.7 billion per year. In the 4 years 1950 to 1953 the total debt was expanded an average of \$38 billion per year. The spending of this increase of \$18 billion per year of borrowed money, above the 1946-50 level, created the markets to offset the loss of markets in rural areas due to lower farm prices.

In 1953 the Republican Party took over the administration of the United States. The Korean war ended, and steps were taken to cut back the spending of borrowed money. In addition, the administration asked that farm price supports be reduced, thus setting the stage for further losses in gross farm income and earned national income.

At the time I was employed by the Joint Committee on Defense, a part of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in line with my duties, I prepared a memorandum for Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, who was chairman at the time, and the late Senator Maybank, who was the ranking Democrat on the committee. I told them that if the debt expansion was reduced and farm prices were not restored to parity we would go into a depression before 1953 was over.

Senator CAPEHART sponsored a series of meetings and luncheons for several Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and invited in the heads of a number of leading corporations. I was also invited to attend and speak. At these meetings I pointed out what would happen. They did

not believe me, or could not get anything done about it. In July 1953 we started to move into a depression.

Then, instead of restoring the lost income from farm production, the administration asked Congress for further reductions in price supports. On the other hand, the economic advisers to the President prepared a speech, delivered in the fall of 1954, in which the American people were told that we were going to move up to a national income of \$500 billion. If the American people have a fault, it is that they like to make money. As a result, in 1955 corporations and private citizens borrowed \$72.4 billion in the nature of a mortgage against future income, and proceeded to spend it.

The spending of this borrowed money offset the loss of markets in rural areas, and we had what appeared to be prosperity. In spite of the spending of this fantastic sum of \$72.4 billion of borrowed money in 1955, the value of our farm production moved downward.

The debt expansion in 1955 was far beyond our rate of savings and profits. In 1956 the debt expansion dropped back to approximately \$44 billion a year. This total, plus the spending of borrowed money in 1955, was an average of \$58 billion per year.

But, the debt expansion in 1956 was greater than our rate of savings and profits, and in 1957 the debt expansion dropped back to \$38 billion, or approximately in ratio with actual earnings.

In January 1957, when I was doing private research, I told Senator CAPEHART that we were going into another depression before the year is over. The question is: How did I know? I knew that the debt expansion was not enough to offset the loss of markets in rural areas. Senator CAPEHART consulted with some of his colleagues but they were too busy with other things. Furthermore, the American people were being told that we were in a period of great prosperity.

In 1957, we moved into another depression. Then, again, instead of restoring economic balance between rural and industrial incomes with a restoration of farm prices, the administration asked for a further reduction in price supports, thus again reducing the earned income of the farmer, and also the United States.

How did we get out of it? During the campaign you heard the Democratic Party accuse the Republican Party of having a high-money policy. But the records of the Government prove that in 1959 we added \$72.9 billion to the total debt, almost twice the amount of available money in terms of profits and savings.

This again offset the loss of markets in rural areas and, again, in spite of the spending of \$72.9 billion of borrowed funds in 1959, farm prices moved downward.

In December 1959, I prepared a memorandum for Senator CAPEHART in which I told him that our economy would grind to a halt in 1960 and that the Nation would be very fortunate if we were not in another recession by November. Economists far and wide in January were predicting a big boom, and again in consulting with his colleagues, he found they weren't interested in doing something about it.

The final figures for debt expansion in 1960 will be available in May 1961. My estimates indicate that the debt expansion in 1960 will approximate \$65 billion, not enough borrowed money to offset the loss of earned income generated by new farm production. The proof lies in the reduction in our total output of goods and services in 1960.

A simple balance sheet of the United States proves that to meet 1960 payrolls and interest on the debt we have accumulated, we should have had a national income of \$466 billion. We had approximately \$420 billion, or an operating loss of \$46 billion. Of importance is the fact that we had to borrow

and spend \$65 billion to create the \$420 billion we did have.

How about the future? Without a restoration of price balance between agriculture and industry it will require approximately \$75 billion of borrowed money in 1961 to keep our economy operating at 95 percent of capacity. The question is: Who is going to borrow this money? The debt expansion of the private segment of our economy is already at a dangerously high level, and the public debt is far beyond what it should be.

The point I wish to drive home is that this is not a political problem. It is a matter of having a price for domestic production of farm products and other raw materials which will keep them in balance with current payrolls and capital costs.

This brings up the question, what will it cost to restore farm prices to balance with the rest of our economy? The answer is, nothing. With farm prices in balance with current wages and salaries and capital costs we can earn \$480 billion of national income with a debt expansion of only \$48 billion, or in direct ratio to profits and savings. As I have pointed out, in 1940 to 1943 as farm values were restored to 1925-29 levels, our national income increased from \$81.6 billion to \$170.3 billion. There was no cost. We gained \$88.8 billion in 3 years. In other words, we can have \$60 billion more income with about \$27 billion less debt expansion than will be required if we do not restore farm prices.

In the last 10 years agriculture has been underpaid \$157.8 billion as compared to increases in total wages and capital costs. The direct result has been a loss in the source of earned income of approximately \$1,100 billion in the United States. How did we operate?

We borrowed approximately \$190 billion over and above all savings and profits. The spending of this \$190 billion of borrowed money, through a five times turn in trade channels, created \$950 billion of unearned income. This offset the loss in earned income to that extent. The rest of the income was lost entirely by three depressions in the last 8 years.

How about repayment of this excessive debt? During the course of several meetings a leading New York economist was invited to discuss with me the desirability of an audit and I asked him, "What is the operating profit of the United States?" He answered, "I do not know what you are talking about." I immediately knew that he had not made an audit.

I am going to tell you what the operating profit of the United States is. It is approximately 20 percent of the national income. Therefore, to repay the \$190 billion of excessive debt added since 1951 it will require \$950 billion of future income to earn the profit to pay off this additional debt. In the meantime until it is paid, we will have to earn approximately \$5 of national income to earn each \$1 of interest on this excessive debt.

Summed up, to meet the interest on the addition of total debt amounting to \$480 billion since the end of 1950, it will require \$120 billion more of future income per year to earn the profit required to pay the interest at an average rate of 5 percent. We have been told a lot about a free economy in the years that have passed. But the record proves that we have always had a system under which debt repayment was not free. It has always been a fixed contract in terms of interest and principal payments.

I ask you this question: How can you as an individual, or how can we as a nation, meet our financial obligations unless the income of the United States is kept in balance with the debt we have incurred?

#### TRANSLATED TO IOWA

Up to this point I have been talking in billions about our national economy. In the same way that it is possible to make an audit of the United States it is possible to make an audit of every State, including the State of Iowa.

In the last 10 years the agricultural industry was underpaid \$157.8 billion. Iowa's share of this underpayment was \$10,880 million. This is an average of over \$1 billion per year. This underpayment has moved up from approximately \$200 million in 1951 to \$1.95 billion in 1960. In 1961 it will exceed \$2 billion unless something is done about it. The underpayment in 1960 was approximately \$700 per capita in the State of Iowa.

Let me analyze this underpayment. This total of \$10.88 billion not having been paid to the State of Iowa could not be used to buy goods and services. Businessmen in the State lost this market for goods and lost the operating profit involved to pay wages and capital costs.

The State lost revenue from tax receipts on income and lost income from the sales tax which would have resulted from the additional sales. This money could have been used to build schools, roads, and other public improvements, but it was not available. Finally, about 20 percent of the \$10.88 billion would have been operating profit and savings for the people living in Iowa. It would have found its way into bank deposits and other financial reserves with which to expand the economy of Iowa. All of it was lost as the result of the underpayment for the farm products produced in Iowa.

Next let me ask you the \$64,000 question. The underpayment for Iowa's farm production, as I have pointed out, has gradually increased since 1951 until in 1960 it amounted to approximately \$700 per capita. What have the farmers, businessmen, and bankers in Iowa done about it? I am afraid that you have to answer, nothing outside of a little grumbling.

It happens that I was born in Iowa and attended Iowa schools and a son and daughter of mine graduated from the University of Iowa. I am going to tell you what is wrong with Iowa. The State, in spite of its wonderful school system has a tremendous inferiority complex. You have been waiting for some wise man from the East to solve your problems.

Farmers, businessmen and bankers have paid dues to national organizations of various kinds and, in turn, have been given the wrong information and swallowed this information hook, line and sinker.

You have been told that there was something wrong in protecting the price of farm products and have supported legislation which destroyed the relative income of Iowa's agriculture and the income of the State in which you live.

#### IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURE IN IOWA

In 1951 the value of Iowa's farm production was equal to approximately 62 percent of the entire income of the State. In addition, over one-half of Iowa's industries were engaged in processing farm products. You have permitted the income of agriculture and the dollar income of the industries processing farm products to be reduced.

Under our political system we have a representative form of government and Iowa has had the right to elect two Senators and eight Representatives to represent the State on the Board of Directors of the United States (the Congress). How could these men represent Iowa and its people for the benefit of the State of Iowa, unless they were willing, no matter what their political affiliation might be, to demand equality in price

for the production of Iowa with other States in the Nation as a whole?

Let me point up the political loss which has been added to the loss of income. Iowa still is an area with room for economic development. In the recent census the results show an increase in population for the Nation in the last 10 years of approximately 19 percent. The increase in Iowa was 5 percent. Why was it only 5 percent? Because of the underpayment for farm production, you had to export young men and women from Iowa to other States. The people living in Iowa had to pay the costs of feeding, clothing and educating these men and women from a subnormal income. They left Iowa because of economic conditions. They could earn more in other States.

As a result of this export of population the State of Iowa is to be penalized, and in the future we will elect only seven Members of the House instead of eight Members which we now elect. You will lose one vote on the Board of Directors of the United States.

Now, let us use a little arithmetic. The \$1 billion of underpayment per year to agriculture in the State of Iowa in the past 10 years would have meant an additional income of \$2,000 per capita for 500,000 more population in Iowa. This additional population would have prevented the loss of one Representative and would have provided Iowa with 500,000 more consumers.

During the period from 1929 I have watched the State of Iowa quite closely because as I have pointed out it is my home State. The State legislature has provided funds for a development committee supported by taxes. Why has not this committee made an audit of the State of Iowa to find out the origin of State income and its importance in State development?

Next, let me ask a direct question. What chance has the State of Iowa to develop unless the key industry of the State, agriculture, which traditionally has produced products equal to 62 percent of the entire income of the State, is prosperous? How is the State of Iowa going to obtain new capital for development unless it earns the new capital from farm production?

After talking to you it is easy for you to ask the question, if what you say is true why has not something been done about it? In 1947 Congressman HOEVEN of Iowa, now the ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced a bill (which I helped him to prepare). This bill would have permanently supported 12 basic farm crops at 90 percent of parity. This legislation would have protected the income of the State of Iowa. At that time the other seven Congressmen from Iowa joined with Mr. HOEVEN in introducing the legislation.

