

lead and zinc mining operations and smelting concerns completely shut down.

Due to extensive prospecting at great expense, it has been proven that there are zinc reserves in the Knoxville and Mascot areas of east Tennessee to last a hundred years of normal production.

Neither lead nor zinc can be produced in the United States on a profitable basis in competition with the substandard wages and working conditions abroad. Recent past history has proven conclusively that a healthy lead-zinc industry in the United States is vital to our national defense and to the well-being of our Nation's economy.

It is high time that we in this country take steps to protect the well-being of our own people.

Enactment of my bill, which would impose a very modest import tax on lead and zinc, will go a long way toward revitalizing the lead-zinc industry and in returning to work thousands of lead and zinc miners and smelter workers.

May I emphasize here that in the case of hard-rock mining, such as lead and zinc, reasonable protection by legislation has a chronological implication of the utmost importance. The risk capital required for exploration and development of new deposits generally will require 5 or even up to 10 years before return on investment can be anticipated. Only legislation will afford a durable solution because of the length of time required to develop new production. This is why tariffs rather than quotas are the appropriate solution.

Tariffs permit the market to function and respond to changes in demand. Quotas do not.

Eight years is long enough to ponder this problem. We have the facts and the recommendations of the Tariff Commission and now we should translate them into sound, proper, and constructive legislative action.

Based upon testimony adduced in executive session in the Ways and Means Committee last year when my bill, H.R. 11584, was being considered, in addition to stabilizing the price and production of lead and zinc, this bill would produce revenue to the Federal Treasury of approximately \$36 million a year, which, to me at least, is a matter of substantial and material importance.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 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:

Eternal Spirit, Thou hast written Thy law on the tablets of our hearts. In Thy fellowship alone, we find peace for our spirits and power for our tasks.

In the brooding silence of this still moment of devotion, may open windows of faith flood our gloom with Thy light, that in Thy sunshine's blaze this day may brighter, fairer be.

We come with hearts grateful for freedom's glorious light, with no walls or curtains to blot it out. Dowered with privileges as no other nation, may the richness of our heritage be to us Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, to unshackle the enslaved, to clear the way for freedom everywhere, that through the potent ministry of our dear land, all peoples of the earth may be blessed.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me state that it is very important that we have some time in order to have some very important consultations which we have not had time to have, because of the pressure under which all of us have been working. Therefore, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Secretary will read the Journal.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 3, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no corrections, the Journal as read will be approved.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 3, 1961, Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on March 6, 1961, submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

George F. Kennan, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia;

Philip H. Coombs, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations;

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be deputy representative to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and a deputy representative in the Security Council of the United Nations;

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be a representative to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, John Howard Morrow, of New Jersey, and Charles P. Noyes, of New York, to be alternate representatives to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-417, the Speaker had appointed Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia, Mr. POFF, of Virginia, and Mr. MOORE, of West Virginia as members of the James Madison Memorial Commission on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in

which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 845. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes;

H.R. 856. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan;

H.R. 858. An act to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers;

H.R. 860. An act to repeal certain obsolete provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to unemployment compensation for Korean conflict veterans;

H.R. 866. An act to amend section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals;

H.R. 1822. An act to adjust the amount of funds available for farm operating loans made pursuant to section 21(b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended;

H.R. 2953. An act to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes;

H.R. 3587. An act to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide outpatient medical and dental treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as such treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War; and

H.R. 5075. An act to provide temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance benefits, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 845. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes;

H.R. 856. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan;

H.R. 860. An act to repeal certain obsolete provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to unemployment compensation for Korean conflict veterans;

H.R. 866. An act to amend section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals; and

H.R. 2953. An act to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 858. An act to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1822. An act to adjust the amount of funds available for farm operating loans made pursuant to section 21(b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 3587. An act to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide outpatient medical and dental treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as such treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War; and

H.R. 5075. An act to provide temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

INCLUSION WITHIN JOSHUA TREE NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF., CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include within the boundaries of Joshua Tree National Monument, in the State of California, certain federally owned lands used in connection with said monument, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT IN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONT.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract with Glacier Park, Inc., to provide concession facilities and services for the public in Glacier National Park, Mont. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROVISION OF JURY COMMISSION FOR EACH U.S. DISTRICT COURT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a jury commission for each U.S. district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF FEES OF JURY COMMISSIONERS IN U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR RETIRED JUDGES TO PERFORM CERTAIN JUDICIAL SERVICES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize retired judges of certain territorial courts to perform judicial service when designated and assigned (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the granting of electors of President and Vice President to the District of Columbia

"The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby resolves as follows:

"SECTION 1. The proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing as follows:

"Article —

"SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct

"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State but in no event more than the least populous State they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States

but they shall be considered for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President to be electors appointed by a State and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" is hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"SEC. 2. A certified copy of the foregoing resolution shall be forwarded to the Administrator of General Services in accordance with section 106(b), title I, United States Code, and also to the President of the U.S. Senate and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"We certify that this bill has passed the house of representatives and the senate.

"JOS. OMINSKY,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"HIRAM G. ANDREWS,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"JOHN MORGAN DAVIS,

"President, Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1

"A memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a gold subsidy law for the purpose of stimulating gold production in the United States and thereby maintaining a high employment level for miners

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The gold shortage has precipitated an economic and labor crisis in the United States which makes it imperative that the Congress of the United States take immediate and forthright action to remedy the situation.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation granting a subsidy to those persons or organizations producing gold. The subsidy of 100 percent shall be on only that gold produced in a calendar year which is in excess of the gross production for the year 1960.