The bill was necessary to replace the 90 percent price support bill passed in 1942 because it was to have expired automatically on December 31, 1948. But, an interesting thing happened. A leading Iowa newspaper ridiculed this type of legislation and a leading farm organization threatened to defeat some of the Members from Iowa at the next election.

The bill was not passed, and in 1948 Congress passed two bills. The House passed an extension of the 90 percent price support legislation, and I would like to point out that the Republican Party in 1948 had a majority in the House. The Senate, however, passed a sliding scale price bill with price supports to be from 60 to 90 percent of parity. In the conference on the two bills both of them were passed, the 90 percent price support to continue through 1949 and the other bill to take effect January 1, 1950.

With the passage of the bill to reduce price supports farm prices moved downward

in 1948 to 1949. What was the effect on the State income of Iowa? From 1948 to 1949 it dropped \$531 million. I tried to prevent that from happening.

The next question which you may have is "How about the consumer?" In Japan the average monthly wage is approximately \$40 per month, or less than one-half the weekly wage of industrial workers in the United States. Japan just recently announced a price support of \$2.74 per bushel for wheat produced in 1961.

In the 10 years 1943 to 1952 the average price of corn to the farmer was approximately \$1.42 per bushel. The price of hogs to the farmer was approximately \$18.50 per hundredweight, and the average price of cattle was approximately the same. The average price of prime cattle was approximately \$28 per hundredweight. Remember that this was the actual average price for 10 years.

The hourly wage in industry in the same period was approximately \$1.28 per hour. In 1960 the average hourly wage in industry will approximate \$2.30, or an increase of approximately 80 percent. Simple arithmetic proves that the average industrial worker could pay 80 percent more for farm products in 1960 than he could in the 10-year period 1943-52.

For farm prices to be in balance with the increase in wholesale prices since 1943 to 1952 the farmer should be receiving approximately \$2.42 per bushel for wheat, \$1.86 for corn and approximately \$23.50 per hundredweight for the average hog and cattle production. Prime cattle at parity should be approximately \$36 per hundredweight. You can compare this with the prices you are being paid today and you have a clear picture of how much you are being underpaid. As I have pointed out, it totaled an underpayment of approximately \$1.95 billion for the total farm production in Iowa in 1960.

Of importance is the question, how did labor obtain this increase? First it obtained the passage of legislation to curtail labor's production to 8 hours per day. Any labor above that had to be paid with time and a half.

Next, they were able to organize in such a way that they can force industry to pay the wage, or close up. It is not my purpose to argue whether this is right or wrong. My purpose is to set out the facts from my audit.

I want to state very clearly that I am not here to tell you what to do, but to point out that arithmetic is an accurate science and that you are going to have to decide the kind of program which you want.

To remain in balance with the increases in wages and capital costs, you must have a minimum of 90-percent price supports to assure equitable exchange for what you produce as compared to what you buy.

If you do not want price supports and want to follow the advice to do away with them, then I want to warn you that you had better get the storm cellar ready for the collapse.

If farm prices are not maintained in balance with adequate price supports, then wages and capital costs will have to be reduced to balance eventually with the food bill which society is willing to pay.

Removal of price supports would find farm prices moving down to 1942 levels. Your principal crop, corn, is already at 1942 levels. Such a happening for all farm products would force a repetition of 1929-33. What would it involve in terms of dollars? It would mean a reduction of 55 percent of the 1960 national income, or an annual loss of \$230 billion. It would force a reduction of 55 percent in wages and salaries. It would reduce all property values 55 percent and

would force the repudiation of 55 percent of the total debt of \$1,050 billion at the end of 1960.

If this is to be our course, we will have proved to most of the world that capitalism under the American system has failed.

Furthermore, after the collapse has taken place, similar to the economic collapse in 1929 to 1933, nothing will have been solved. We will still be faced with the problem of keeping farm prices in balance with the price of industrial products.

In conclusion, I want to thank the Farmers Grain Dealers Association for the opportunity to meet with you at your annual convention. You have a wonderful organization covering the State of Iowa, the leading farm State. The members of your organization make audits, annually, of the records of the many grain dealers to arrive at a profit and loss statement.

Why don't you as an organization get busy and make an audit of the United States and of Iowa's part in the economy as a whole? It isn't necessary for you to help me make it. I have made it.

But, you or someone else must make such an audit if the people in Iowa along with other States are to have the direction they need in solving the so-called farm problem, which in reality means to solve the problem of a solvent and prosperous United States.

Farm prices at parity protect the markets which industry needs to meet payrolls and capital costs. These markets, in turn, protect the jobs and the wages which are paid to labor. Of still greater importance is the fact that farm prices in balance with other products at wholesale will protect the income of the United States, and will assure the earning of new capital with which to expand our economy in direct proportion to our increase in efficiency and population.

And, finally, no matter what kind of political Government you have, the United States cannot earn the income to buy our total production if the prices of farm products and other raw materials are not at parity or in balance with wages and capital costs. Why is this true? It is true because arithmetic is an accurate science, and without a raw material income in balance with the rest of the economy we cannot earn the income required to buy the production needed to meet payrolls and capital costs.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, on Monday next, for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD, on February 16, for 1 hour.

Mr. SIKES, on Monday next, for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. CONTE, on February 7 (at the request of Mr. SHORT), for 1 hour.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. MILLER of New York.

Mr. ALGER in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. BAILEY, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WILLIS.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 7, 1961, 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:

532. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of two proposed bills: (1) a bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; and (2) a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

533. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a copy of the 26th Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the Report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

534. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, relative to providing war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, and upon request for any department or agency of the United States, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

535. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting copies of a report of contracts negotiated under 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (11) and (a) (16) covering the period from July 1 through December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

536. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 44th Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

537. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3864. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3865. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3866. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3867. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3868. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by providing for fair competition between domestic industries operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act and foreign industries that supply articles imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3869. A bill to implement the enforcement of the internal revenue laws relating to alcoholic beverages by allocating 1 percent of the alcohol taxes collected for enforcement purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 3870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3871. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3872. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 3873. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the designation of individuals to receive survivor annuities under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3874. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable (subject to the existing actuarial reductions) to both men and women at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend section 9(d) (1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3876. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3877. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3878. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 3879. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3880. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the town of Afton, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3882. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3883. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3884. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, and loan guaranty benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 3885. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 3887. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N.C., and two electron microscopes for the use of the Duke University Medical Center at Durham, N.C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 3888. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the excise tax on general telephone service shall be permanent the same as the taxes on other communication services, but to allow a taxpayer a credit against such tax for State and local taxes paid by him on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 3890. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 469 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H.R. 3893. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3895. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 3897. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel and Tourism and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PPOST:

H.R. 3898. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3899. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3900. A bill to amend section 277 of title 10, United States Code, to provide post exchange and other privileges for persons transferred to the Retired Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3901. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3902. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Highway Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 3904. A bill to amend section 9(d) (1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 3905. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California (by request):

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the need for a revision of the social security program to make more adequate provision for needy aged persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report "Communist Target—Youth—Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 148. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the Select Committee on Small Business authorized by House Resolution 46; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 149. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 141; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 150. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 1, House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to afford protection for domestic industry in the field of international trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REIFEL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for the continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the amendment of title I of the Federal Social Security Act, relating to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation similar to Senate bill 2757 of the 85th Congress, relating to the Burns Creek site in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation increasing the personal exemption and the deduction for dependents under the Federal income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, against granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to pass legislation granting medical assistance to the aged under the Federal Social Security Act, and eliminating the pauper's oath; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, for the continuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and commending their past and present actions; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting that President John F. Kennedy direct that a 2-year moratorium be declared on all charges for drainage against the farmers of the Columbia Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. R. 3906. A bill for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3907. A bill for the relief of Lucio Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3908. A bill for the relief of Theresa Woosin Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H. R. 3909. A bill for the relief of Tio Sien Tjiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3910. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3911. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Bernat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 3912. A bill for the relief of Chikoko Shinagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3913. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Balic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 3914. A bill for the relief of Walter Weber (also known as Walter Phillips); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3915. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H. R. 3916. A bill for the relief of Bimla Singh Narang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3917. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Zuchowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 3918. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosa Torres-Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H. R. 3919. A bill for the relief of Heh Ik Chang (Harry Chang Glover); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 3920. A bill to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3921. A bill for the relief of A. Hameed Naz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 3922. A bill for the relief of Mr. Elizabeth G. Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H. R. 3923. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. George L. Nielson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Galib Kahraman and his wife, Zekiye Kahraman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Marica Logonder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H. R. 3926. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H. R. 3927. A bill for the relief of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3928. A bill for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3929. A bill for the relief of Albert W. McConchie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H. R. 3930. A bill for the relief of Robert Freund, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of Francesca Indelicato and Renzo Orazio Indelicato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3932. A bill for the relief of Min McFadden; 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:

48. By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Petition of Charles S. Martin, Shreveport, La., National Petitioning Committee for Constitutional Government of America and Clyde G. King, Shreveport, La., chairman, Legislative Committee, National Petitioning Committee for Constitutional Government of America calling for impeachment of the Supreme Court of the United States for violation of the Constitution in accordance with article II, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of residents of the Seventh California District asking Congress to support legislation which would ban pay television in all forms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

50. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Marjorie Cook and others, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a program for the systematic and definite prevention of Government waste, and a constitutional amendment providing for the eventual retirement of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

51. Also, petition of Clifford Crall, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to a redress of grievance relating to the suppressing of news in regard to a criminal conspiracy against him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The Boy Scout Movement Grows With America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National Boy Scouts of America Week will be observed this year from February 7 through 13, and I feel it is most appropriate at this time to salute the Boy Scouts on their 51st birthday.

This most worthy organization was incorporated in the District of Columbia on February 8, 1910, with application papers which stated:

That the purpose of this corporation shall be to promote, through organizing and cooperating with other organizations, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by Boy Scouts by placing emphasis on the Scout oath, or promise and law, for character development, citizen training, and physical fitness.

With such a high purpose the Boy Scouts of America were bound to succeed and grow, but the growth which has followed has, I am sure, exceeded many times over any estimate the signers of the application for incorporation may have had.

One measure of the growth that I find particularly worthy of note is that during the year 1950 the Boy Scouts of America reached a registered membership of 2,795,222. The youth of our country who were born during 1950 will reach their 11th birthday this year and be eligible to join an organization which in that short span of time has achieved an active membership that far exceeds the 5-million mark and a total membership that by the end of this year will be well beyond the 30-million mark.

Such figures stand by themselves as the highest tribute that can be paid to every adult in this country who has contributed countless hours of his time to the building and perpetuating of the Boy Scouts of America.

It is my belief that the early leaders of the scouting movement, who began with such high ideals and purpose, have fully met and passed on to their successors the responsibility they assumed in molding the character, mind, and body of the boys who joined with them in this great adventure. The 1,356,432 volunteer men and women who lead the Boy Scouts of America deserve our respect and gratitude for the outstanding work they are doing with the youth of our Nation. It is my firm conviction that only through organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America can inroads into the appalling increases in juvenile delinquency be made. The Scout troop provides the competition, the feeling of belonging to

a group, the incentives to achieve and learn, and the opportunities to become self-reliant which are so essentially a part of the growing boy's needs. Some youths who do not, or will not, join a Scout troop often become members of a gang where courage, loyalty to the group, and aggressiveness are distorted to acts of destruction and violence. Where the scouting movement is strong and vigorous, we find proportionately less juvenile delinquency—it is one of our greatest assets in dealing with the wayward boy.

In closing I feel it is appropriate to note that for the first time we have a President of the United States who as a youth was a member of this organization. It is a pleasure and a privilege to pay tribute to the Boy Scouts of America who so ably exemplify in their daily lives their pledge "to do my duty to God and country."

## Strengthening Free Enterprise as Antirecession Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the U.S. economy—now undergoing pangs of unemployment and business and industrial lags—should, I believe, enlarge the role of free enterprise in resolving our economic problems, rather than depend too much on Uncle Sam.

Over the weekend, I was privileged to comment on aspects of this approach to our economic difficulties in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATION, FEBRUARY 5, 1961

The Nation today—if it is to successfully meet the challenge of the times—must: Further mobilize its people and resources; blueprint a realistic "plan of action" for the future; and then forge ahead—confident of our ability to solve the difficult tasks confronting us at home and abroad.

Among the major problems is the need for bolstering the economy.

The horizon, of course, is thickly populated with economic physicians—listening intently with stethoscopes to the heartbeat of the Nation.

Following such fiscal examinations, however, they differ widely on theories of cause and cure.

As a nation, we must be realistic and face the hard economic facts of life, particularly those relating to unemployment, and business and industrial lags.

Personally, however, I do not believe the X-ray picture is as clouded economically or otherwise, as some of the analysts' diagnoses.

By experience, we have learned that the health of individuals, or nations, depends to a large degree upon a positive—not a negative—attitude. This is essential if the patient is to see the problems in perspective and carry out the proper remedies.

At this time, the Nation can ill afford to have confidence in our system undermined, our progress downgraded, and our faith in a free system's ultimate ability to succeed, supplanted by economic pessimism bordering on disillusion and despair.

To the contrary, the Nation needs an injection of optimism—fully justified, I believe, by past performance—and then fortified by creation of realistic, constructive plans to meet the challenges ahead.

Now, what can be done? Among other things, we need to: realistically emphasize, as I mentioned, the positive aspects of the picture—not enlarge the negative out of proportion; create workable plans to resolve the economic difficulties; get rid of the pass-the-buck attitude that would attempt to let Uncle Sam do the whole job; encourage the cooperation of all segments of the economy.

All of us have a vested interest in, and a fundamental responsibility for, contributions to our economic progress.

Fortunately, there are many bright spots in the economy. These demonstrate that—while real difficulties exist in some areas—other segments are prospering and moving forward at record rates of activity.

To deal with the soft spots in the economy, however, we need action, not just words; realistic plans, not just dreams; work and sweat, not just wishful thinking.

Now, what are some practical ways to do the job?

Fundamental steps, I believe, include the following:

1. Explore for new ways and means by which job-creating business and industry—the real foundation of our economy—can be encouraged to expand activities, reemploy the unemployed, and generally get the economy rolling forward at a good rate of progress.

2. Insofar as necessary, expand construction of housing, highways, airports, and other programs.

3. Better utilize the technical assistance and guidance programs available from Federal and State Governments to bolster the economies of local communities.

4. Encourage "bootstrap," self-help efforts to communities—wherever this is possible.

Again, I would emphasize that the successful solution of our current economic problems depends upon citizens—free enterprise—government—in designing and carrying out the plans to strengthen the economy—with everybody carrying a fair share of the load.

## PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

In his state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy proposed, among other things, the following steps: Improvement of the unemployment compensation program; more liberal distribution of surplus foods to families of unemployed; redevelopment programs for areas with chronic labor surplus; stimulation of housing construction; tax incentives for sound, planned investment; and other measures.

The Congress, of course, will need to consider these and other proposals for bolstering the economy. The big job, of course, is to find ways and means to serve both the immediate and long-range interests of the country.

## EMERGENCY STEPS

In addition to the involvement of new programs, there are currently a number of steps which can and should be taken to deal with the situation—particularly in hard-hit areas.

Recently, I contacted a number of Federal agencies, including the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Defense, and the Small Business Administration—to urge maximum assistance to people, to hard-hit communities, as well as greater cooperation with agencies of the State government attempting to deal with the situation.

For Wisconsin, I recommend the following steps:

First. A survey of unemployment by the Labor Department to single out the communities of greatest unemployment;

Second. A special study by the Area Development Office of the Department of Commerce to find ways and means by which hard-hit communities can take immediate, and long range, measures to bolster the economy;

Third. Efforts to channel Government contracts, as available, to hard-hit areas;

Fourth. Provide communities with available technical assistance and guidance through Federal agencies to help them help themselves.

## NEEDED: EFFORTS TO STRENGTHEN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Over the years, so-called antirecessionary policies have been developed involving largely actions to be taken by the Government or its agencies dealing with economic problems. The popular trend, unfortunately, is to look to Uncle Sam to take the necessary steps; feeling that the free enterprise system—partially impaired by the economic difficulty—can just hobble along as best it can.

Logically, the free enterprise system—the breath and life of our economy—should lead the way to greater economic progress.

The injection of more tax dollars into the economy, of course, can provide some help. However, these are unnatural to the working principles of a free economic system—for the most part, temporary by nature—and fail to serve, within the framework of free enterprise, the long-range interests of growth and progress.

Free enterprise—not the Government—creates the giant's share of U.S. jobs and goods and services that serve our people. The American people, I believe, should be rehabilitated from the long habit of overlooking free enterprise as the right vehicle for reinvigorating the economy.

In the light of these factors, I believe we need a new look at the situation, to determine how free enterprise can play a more significant, effective role in times of economic crisis. The study, I believe, should include exploration of the following possibilities:

1. Encouragement of business and industries to advance plans for expansion of operations (perhaps with carrot-type inducements in tax treatment, insurance or other methods);

2. Encouraging more people to invest in businesses and industries. Today there are more than 12½ million shareholders in U.S. enterprises. The injection of more savings dollars into such enterprises could, I believe, have a reinvigorating effect on the economy;

3. Public confidence too, is a major factor in fighting trends toward recession. The painters of doom and gloom—in my humble judgment—do the country a great disservice by disproportionately blowing up the difficulties but not putting them in proper perspective in relation to the overall strength of the nation.

These, and other, steps, I believe, are worthy of considering in attempting to strengthen the ability of our free enterprise

system to promote normal growth and progress as well as to deal with economic crises.

Soon, I shall reintroduce my bill in Congress to establish a National Economic Council. The purpose would be to provide top level planning of economic policies and programs. The objectives, too, I believe, should include a special study to analyze—and enable us to better cope with—the up-and-down cycles in the economy. In addition, the Council would evaluate conditions and long-range trends domestically and internationally and provide guidance and more effective planning within our free enterprise system.

Unless we successfully bolster the economy, we will find it increasingly difficult to cope with the fluctuations in our domestic economy as well as to compete on the world market. If, however, we can provide the farsighted planning, I am confident that the resources, know-how, ingenuity and great production capacity of the U.S. free enterprise system cannot only hold its own in international competition, but further strengthen our dynamic domestic economy—the greatest in world history.

## Louisiana Interested in Maryland's Outdoor Show at Cambridge

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana has a special interest in the annual outdoor show at Cambridge, Md., in the congressional district of Representative THOMAS F. JOHNSON. Each year the Louisiana Fur and Wildlife Festival selects a queen and alternate queen for this event. One attends the outdoor show and the other the annual Louisiana Mardi Gras Ball in Washington. This year's queen is Miss Debra Ann Labove, of Cameron, La., in the district of Representative T. A. THOMPSON. Miss Labove will participate in the Mardi Gras ball February 11. The alternate queen is Miss Myrna Viator, of Delcambre, in my district, who took part in the outdoor show staged on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of last week.

One of the features of the show, which is conducted for the purpose of advertising the natural resources of Maryland, is a muskrat skinning contest as part of the recognition of the fur industry. Fur, of course, is one of the leading industries in Louisiana and the Third Congressional District, which I have the privilege of representing, is the greatest fur-producing area in the United States.

About 10 years ago an exchange of visits between Maryland and Louisiana muskrat skinning experts was inaugurated. In other words, Maryland representatives go to Louisiana and Louisiana contestants visit Maryland. Carrying Louisiana's colors in the competition at Cambridge this year were John Broussard, of Creole, and Isaac Broussard, of Hackberry, Delaware, Virginia, New York, and New Jersey also compete.

Winner this year was Russell Insley, of Cambridge.

The outdoor show was founded in 1938. One of the founders was Mr. Emmett Andrews of Cambridge, who has been with the Federal Government for some 19 years, presently with the Central Intelligence Agency. He has maintained his interest over the years in the show which is sponsored by the Cambridge Junior Chamber of Commerce.

## Address by Hon. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, Before National Cotton Council of America

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by me before the National Cotton Council of America, at the Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tenn., on January 31, 1961.

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

Excerpts from speech by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, before the National Cotton Council of America, Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tenn., Tuesday, January 31, 1961.

You represent all segments of a great industry—production, processing, manufacture, and sales. Your guests include representatives of many allied interests. This opportunity for discussion with you will be helpful, and your views will be appreciated.

Cotton and cotton products are staples of our domestic economy and our foreign trade. You are affected by both Government at home and world affairs. Under present conditions cotton manufactures are especially sensitive to tariff revisions.

From association with you and those you represent, I know of your good work. Your constant study of conditions at home and abroad must give you deep concern today; as they do me. I have a working knowledge of your purposes and objectives; and I hope you know mine.

I am a conservative; I have been called unconstructed. I wear the label with pride if it marks me as one who fights for the fundamentals on which we have developed the finest system of Government ever known. I fight for these fundamentals because I believe in them.

I believe sound progress should be the primary purpose in every man's life. Sound progress is the source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing; this is another application of checks and balances which have been so useful in our Government.

I believe it is the sound productivity and strength, developed under our free enterprise system, that have brought us to world power in a few generations. Historically, lives of nations are measured in hundreds of years. I want this Nation's life to be longest and best.

I believe continuing centralization of government destroys freedoms and strength. We have already gone too far. With excessive centralization comes excessive central

edict and regulation, and excessive Federal competition and taxation. It produces the evils of state socialism.

I believe our people want our system perpetuated and strengthened. Basically, the requirements are: Simple honesty and individual initiative, self-reliance and willing work, constructive production and free competition, and progressive development with sound financing.

I believe that with responsible citizenship, good government, and fiscal soundness, there would be no fear for the future. But without these, there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. I think we face these alternatives today.

I admit a feeling of anxiety, and I suspect most of you know it too. Our Government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home. This Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest. The need for constructive discipline and restraint is clear.

Our strength is being sapped by deficit financing indulged in too long; Federal paternalism grown too big; the Warren Court grown too mighty; and labor leaders grown too powerful. These are subverting our system, changing our attitudes and hobbling our will for freedom.

From experience we have learned that the more government is centralized, the more easily it is influenced—if not yet controlled—by leaders of organized pressure groups. Certainly, the political target areas and ruling officials of government are more concentrated.

I regard the right to work as I do the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. States have the right, the responsibility and the duty to protect this fundamental freedom. Twenty States to date have enacted right-to-work laws. I shall fight to preserve them.

The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes States rights in this field. Labor leaders want this provision repealed. Without it they could reasonably expect the Warren Court to strike down every State right-to-work law in the country regardless of the expressed will of the people.

Judicial usurpation of power has reached a peak in the Warren Court. Its decisions have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with authority in the executive branch of the Federal Government and usurped the powers of Congress.

There can be no doubt that the Warren Court is undermining our system of government, contributing to centralization of power and authority; it is sapping our national strength at its roots. This makes us more vulnerable to destructive forces at home and abroad.

The Conference of State Chief Justices said development of immense power in the Supreme Court is second only to increasing dominance by the National Government. It said the Court was not only the final arbiter of the law; it has become the maker of social and economic policies.

Evidence of Federal paternalism and domination is all around us. It is clearly obvious in Federal subsidies which are flowing to business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, education, States, localities and individuals.

There are nearly 100 Federal programs through which Federal payments are made to States, localities and individuals. These are in addition to Federal payrolls, contracts for goods and services, etc. The number has been rising, and there are now proposals for more.

Nearly 40 million people will receive Federal payments this year totaling some \$40 billion, including social security. Forty million people with their families could be nearly the equivalent of half of our popula-

tion looking to the Federal Government for money.

This Nation has been on a deficit financing basis during 24 of the past 30 years; and, despite the optimistic estimates from some quarters, I predict another deficit in the current year; and we can count ourselves fortunate, indeed, if there isn't a larger deficit next year.

When I came to the Senate in 1933, the Federal debt was \$16 billion. It is now \$290 billion. It has gone up some \$30 billion since the end of World War II. Total debt in the United States—Federal, State, and local, corporate and personal—now totals \$1 trillion or \$1,000 billion.

Continuing national deficits and debt are among the prime causes for inflation. The value of the dollar is now 46.5 cents, on the 1939 index. It has dropped every year in the past 10, except 1955. It dropped in all but 3 months in the past year. It will drop further.

Our situation is characterized by debt, deficits and inflation. Such a state of affairs cannot inspire confidence; but we have run into international trade balance troubles, and we need confidence in the dollar such as we have never needed before.

For 15 years the United States has been the world's banker, the world's policeman, and the world's Santa Claus. The American dollar is showing the strain. Loss of confidence in the dollar would be disastrous, and we should understand what it would mean.

In the sprawling Central Government we have developed it is difficult to see the full implications of the weaknesses I have described. But their combined effect finally is coming partially to light in the realization that we are running heavy international payments deficits.

This involves our gold reserves; they are seeping away. It involves confidence in the dollar. Currencies in numerous free world nations are tied to the American dollar. Loss of confidence in the dollar could be disastrous not only in the United States, but to freedom everywhere.

What is this balance of international payments which suddenly is so important? It is the dollar value accounting of the debits and credits of all of our transactions with the rest of the world; and for years we have been spending abroad more than we have been taking in from other countries.

In 10 years our expenditures abroad, including foreign aid, have exceeded receipts from foreigners by some \$21 billion. Our cash deficits in foreign transactions in the past 3 years have become alarming. This dangerous situation must be corrected.

Foreign governments and foreign central banks may take payment for these deficits in dollars, or they may demand our gold at the rate of \$35 an ounce. They have taken \$5 billion from our gold reserves in 3 years; and \$7 billion since 1950. Our free gold is now at its lowest level in 20 years.

There are some obvious incentives for foreign holders to leave a substantial part of their dollar receipts here on deposit, or invested in short-term securities, rather than withdraw the gold. But decision to hold dollars rather than take the gold depends on confidence in the dollar.

Outstanding foreign claims total \$18 to \$20 billion; about half of these are in official accounts and gold could be demanded. Some \$12 billion in gold is dedicated to our currency and Federal Reserve deposits. More than half of our undedicated gold is gone; less than \$6 billion in free gold is left.

Nothing confronting us today is more important than restoration of full confidence in the dollar—confidence in the stability of its purchasing power, and confidence in its convertibility into gold. This can be done only by maintenance of sound fiscal position.

The balance of international payments is a complex account of many activities—some public and some private. A summary of entries for 1960 shows:

Receipts from export of goods and services brought in \$26.9 billion.

Payments for import of goods and services (including tourist expenditures abroad) cost us \$20.3 billion.

This left an excess of trade receipts over payments of \$6.6 billion.

But other payments leaving the United States more than offset this trade surplus. These included: Direct military expenditures abroad, \$3 billion; net long-term private investment abroad, \$2.4 billion; net short-term private investment abroad, \$1 billion; net government foreign loans and grants, \$2.7 billion; and payments for pensions, private remittances, unrecorded transactions, etc., \$1.1 billion.

These figures are condensed and projected. But they are accurate enough to tell the 1960 story: we spent \$3.6 billion more abroad than foreigners paid us. For the third consecutive year our deficit in the international payments balance exceeded \$3 billion.

Our merchandise exports were the bright spot in the balance-of-payments picture. Combined with import reduction they gave us a substantial trade surplus, but not enough to offset the great outflow in other areas. But continuation of this surplus is questionable as textile men know.

Raw cotton exports had a good year; I wish the finished goods situation were better. Raw cotton was one of five key commodities in which 1960 exports exceeded 1959 shipments. Others were steel mill products, unmanufactured aluminum and copper, and commercial aircraft.

I am a firm advocate of sound foreign trade on a reciprocal basis, but I do not believe tariffs should be an adjunct of our foreign policy. For a while, after World War II, we were virtually the only source of supply, but we have never assumed our rightful place in world trade.

Traditionally, not enough of our vast agricultural and industrial production potential has gone into sound and profitable export. Only 4.5 million of the men and women in our work force are employed in foreign trade activities; and presently too many of them are unemployed.

I know the traditional handicaps: I know the new ones too. The days of the intolerable Hawley-Smoot-type tariffs are gone and should never return. The days of subsidized foreign production at the expense of our own must go too. A great deal of constructive work needs to be done.

We who serve on the Senate Finance Committee, struggling with taxes, tariffs, and customs \* \* \* like you, are acutely aware of at least some of the problems of foreign trade. Some of them have been created by excessive use of foreign aid detrimental to our own people.

Foreign aid will burden our taxpayers for generations. Gross foreign economic assistance since the end of World War II has totaled nearly \$65 billion. Too much of this has gone to close so-called dollar gaps resulting from World War II destruction and exhaustion in competitor nations.

These gaps have been more than closed. Foreign competitors have been subsidized with our money, materials, machines, and know-how. We built modern factories for aggressor nations who are our competitors. Much of our international payments difficulties stems from Germany and Japan.

Segments of our trade activity are feeling the effect of these subsidies in low-wage areas. In some instances they are pricing our merchandise and commodities out of world markets, including our own; they are putting our business out of production and our people out of work.

Aid for food and shelter is one thing; foreign aid as an instrument of foreign policy which, in excess, is turned against us, should be considered in a different attitude. Some of the professional foreign aiders scattered through the Government can't understand this.

Not all of the foreign aid shows up in foreign assistance appropriations and expenditures. We find some of it in tariff agreements. More foreign-aid money is being sought for new places, and so are additional tariff concessions. Some of the tariff proposals involve textiles.

I believe in free, competitive enterprise and trade. These are fundamental to our system; they are the basis for sound prosperity. They are just as sound internationally as they are domestically. But free competition contemplates reciprocity under one set of rules.

Assuming proper administration, I have favored the reciprocal trade idea since Cordell Hull proposed it nearly 30 years ago. The objective was to increase foreign trade on a reciprocal basis. I supported it in my first Senate speech, and I treasure Secretary Hull's letter of appreciation.

There is some basis for question as to whether current administration is on the right track. Certainly, Cordell Hull never thought reciprocal trade agreements would be dominated by foreign policy or engineered through the GATT (this is short for General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

The GATT has been accused of being an instrument of foreign policy, acting too frequently without regard for the meaning of reciprocity. Members of Congress have questioned the wisdom of some 30 nations passing judgment on our tariff agreements. There is need to look into GATT.

The executive branch has refrained from requesting authorization for participation of U.S. representatives in the GATT. The subject has been a matter of considerable discussion in congressional committees, but specific legislation has not been enacted to date.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be up for renewal next year. In view of accumulating criticism and current conditions, I would have to say extension of the act will not be easy. International payments will be one factor; segments of our industry damaged by foreign imports will be another.

I regret that the Tariff Commission was not allowed to include products made of cotton in its investigation under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. I was disappointed by the fact that my protest to the President in this matter was unsuccessful.

This is regrettable because increasing imports of finished cotton goods are a fact; so are closed mills and unemployment. It is well that the cotton industry has taken the lead in studying agricultural problems. Agriculture, and cotton in particular, have many problems; and acreage reduction is no cure.

I hope you emphasize implications of foreign competition. Legitimate competition is best met by sound research, production and prices. Government-made distortions are difficult. The Government should not damage our industry or make it profitable for business to migrate; but this is happening.

Recent growth of investment abroad by U.S. corporations is unprecedented. Direct investment of all kinds now exceeds \$30 billion (book value). The increase is averaging more than \$2 billion a year, exclusive of overseas earnings reinvested. This is long-term private investment affecting the international payments balance.

The emphasis of this migration is shifting from raw materials to finished products. The more obvious reasons include: Getting

inside export barriers; establishing new bases for export into markets where we are losing out; and sending more manufactures back into the United States.

There are other reasons too, including Government incentives—present and proposed—such as tax advantages, investment guarantees, financial assistance, export credit insurance, etc. And, of course, areas offering low wage and production costs, as compared with ours, exist in many parts of the world.

It should be noted that \$2.7 billion in foreign loans and grants flowed out of the country in 1960. Most of this was foreign aid, which contributed heavily to our balance of payments deficit. Reduction in these expenditures would be a big factor in controlling our loss of gold.

Our problems are many and complex. Many of them could have been avoided with ordinary frugality and efficiency. We have reached a point now where there must be agreement on one paramount objective; the American dollar must be defended and strengthened; confidence in it must be maintained.

This was a strong Nation with a sound system. But we have been subjecting it to irresponsible abuse; this must be stopped. We are in a dangerous storm; I think we can weather it if we are willing to accept and apply discipline and restraint in both public and private affairs.

We are in a new era of atomic energy, rockets, and space. Our population is increasing. Our resources are great. Our productive know-how and capacity are unsurpassed. In such conditions, with commonsense, representative democracy with free enterprise should thrive soundly for the good of all mankind.

## Washington Report

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include another of my "Washington Reports":

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas)

House organization is almost complete. Republican (minority) and Democrat (majority) parties have each assigned their members to their committees, respectively. The Democrat members of the Ways and Means Committee assign the Democrats. The Republican committee on committees has completed the Republican assignments. The House majority leader (RAYBURN, of Texas) and minority leader (HALLECK, of Indiana) earlier reached agreement on committee realignment between parties, based on the new proportion of Democrat and Republican Members. So the committees generally are 3 to 2 Democrat-Republican instead of the last Congress' 2 to 1 ratio. This realignment assures a more strenuous contest over controversial legislation.

The Presidential prayer breakfast of the 17th Annual International Christian Leadership Conference was as usual a tremendous experience. Deeply moving and thought-provoking talks were given by the President, Vice President, Senator Lausche, and Billy Graham, all the more significant to everyone present, no doubt, because of the religious issue in the campaign. To me there

was the realization of the unity and conviction of those who believe in Deity as opposed to the world's nonbelievers. From this comes the strength of our great Nation. This experience was particularly memorable for me since I was privileged to extend greetings and a message from the Members of the House Prayer Group. I had the opportunity to meet or chat with the President, Vice President, Billy Graham, Adlai Stevenson, Cabinet members Rusk, Day, Goldberg, Dillon, McNamara, Hodges, Senators Carlson, Lausche, and Stennis, and Judges Boyd Leedom and Marvin Jones, and Metropolitan Opera Singer Jerome Hines. I am sure now as I was then that we have no problems we can't solve through determined effort motivated by spiritual conviction. The President remembered the occasion when we both shared the rostrum reporting on the Hoover Commission status of legislation in Senate and House respectively before the Chamber of Commerce.

The President's message on balance of payments and gold was a good one. Some noteworthy highlights include: (1) Recognition that we are the "banker of the free world" and that any potential weakness in our dollar spells trouble; (2) interest rates should be increased to hold and attract foreign investment in this country; (3) in reckoning international assets and liabilities, the United States is solvent—Western European countries owe us long-term governmental debts of \$2.9 billion and our private investments total \$48½ billion, exceeding foreign investment in the United States by \$32 billion; (4) we will seek the fullest possible measure of tariff reduction by foreign countries to the benefit of our exports (long overdue, as I see it); (5) American goods must be priced competitively maintaining competitive costs, improving productivity and stabilizing, or where possible, lowering prices. These are worthy objectives but not to be reached by Government control and planning but by free, competitive-market enterprise. The message sidesteps the wage-price spiral forced on us by labor leaders demanding pay increases beyond productivity, which is largely responsible for pricing us out of the world market. Yet the message is there for those responsible. So it isn't more Government control we need but more understanding and cooperation by pressure groups, like labor, willing to work within the framework and by the ground rules of free enterprise. This includes, too, those business groups guilty of price fixing and other monopolistic actions, violative of free enterprise.

The missile gap, is it or not, is the subject of speculation here. Apparently campaign analyses and statements were inaccurate. Some of us tried hard to present the correct picture of U.S. strength based on known facts. Always in Washington it's the same old story—the need for doing your homework, studying and understanding. I suspect some campaigned so hard the homework was neglected.

The President's health message asking for medical care for the aged under social security was a great disappointment to me for very sound reasons. The Ways and Means Committee studied this long and hard last year and decided against it. Here are some of the reasons why we did: (1) Only those covered by social security are thus aided and these without evidence of need, even millionaires would be covered; (2) there is no evidence of lack of medical care in this country because of lack of money to pay for it; (3) U.S. medical care is the best in the world because as private enterprise there is incentive, resulting in men wanting to be doctors. Government-controlled medicine, where tried in the world, results in shortage of doctors and technicians, and facilities, hence poorer medical care; (4) the program is socialized medicine, the

President's statement to the contrary notwithstanding. The doctors, hospitals, and facilities will be authorized by Government, fees regulated, auditing, policing, and penalties prescribed, necessarily, to see that the Government intent is fulfilled. All this is Government control and adds up to socialism; (5) there will not be free choice as depicted—only a choice of those doctors authorized and facilities available. This is not a free choice. Again there's a failure to do the homework, to know the truth, to learn the facts. Federal Government doesn't even have a record or knowledge of the largest area of medical care in the United States, the local efforts. Surely we should start with knowledge, not a politically decided need. So now it's up to the people not to be hoodwinked.

### Tax Rebates to States for School Aid

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the January 23 edition of the Washington Post carried the following release from the Associated Press dealing with a proposal made by Gov. Michael DiSalle of Ohio to the executive committee of the Governors' conference:

#### TAX REBATE PUSHED TO AID U.S. SCHOOLS

A proposal by Gov. Michael V. DiSalle of Ohio to let States have part of the money collected for Federal income taxes to spend on schools was approved Saturday by the executive committee of the Governors' conference.

Among the executive committee members approving the plan was Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland.

DiSalle's resolution calls for the Federal Government to return to any State 5 percent of the Federal income tax collected there.

The State, in return, would be required to spend 40 percent of that money for operating and construction costs of schools. Gradually, over a period of from 5 to 10 years, it would become mandatory for the State to spend all of the money on schools.

DiSalle said he was particularly pleased that his proposal was approved by eight Governors, four Republicans and four Democrats.

The proposal will be submitted to President John F. Kennedy. If he considers the idea a workable one, the Governors will develop the details before going to Congress to ask for legislation.

DiSalle said one big advantage to this proposal would be that it would eliminate the fear of those individuals who say that Federal aid to schools would necessarily mean domination of local school boards by Washington.

After reading the above article, I immediately wired Governor DiSalle, and the text of my wire follows:

JANUARY 24, 1961.

The Honorable MICHAEL DISALLE,  
Governor, State of Ohio,  
Columbus, Ohio:

Have just read Associated Press release concerning your proposal to permit States to retain 5 percent of Federal income taxes collected within the State for purpose of school operation and construction costs.

I note you plan to develop details before coming to Congress for legislation.

I have introduced this legislation in the 85th, 86th, and again in the 87th Congresses and my present legislation is identified as H.R. 46 and H.R. 47. The former permits the District Director of the Internal Revenue to transfer to the State treasury 1 percent of all Federal and corporate income taxes and the latter provides for an appropriation to the individual States of 1 percent of all Federal and corporate income taxes for school operation and construction costs.

I would be most happy to cooperate with you and the executive committee of the Governors' conference in endeavoring to bring these proposals to a successful conclusion. Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Congressman.

I further wrote to our new President, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, the following letter:

JANUARY 24, 1961.

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a copy of an Associated Press release which appeared in the January 23 edition of the Washington Post. The release briefly covers a proposal submitted to the executive committee of the Governors' conference by the Honorable Michael DiSalle of Ohio relative to a Federal tax rebate to States for school aid.

It will be noted that the proposal received the endorsement of a number of Governors, and it is planned to submit same to you for your consideration. If you consider the idea a workable one, the release goes on to state that the Governors will develop details and approach Congress for legislation.

I have introduced such legislation for the past number of years, in fact my original bills were introduced in the 85th Congress. This Congress they are identified as H.R. 46 and 47, copies of which are enclosed. I personally feel the ideas contained in these bills are worthy of serious consideration by you as I have found them to be readily acceptable to a great number of people.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been advocating this type of a program since 1956, and have introduced legislation in each Congress to implement it. Unlike Mr. DiSalle's proposal however, my legislation asks for only 1 percent of all personal and corporate income taxes and requires that the entire amount be expended for educational purposes.

Under the proposals I have pending in the House, H.R. 46 and H.R. 47, the States would have direct control over the expenditure of the money turned over to them. Every person I have spoken to who is opposed to any Federal aid to education, and every person I have spoken to who is an advocate of Federal aid to education, insist he wants no bureaucracy or Federal control. My resolutions will meet that desire, for it need not add a single person to the Federal payroll and would surely eliminate any possibility of Federal controls.

The concept of my proposals is not exactly new, as legislation somewhat along the same lines was introduced as far back as 1949. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that any monetary assistance given to the States must be derived through taxation. Under my proposals, the States would receive 100 percent of the money representing the 1 percent withheld from the personal and corporate taxes; rather

than leaving a portion of it here in Washington to cover the cost of a large administrative overhead.

The proposals would also meet the argument which faced the Congress last year as to whether any moneys could be used for teachers' salaries. If the States retained this money, which incidentally would be from their own people, it could be expended by them in any fashion they saw fit. If their facilities were sufficient, they could earmark it for salaries. If their teachers' salaries were sufficient, they could earmark it for construction; or halve it, however they saw fit.

I urgently request the membership of this body to give earnest consideration to these proposals and ask that those members of committee who would be called on to consider such legislation weigh heavily the merits of these proposals.

### Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Edith Nourse Rogers was a dear friend. She was a fine woman, a true representative of her constituency, a dedicated public servant, and an outstanding American patriot.

On January 16, 1961, a tribute was paid to her by her able and worthy successor, the Honorable BRAD MORSE, and colleagues who served in this House with this distinguished lady whose untimely passing last fall shocked all of us. At the time of the tribute to her I was inadvertently prevented from participating. But in view of the high regard, affection, and respect I hold for Mrs. Rogers, I would like to include in this RECORD my feelings about this wonderful woman.

I became well acquainted with Edith Rogers in my 2 years in Congress. It did not take long to know her. She was warm and personable, sweet and considerate, fair, perceptive, and courageous.

She used to come over to me on the floor of this House and discuss my district problems. Being ever curious about what was going on all over this Nation of ours, she seemed as concerned about matters affecting my district as if it were her own. This she did, I am sure, with others, and as a result was knowledgeable sympathetic to the problems facing our Nation.

I served with Edith Rogers on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I should say I served under her, for I respected her vast seniority on this committee and considered her as my mentor. I am still awed by the warmth with which her name was hailed by veterans and their organizations as they appeared before our committee and at public functions. An introduction of Mrs. Rogers always brought cheers and enthusiastic ap-

plause from the rank and file of these men who fought our country's battles. They stood to a man to hail her. She would modestly rise with her slight frame, smile sweetly and humbly, and with a wave of her hand create a feeling of benevolence and understanding that would pervade the entire room.

Edith Nourse Rogers departed life carrying with her the affection of all of us who knew her for she had brought joy into our lives with her friendly and sunny disposition. She left us possessed of our admiration and gratitude because of her large contribution as a legislator to the strength and betterment of our Nation and its citizenry.

### The USO's 20th Anniversary

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1961, the United Service Organizations, more popularly known as the USO, celebrated its 20th anniversary, and I think it fitting for all Americans to pay tribute to those who have helped to realize its purposes and goals.

I can think of no group which has done more to support the morale of America's fighting men and the women of our auxiliary forces than has the USO and certainly all who have served in this Nation's Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard during the past 20 years must agree.

Organized a few months before the attack on Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into the worst holocaust of all time, the USO immediately went to work on a task no agency of Government could perform. It brought to our Armed Forces everywhere spiritual, social, welfare, recreational, and educational activities so vital to high morale.

Although there are figures available to us on the military cost of World War II, the Korean conflict and the years between and since, no price tag can be placed on the contributions made by the USO to America's defense. All our modern weapons, the high caliber and training of our Armed Forces and, indeed, America's great economic and industrial resources, would have been of little consequence had we lacked the morale to carry through our fight to ultimate victory.

The USO was born at a meeting of the six agencies which today still continue their work in this field. They are the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army and the National Travelers Aid Association.

Although the need for the USO is greatest in wartime, today's international tensions and the necessity for us to

maintain two and a half million men and women in uniform here and throughout the rest of the world make it imperative that the vast services of this organization be continued. For this reason, more than 200 USO clubs presently are maintained throughout the United States and in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, the Canal Zone, Guam, Okinawa, Puerto Rico, Morocco, France, Italy, Turkey, and Greece.

Last year, the 40,000 USO volunteers helped provide the following services to our Armed Forces:

Visits to USO clubs, 36,223,768.

Servings at snack bars, 7,469,435.

Answers to 5,320,063 questions.

Counseling about marital and personal problems to 113,006 service families.

Obtaining suitable housing for 116,814 dependent GI families.

Despite the enormous scope of these activities, the USO is even better known for the millions of cups of hot coffee it has served and the topflight entertainment it has taken to our armed services in all corners of the globe.

More than 20 million veterans of World War II and the Korean war have seen these shows. Playing before audiences ranging in size from 15 to 15,000, they have been put on everywhere from the jungles of China-Burma-India, to the "cow pasture" circuit in Normandy. More than 700 times every day and night, the curtain rose on USO shows in even the most inaccessible spots on earth—the Aleutians, distant Arctic bases, Greenland, Iceland, Labrador; in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa and all Pacific outposts; in Turkey, in Greece and elsewhere in the Middle East; in Germany, France, Italy, England, Spain, and throughout the rest of Europe; all over north Africa, our scattered bases in the Caribbean, in Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone.

In all, the USO has put on 457,263 performances for our armed services in the 20 years of its existence. Its entertainers have performed for an aggregate audience of approximately 240 million GI's. A Broadway show would have to run continuously for 1,100 years to play before so many people.

At present, the USO is staging more than 2,000 of these productions annually for GI audiences of approximately one million.

Mr. Speaker, to today's cold war it is vitally important that we keep the curtains rising on these shows, for they are one of the piers upon which our military morale rests.

### Human Touch in the Department of the Interior

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have been closely

connected with the operations of the Department of the Interior for a number of years.

I am delighted to report to my colleagues that since January 20, there have been changes at the Department of the Interior indicating that we may hereafter look to that Department for the highest type of government administration. These changes have been and are being wrought by our former colleague, the recently confirmed Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, who is applying his well-known energy, his superior intelligence, and his excellent judgment to the objective of building a government department of which we may all be proud.

Secretary Udall on taking office realized at once that he must have the support of the more than 50,000 employees in the Department of the Interior if he were to succeed in his determination to improve the operation of the Department. He also appreciated that recognition of the skills and abilities of this great army of dedicated public servants was essential to gaining their support.

According to local news reports, on the third day of his regime, Secretary Udall issued a call for and met with as many employees of the Department as could crowd into Interior's big auditorium. At that time he promised Interior employees that working with him would be an exciting experience and an adventure.

We in the new administration at Interior want employees with imagination and new ideas—

He told them:

We need workers who are bold enough to question us on our ideas. We value this type of employee far more than the clock watcher and the timesaver.

I was delighted also to learn from press and radio and television reports of February 2 that Secretary Udall is expanding even further the use of the effective human touch in dealing with and inspiring the Department employees. He has instituted a program of calling small groups of workers personally to his office and talking to them about the problems involved in their particular jobs.

As a guide to his objective in maintaining a new and closer liaison with Interior employees, Secretary Udall makes reference to the statements made by President Kennedy in his state of the Union message about our distinguished Federal civil service. In this connection I append for ready reference the inspiring words of the Chief Executive relating to employees of the executive department:

We have found it full of honest and useful public servants—but their capacity to act decisively at the exact time action is needed has too often been muffled in the morass of committees, timidities, and fictitious theories which have created a growing gap between decision and execution, between planning and reality. In a time of rapidly deteriorating situations at home and abroad, this is bad for the public service and particularly bad for the country; and we mean to make a change.

I here pledge myself and my colleagues in the Cabinet to a continuous encouragement of initiative, responsibility, and energy

in serving the public interest. Let every public servant know, whether his post is high or low, that a man's rank and reputation in this administration will be determined by the size of the job he does, and not by the size of his staff, his office, or his budget. Let it be clear that this administration recognizes the value of daring and dissent—that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change. Let the public service be a proud and lively career. And let every man and woman who works in any area of our National Government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and honor in future years: "I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need."

### Responsibilities of the Director of the Food-for-Peace Program

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the appointment by President Kennedy of our former colleague, George McGovern, as Special Assistant to the President, Director of the food-for-peace program, brought favorable reaction throughout the country, and particularly among the Members of the House of Representatives.

The ability, the vision, the courage, and his excellent experience, qualifies George McGovern for this important and responsible position, and in making this humane program, instituted by President Kennedy, a success.

The President recently demonstrated his great interest in the use of our agricultural abundance overseas by defining the duties of Director McGovern in an Executive order, and an accompanying memorandum to the heads of executive departments, both of which I include in my remarks:

#### EXECUTIVE ORDER AMENDING PRIOR EXECUTIVE ORDERS TO PROVIDE FOR THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Whereas American agricultural abundance offers a unique opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way, and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples around the world; and

Whereas exports of farm products are of great importance to the domestic economy, furnishing approximately 11 percent of total farm income; and

Whereas many Government functions and activities relate to the movement overseas of agricultural products and commodities, and a number of Government agencies have responsibilities in connection with these activities; and

Whereas it is of fundamental importance that we have a national food policy directed toward using our agricultural abundance as a national asset to meet foreign policy objectives;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Executive Order No. 10900 of January 5, 1961 (26 F.R. 143), headed "Administration of the Agricultural Trade De-

velopment and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended," is hereby amended by renumbering sections 6 and 7 thereof as sections 7 and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 5 the following new section 6:

"SEC. 6. Director of the food for peace program: Subject to the direction of the President, the Director of the food for peace program (provided for in a letter of the President bearing the same date as this order) shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and coordination of the functions hereinabove delegated or otherwise assigned to officers or agencies of the Government. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not be construed as terminating any delegation or other assignment of function made by other sections of this order."

Sec. 2. Executive Order No. 10893 of November 8, 1960 (25 F.R. 10732), headed "Administration of mutual security and related functions," is hereby amended by adding at the end of part I thereof a new section III, reading as follows:

"SEC. III. Director of the food for peace program: Subject to the direction of the President, the Director of the food for peace program shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and coordination of the functions under section 402 of the act (22 U.S.C. 1922). The foregoing provisions of this section shall not be construed as superseding any delegation or other assignment of function made by the act or by other sections of this order."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 24, 1961.

#### MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., January 24, 1961.

I have today issued an Executive order relating to the duties of the Director of the food for peace program. This order amends Executive Orders 10893 and 10900, providing for the administration of the mutual security and related functions and of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, respectively. It provides that the Director of the food for peace program shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and coordination of the functions under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, as well as those functions under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 which are delegated by Executive Order No. 10893. These provisions of law deal with the use of American agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

The purpose of this memorandum is to describe further the role of the Director of the food for peace program, who will be located in the Executive Office of the President.

American agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples all around the world. We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity. We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad. Humanity and prudence, alike, counsel a major effort on our part.

Many Government functions and activities relate to the overseas movement of agricultural commodities and products of the United States. It is important that responsibility for coordination of all these efforts be centralized so that they can become more meaningful—a more useful instrument of our foreign policy, and more efficient.

Accordingly, I expect to look to the food for peace Director, working under my direction and with the Secretaries of State and Agriculture in particular, to exercise affirma-

tive leadership and continuous supervision over the various activities in this field, so that they may be brought into harmonious relationship.

The most immediate task which I have asked the Director to undertake is that of conducting an intensive review of all these activities and considering possible improvements in them. He will communicate to me the results of this review and his recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for such legislative changes as may be necessary. I have asked the food for peace Director to consider very carefully the intimate relationships between our foreign agricultural activities and other aspects of our foreign-assistance program and to develop the necessary programs and policies in coordination with the Mutual Security Coordinator.

I know that in all of his endeavors the Director will have your full support and cooperation.

This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

### Washington Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 4, 1961:

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, Feb. 4, 1961)

The Rules Committee enlargement from 12 to 15 (see three preceding newsletters) was a victory for Speaker RAYBURN and the radical Democratic House leadership. Liberal (radical) domination of the Rules Committee assures quicker and easier programming of the President's program for House consideration. The close vote, 217 to 212 (for: 195 Democrats, 22 Republicans; against: 64 Democrats, 148 Republicans) also heralds endless close battles on the House floor over the controversial issues, particularly since the administration and the House leadership pressured many Members to vote for the change. It was a historic debate. Only 4 Members of the 437 Members were absent (there are 2 vacancies; 2 Members left hospital beds to be present).

Excerpts from debate include:

KILDAY, of Texas: "The Committee on Rules should consist of an uneven number of members to prevent the existing stalemate of the votes."

BROWN, of Ohio: "Misinformation, misrepresentation, falsehoods, and slander have been directed against the committee."

CURRIS, of Missouri: "The Rules Committee unfairly and improperly has been made to appear to be the whipping boy when the majority could at all times have worked their will and brought legislation to the floor. The Rules Committee does not possess the power and has not possessed the power to keep legislation off the floor of the House."

SMITH, of Virginia: "The ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) claim credit for all this ruckus that is going on now. Fifteen thousand bills were introduced in the last Congress and 90 percent died in House committees while the Rules Committee only neglected to report 10 percent of the bills that came before them. Why not wait until

the Rules Committee refused to give a rule to make a change, instead of now?"

ARENS, of Illinois: "It is proposed here to convert a screening committee, a senior deliberative committee, into a rubber stamp committee for whatever our new President may propose, and subject to the dictates of the Speaker."

MILLER of New York (quoting President Kennedy from the day before): "A President and a Congress who hold each other in mutual respect will not permit nor attempt any trespass; in the absence of threats, promises, coercions, and distortions, I really believe this resolution would today be defeated if every Member followed the voice that whispers within him."

WALTERS, of Pennsylvania: "We must stand back of the President of the United States. We must not fall the United States and her leader in our vote today."

JUDD, of Minnesota: "I do not know when any President of the United States, whether new or old, was ever given any authority to make commitments or to announce programs that amount to commands to the legislative branch of the U.S. Government. The proposal has real dangers. It is a calculated assault on the whole committee system, which is the best yet devised for providing careful consideration and study of legislation."

HALLECK, of Indiana: "It is unwise, unjustified, untimely, unnecessary, and therefore insupportable. This present effort proceeds first on a false assertion and second on a false assumption. The false assertion is that in the last Congress the Committee on Rules did roadblock legislation. The false assumption is that we Republicans are going to be obstructionists just for obstruction's sake. This is not true."

RAYBURN, of Texas: "We have elected to the Presidency a new leader. He is going to have a program that he thinks will be in the interest of and for the benefit of the American people. Let us move this program. Let us be sure we can move it. And the only way that we can be sure that this program will move when great committees report bills, the only way it can move, in my opinion, my beloved colleagues, is to adopt this resolution today."

ALGER, of Texas: "The great danger is the zeal of the liberals who can and will change the ground rules of debate, through the closed or gag rule, waiving of points of order and prevention of amendment. I concede the right of the leadership to recommend the addition of members to the committee and the correctness of a 2-to-1 majority so that the majority party can control the programming of legislation, but I do oppose and protest the intent at this time of liberalizing the committee to become a rubberstamp of the administration's program. The House must do its work independently of the administration and Executive influence."

President Kennedy's state of the Union message and economic report form a two-part description of his outlook and intentions as Chief Executive. These two messages differ markedly from those of former President Eisenhower.

The state of the Union message was, at the least, as ominous and gloomy in portent as any of his campaign statements. There is no mistaking the President's excellent rhetoric and his grasp and command of language. There is, however, difficulty in analysis, as I see it, of his grasp and understanding of both our present situation, including the enormity of the tasks confronting us and of the basic structure of our economy. This, in turn, makes appropriate a reevaluation by each person of the role of Federal Government in our lives, both the executive and legislative branches of it. These messages lead to tremendous contradictions. Yes, there is "national peril and national opportunity" just as there is tremendous pain and unhappiness

as against great opportunity, accomplishment, and joy in individual human life. So we come to the need for both understanding and the proper outlook. Many scenes in life are bleak or glowing with promise, depending on whose eyes behold them.

The generalities of the state of the Union message were spelled out in more detail in the economic report. Economic report excerpts which particularly provoke thought (and which we should study against my yardstick: (1) Is it a function of Federal Government; and (2) can we afford it?) include:

1. In the past 3½ years the gap between what we "can" produce and what we "do" produce has threatened to become chronic. Realistic aims and goals for 1961 are to reverse the downtrend in our economy, to narrow the gap of unused potential, to abate the waste, and misery, of unemployment, and at the same time to maintain reasonable stability of the price level.

Question: Is Federal Government intended either to be the judge of this matter or to prescribe its solution? Do we believe in Federal judgment and planning of our economy?

2. Annual growth rate of 3.5 percent in the Nation's total output is not high enough. Our potential growth rate can and should be increased.

Question: Isn't this inferring omniscient judgment and too heavy reliance on Federal subsidy as the solution?

3. Annual growth could have been greater; there could have been more employed; corporate profit could have been more. All this could have been accomplished with readily available manpower, materials, and machines without igniting inflation. How, when all Federal programs recommended more spending of money that first must be taken in taxes from people and industry?

4. The problem of unused potential will remain. True, and so it will always be; that's life and its challenge, not a reason for more Federal aid.

5. This administration is pledged to a Federal revenue system that balances the budget over the years of the economic cycle—yielding surpluses for debt retirement in times of high employment that more than offsets the deficits which accompany low levels of economic activity in poor years. Contradictory or false—even in years of our Nation's highest employment, Federal spending goes up, not down, and the possible surpluses evaporate. Indeed, our employment is highest now in history and yet President Kennedy proposes gigantic new spending.

6. Debt retirement at high employment contributes to economic growth by released savings for productive investment by private enterprise and State and local governments. This can be accomplished by reduced Federal spending, not increased spending as President Kennedy recommended.

7. The President then recommends Federal spending programs that will put money in people's hands to sustain consumer spending and increase aggregate demands now when the economy is slack. So here's the clash: Is it more sensible to tax, sending money to Washington where it is ladled out through Federal programs or return it to the people's hands by reduced Federal spending and tax cuts?

8. We must strengthen our school lunch program to make the best possible nutrition available to every school child, regardless of the economic condition of his family or local school district. Try the yardstick on this one: Is this indeed the role of the Federal Government?

9. This administration will not distort the value of the dollar in any fashion. This is a commitment. Contradiction: Increased

Federal spending will incur deficits which create inflation which destroys the dollar.

My own further observations include: President Kennedy seems to lack a fundamental understanding of the free enterprise economic system. Federal Government is not responsible for our economy nor to feed, clothe and house us. Government, when government action is needed, is best closest to the people.

(2) Human rights and freedom are God given, not government given. Government aid presumes government control and the individual dependent on government aid is subject to control—this is not freedom.

3. The dominant problem of peace and survival is assured by a strong defense. A strong defense rests on a strong economy. Any weakening of our free competitive enterprise economic system endangers our very survival.

4. Federal Government judging needs and proposing solutions frequently is analogous to the "man rocking the boat while proclaiming there's a storm at sea."

5. Arthur Schlesinger, Presidential assistant, provides a clue to the President's thinking perhaps in his stated belief that "a welfare state is the best defense against communism, and a welfare state is one that provides basic elements for its citizens such as food, clothing, shelter, education, and opportunity." My interpretation is the reverse. The welfare state is communism, which is a Socialist state.

6. President Kennedy's criticism of our ills might well be directed at his own party which has controlled all legislation the last 6 years.

## Legislative Program for Liberals

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

## HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1961, I had the privilege of addressing the membership of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C. The following is a copy of the address which I delivered:

Chairman Al Hartnett, Mr. Dick Carter, Mr. Ken Peterson, and members of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, I am pleased to accept your invitation to address you at this conference on legislation and civil rights.

Only the affection for my good friend, Ken Peterson, your legislative director and the high esteem in which I hold your union could induce me, a New Yorker, to plow through 18 inches of snow, when traveling was banned and the roads impassable, to come to Washington to speak to you on these vital subjects. The beautiful snow blanketing our city and the District of Columbia reminds me of an old Italian saying which my mother used to recite, "When the snow melts, the garbage is seen."

The snow which has accumulated during the past 8 years has melted and we see the garbage, refuse, and offal underneath. In his valedictory speech, President Eisenhower spread a blanket of white snow over the activities of the past 8 years. He pointed out the seemingly great progress that was made during the past 8 years, the prosperity which we seemingly enjoy, and the security which surrounds us. President John Kennedy, in his state of the Union address pointed out what lay underneath the blanket

of snow and jolted us from our smug complacency and the feeling of self-satisfaction.

The snow having melted, we find that today we are now faced with 5½ million without jobs, with 1 million searching for work for more than 4 months, and over 500,000 having exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, bankruptcies have reached the highest level since the great depression, housing starts in 1960 were 400,000 less than 1959. One-eighth of those without jobs include the unemployed in depressed areas, the recent graduates unable to use their talents, and those unskilled workers laid off in the automobile, apparel, metal, and machinery industries. While construction is off and profits falling, consumer prices are rising. This paradox is brought about not by competitive commodities, but by those commodities made by those quasi-monopolistic industries who raise their unit prices and charge high profit differentials when their plants are not in full operation. High wages are not the cause of the paradoxical situation.

As legislators, we have duties to perform. We cannot remain idle in the hope that economic forces unaided by Government will solve our problems. The great depressions prove that laissez faire will not work in our present economy. We, who take pride in calling ourselves liberals recognize that immediate action is necessary for the preservation of our ideals, the promotion of our economy, and the welfare of our Nation. President Kennedy, during the campaign, talked of the new frontiers. The new frontiers in America are our cities and not the space beyond. Over 130 cities in the United States have populations over 100,000. Twelve years ago, Congress declared our goal to be a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family. Today we still have 25 million living in substandard housing, we still have 19 States without minimum wage laws, we still have 9½ million senior citizens over 65 years of age with incomes of less than \$1,000 per year. We have 15 States which have major areas with more than 6 percent chronic unemployment. We still have approximately 2 million students whose education is impaired because of lack of funds or because of lack of educational facilities. There are many other areas of activity, but I wish today to discuss five of the most essential subjects for which we prayerfully seek legislative action:

1. Minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25, and to extend coverage.
2. Aid to depressed areas.
3. Federal aid to housing.
4. Federal aid to education.
5. Medical care for our aged under social security.

The first two deal with preserving and improving our purchasing power; the second two, promoting, developing, and preparing for our future; and the last, taking care of our workers in the twilight of their careers.

#### MINIMUM WAGE

One of the great issues to confront Congress this year is the increase in minimum wage and the extension of coverage. The only thing that money cannot buy is poverty. The objective of minimum wage law is to insure a minimum standard of living necessary for the health, efficiency, and general well being of the workers. What is our present situation with respect to the minimum wage law?

Today there are 7.6 million families and single individuals with under \$2,000 a year. At the present minimum wage, with a 40-hour week, a worker before taxes earns \$2,080 per year. The Labor Department estimates that a family of four requires \$4,680 per year to have a modest, but adequate standard of living.

Approximately 20 million American workers are denied the protection of the minimum wage law in any respect. On a State level, we find 19 States have no minimum wages whatsoever.

Five States have provisions for wage boards, but they have not acted. Arkansas, whose legislators inspired the Landrum-Griffin bill, has a minimum wage law for skilled labor of 16 cents an hour. Kentucky has a minimum wage law of 40-50 cents per hour. Ohio, which people believe is a progressive State, has a minimum wage of 70 cents per hour for hotels and restaurants, and 27½ cents an hour for laundries, and \$11-\$15 per week for beauty parlors. Only 11 States have minimum wage laws equal to Federal standards. Therefore, 39 States of our Union have substandard wage provisions. The States have failed to act in this area and it behooves us on a Federal level to fill the vacuum.

Excluded from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act are all our domestic workers, the employees in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; 97 percent of employees in the retail trades; 80 percent in the services as in hotels, restaurants, and laundries; 56 percent in construction, although by bargaining arrangements, they can take care of themselves; 34 percent in finance, insurance, and real estate; 30 percent in wholesale trade.

What I have said I believe demonstrates that we do need a Federal minimum wage law, increasing wages and extending coverage.

What are the prospects of success in this Congress, and why will there be opposition?

A Federal minimum wage law with extended coverage to 8 million as in the Roosevelt bill, or even 3½ million people, will equalize the competitive advantages which Southern States and less progressive States possess by reason of low wages. It is my contention that the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill was not inspired by a desire for reform of union democracy, but because the Republicans who favored industry and the southern Democrats believed that by passing the Landrum-Griffin bill, it would prevent the interference with the industrialization of the South. These States will fight to maintain their economic advantages enjoyed by them because of low wages, no compulsory workmen's compensation laws, and no provisions for rehabilitation of injured workers. A Federal minimum wage law in agriculture will exercise and wipe out the exploitation of migrant labor and Mexican braceros, whose numbers now reach 1,300,000; 800,000 migrant workers, and one-half million Mexican braceros.

We will hear many cries of anguish by the opponents of increasing minimum wages. They will cry out that an increase in minimum wages will bring about inflation, cause unemployment, and bankrupt industries. History and experience belie their complaints.

A study of the Department of Labor made in 1954 showed that the increase of minimum wage to 75 cents in 1950 did not cause unemployment. Rather it retarded it. It demonstrated that the increase to 75 cents per hour from 1938 to 1951 brought about an increase in the level of wages by 171 percent; whereas in high wage employment, the increase was 121 percent, and the increase in manufacturing wages increased by 148 percent. This report showed no loss of employment and very few bankruptcies, even in the South. The U.S. Department of Labor reported that the rise from 75 cents to \$1 per hour did not result in an increase in the consumer price level, nor the wholesale price level. A study at Cornell showed that the increase to \$1 per hour did not contribute to price inflation.

What are the prospects for passage? We must take guidance from the vote on the

Trimble bill to expand the Rules Committee. This is an indication of things to come. Twenty-two Republicans voted to expand the Rules Committee, and the measure passed by a vote of 217 to 212. Last year when the minimum wage bill was being considered, 27 Republicans voted against the Kitchin-Ayres amendment to the Roosevelt bill. I don't expect that we can get more votes unless we conduct our campaign more intelligently, and we must adopt measures and provisions which will not antagonize a segment of Congressmen. We must make haste slowly in this field. It is more important, in my opinion, that we obtain extended coverage rather than the increased minimum. I am concerned more with increasing the pay of the lowest paid workers than increasing the minimum wage in the industries now covered.

You, gentlemen, have a job to do. You cannot expect Congressmen to follow you blindly. The closeness of the election indicates the sentiment of the people and its conservatism. Your job and your function is to convince the uncertain with facts and figures, to destroy the arguments of inflation, unemployment, and high prices with historical experience. You cannot rely upon the blind faith that Congressmen will follow for the sake of following.

#### FEDERAL AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Tied in with minimum wages is Federal aid to depressed areas. Fifteen States have major areas of unemployment. Many other States, approximately 20 in number, have minor areas of unemployment with surplus of labor. Loss of industry to other States, automation, depletion of resources, and vicious foreign competition have created unemployment and depressed areas. West Virginia, parts of Connecticut, and parts of Pennsylvania have suffered tremendously. This problem is one of the great challenges of the 87th Congress. In the 86th Congress, we passed S. 722, but President Eisenhower vetoed it. On four occasions, Republicans defeated aid to depressed areas. Last year the Senate sustained the President's veto by a vote of 45 to override and 39 against. No two-thirds vote was forthcoming. This year we can be confident there will be no veto.

We will have a great opportunity then to carry out the intent of the Employment Act of 1946, which prescribes maximum employment, production and purchasing power. President Kennedy has already taken affirmative action. He has ordered former Congressman George McGovern, administrator of his food program, to use our abundance and surplus to feed our indigent and underfed.

We look forward to providing a revolving fund for private projects in industrial and rural areas, to enhance industrial expansion and provide job opportunities. We, progressives, are dedicated to the proposition that all Americans should have a chance to share the national wealth. I am happy to be able to continue my support for this program of aid to depressed areas.

#### FEDERAL AID TO HOUSING

The new frontiers of America are our cities. The 1960 census indicates that 130 cities in the United States have populations of 100,000 or more. My own city has reached a population of 8½ million. The most important problem in our cities is housing. Today we have 25 million people living in substandard housing. We need 2 million housing units a year, single-family housing, and multiple dwellings. Substandard housing means soaring rates of crime, juvenile delinquency, ill health, and a breakdown in moral and social standards.

The history of the past 8 years in housing is deplorable. In 1960 we had 1,200,000 housing starts, 400,000 less than 2 years ago. It is ironic that we in the cities who pay the major portion of the income tax are denied

public housing by those States which receive grants-in-aid at almost equal to their income tax contributions. We, in New York, pay 20 percent of income taxes, and together with Illinois and California and Pennsylvania, we contribute 42 percent of all the tax collections, and we are denied by short-sighted Representatives the right to live in decent housing.

Two years ago, after two Presidential vetoes, the Congress approved 37,000 public housing units at a cost of \$18½ million. Opponents of the public housing program said it would bankrupt our country. Our Commodity Credit Corporation, whose funds are derived from income taxes and congressional appropriations, pays \$700 million annually to store our surplus grain, and no Republican or Representatives of agricultural States cry out that this outflow is bankrupting our Nation.

The liberals or the progressives have proposed a 10-year program to restore our cities, provide for a balanced suburban development, eliminate our blight and our slums, and to provide for a comprehensive transportation program, including bus, rail transit, commuter railroads, as well as highway programs and construction of airports.

The benefits of increased housing are apparent. It means employment for the tradesman, the plasterer, the electrician, the carpenter, the plumber, the appliance dealer, the architect, the surveyor, and the lawyer.

With a President who favors housing for sales and rentals, who recognizes the need for college housing and housing for the elderly, who recognizes that Fannie May can pump prime the economy, who will not be veto happy, we are confident that we will succeed in this important area.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

One of the great battles of the 87th Congress will be in the field of Federal aid for education. Our Nation has been founded on the principle that an educated electorate is a selective electorate. Our Bill of Rights, with its freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press will have very little meaning if our people are uneducated. We recognize in the face of world competition, that we must stimulate our educational processes to develop scientists, educators, the economists, and the artists to compete with less endowed but more aggressive nations.

Little doubt exists that many States have not fulfilled their obligations to provide educational facilities and opportunities. The high cost of construction, the unattractive teachers' salaries, as compared to blue collar

workers, have discouraged localities and States to expand their facilities. Our educational system has been falling apart. Since 1946, State indebtedness has increased by 500 percent, local government by 200 percent, and Federal Government by less than 10 percent. Federal matching funds are granted for highways, hospitals, and welfare. No matching funds are provided for educational facilities. Consequently, States spend their limited funds where they can find matching funds from our Federal Government.

From a selfish point of view, we, in the State of New York, because of the small allocation to New York State, would oppose Federal funds for school construction. But we in New York feel that we are part of a nation. If we provide funds for school construction in our own State, we should not be penalized by not being able to divert it to supplement our teachers' salaries. We should obtain a measure which will give the State discretion to allocate its funds for school construction or to supplement teachers' salaries in order to attract competitive schoolteachers.

The cry has been raised that Federal funds will lead to Federal control of education. Previous history refutes such a contention and belies such fears. Since 1861, under the Morrill Act, we have had land-grant colleges in every one of our States teaching agriculture. In those grants there have been provisions for teachers' salaries, and never have we had criticism of Federal control in the operation of land-grant colleges. Federal funds are granted for teachers' salaries in federally impacted areas and no criticism has been raised against it. School lunch programs have been afforded our youth and no Federal interference in its operation is discernible. GI educational benefits have been granted without complaint that Federal interference is present. So much so, that the veterans of Korea are clamoring for similar benefits. The complaint of Federal interference is baseless from the point of view of past history.

Education has become a matter of highest national concern and responsibility as vital to freedom's future as the national defense program. Last year, the House passed a bill, H.R. 10128, by a vote of 206 to 189. This bill died because the House Rules Committee refused to allow the appointment of a joint Senate-House conference committee to resolve the differences between the Senate and House bills. Now that the Rules Committee has been liberalized, we expect no such difficulty, and we, liberals, are confident that we shall get an adequate education bill.

#### MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

A government moral fiber is judged by the regard it has for its youth, its sick and its aged. Medical care for the aged is a test of our moral fiber. The Forand bill, which liberals embrace and espouse, provided medical care for the aged under social security. This bill is an insurance plan, which is feasible, inexpensive and humane. It is not a giveaway. It is grafted upon a social security program which is financially solvent and derives its revenues from joint contributions from employer and worker while the worker is employed. It gives medical care after retirement and maintains a worker's freedom of choice of doctor. This bill was rejected by the Ways and Means Committee upon the recommendation of the Republican administration and by the vehement opposition to it by the AMA. A so-called medical care program was approved, which depends upon the cooperation of States which have demonstrated their indisposition and disinclination to contribute which requires a fee payment by persons over 65 and the payment by the aged persons of the first \$250 of medical expense above \$250. Thereafter 80 percent of the cost would be paid by the administration. Public welfare recipients need make no contributions. Persons with incomes of \$2,500 annually would be ineligible. In view of the fact that 60 percent of our 16 million persons over 65 years of age have incomes of less than \$1,000 per annum, this plan was a cruel hoax.

President Kennedy has recommended that men as well as women be eligible at the age of 62 for benefits, but that their benefit payments be proportionately reduced. The success of the liberal proposal depends, in my opinion, on the influence of the President on the members of the Ways and Means Committee and upon the Senators. With assistance from the public and with the President going to the airwaves to advise the people to call upon the recalcitrant Members to support a Forand-type bill, we have hope of success. With the Rules Committee reorganized, a rule permitting floor amendment can be acted upon in the House of Representatives, the House may be able to work its will.

I do not talk of other liberal programs, such as immigration, civil rights, migratory and Mexican labor unemployment, insurance with dependency benefits, or foreign aid. This is part of our program. We are on the way to new frontiers and the Federal Government will play its role in a diminishing world with the programs to provide for expanding human problems.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Nehemiah 2: 20: *The God of heaven, He will prosper us; therefore we His servants will arise and build.*

Eternal God, our Father, in this moment of prayer, may we be inspired with a resolute determination to have a larger part in bringing to a victorious issue mankind's struggle to build the kingdom of freedom and peace, of justice and righteousness.

Gird us with the faith and fortitude of the Founding Fathers who bequeathed to us the liberties which we enjoy and charged us with the respon-

sibility of safeguarding the great traditions of our beloved country.

May the Members of this Congress be sensitive and responsive to the needs of humanity and find their hearts enlarged with a vision of the dawning of a better day for men and nations everywhere.

We pray in Christ's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 153. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so

that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]; the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]; the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE]; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]; and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; members to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, February 6 to February 12, 1961.