"2. A producer of gold who was not engaged in gold production during the calendar year 1960 shall be granted a 100 percent subsidy of total gold production for a 10-year period and thereafter such subsidy shall terminate.

"3. That the Honorable Wesley Bolin, Secretary of the State of Arizona, is directed to send a duly certified copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

"Passed the senate February 20, 1961, by the following vote: 26 ayes, 2 nays, not voting 0.

"Approved by the Governor, February 20, 1961.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 20, 1961."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the Federal excise taxes on communications and transportation services were initially levied during World War II to provide needed funds to support the war effort and to discourage the use of such services; and

"Whereas more than 14 years after cessation of hostilities, the excise tax on communications services and transportation of persons is still in effect and is continuing to discourage the public use of these services; and

"Whereas telephone service and the transportation of persons is an essential part of our way of life and cannot under any circumstances be considered a luxury item to be taxed in the same manner as furs, jewelry, liquor and other luxury commodities; and

"Whereas other household and business necessities are not taxed in such a manner; and

"Whereas the levying of excise taxes upon such necessities as telephone service and transportation imposes taxes on those citizens who can least afford to pay in the same manner as those of unlimited financial means; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Washington respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to remove the unfair and inequitable tax upon communications and transportation services during the current session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the Vice President, to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Washington, and all members of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives in legislative session assembled:

"Whereas the Governors of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, in recognition of the serious depletion of the fishery resources of the Pacific Northwest, met jointly in Boise, Idaho, on February 6, 1961, and agreed to take steps to remedy this situation and to urge Congress to enact legislation to safeguard the fish runs on the Salmon River in Idaho, the most valuable fish-producing stream in the entire Columbia River system, which can be accomplished by preventing any further obstacles to Salmon River fish in their migration to and from the Pacific Ocean, similar to the objectives of Senate bill 323 and House bill 3589 of the 87th Congress; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That we urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation creating a fish sanctuary of the Salmon River by prohibiting the construction of dams thereon and restricting the height of dams below its mouth on the Snake River to a height no greater than the highest of those dams presently constructed or authorized in that stretch of river, that is, a dam having no more than 100 feet of hydraulic head; Be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives immediately send copies of this resolution to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative in Congress from the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, and Alaska, and to the Governors of each of these States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"To the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Stuart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"Whereas the State of Washington utilized 4.64 percent of all electric energy used in the United States in 1950 and was in seventh place among the States; and

"Whereas the relative position of the State of Washington has declined to 10th place with a percentage in 1959 of only 3.83 percent; and

"Whereas if Washington had been able to maintain its relative position in 1959 as compared to 1950, the State would now be utilizing an additional 5 billion kilowatt hours of new industrial power and the industrial job opportunities which are so urgently needed in this State; and

"Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration now has a large surplus of power available for sale; and

"Whereas this relative decline in the industrial expansion of the State of Washington since 1950 is the direct result of the so-called partnership power policy of the last administration; and

"Whereas Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON have provided the leadership in seeking the appointment of Mr. Charles Luce, of Walla Walla, as Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has appointed Mr. Charles Luce, of Walla Walla, as Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration and Mr. Luce took office February 14, 1961; and

"Whereas the proposed Canadian treaty and the Hanford reactor will further increase the available supply of new industrial power; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the Secretary of the Interior on his selection of Mr. Charles Luce as Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That we extend our congratulations and best wishes to Administrator Luce, and that we urge the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to institute a dynamic industrial power sales program in order to increase the rate of industrial investment and tax base and new industrial job opportunities."

A resolution adopted by the Fourth District Democratic Council of the State of Washington, protesting against the proposed merger of the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the San Antonio, Tex., Nurserymen's Association, favoring the exemption of nurseries from the proposed amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania State Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, at Pottsville, Pa., recording its complete support of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON for so long as he remains in the office of Vice President; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. KERR:

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

"ENROLLED HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 507

"A concurrent resolution relating to social security; requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that women, otherwise qualified, shall be eligible for old age assistance upon reaching the age of 62 years; directing that duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has amended the Social Security Act and broadened its coverage to provide social security retirement benefits for women who have reached the age of 62 years; and

"Whereas there are at present many women between the ages of 62 and 65 years of age who are within the coverage of the present Social Security Act; and

"Whereas the recent White House Conference on Aging in its policy statement recommended that Congress amend the Social Security Act to provide that women, otherwise qualified, shall be eligible for old age assistance payments upon reaching the age of 62 years; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the minimum age requirement of eligibility for women under the old age assistance program be lowered from 65 to 62.

"SEC. 2. That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 26th day of January 1961.

*"J. D. McCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Adopted by the senate the 30th day of January 1961.

*"CLEM MCSPADDEN,
President of the Senate."*

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD House Concurrent Resolution 27, which resolution was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas.

Mr. President, I have a personal interest in this resolution, in view of the fact that during the First World War I served in the Naval Reserve. My State is commanding the U.S. Navy for the formation of a Kansas centennial company honoring the 100th birthday of the State of Kansas, and commanding the U.S. Navy upon the 50th anniversary of naval aviation.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

Concurrent resolution commending the U.S. Navy for the formation of a Kansas centennial company honoring the 100th birthday of the State of Kansas and the patriotic young Kansans enlisting in the Kansas centennial company, and further commanding the U.S. Navy upon the 50th anniversary of naval aviation.

Whereas this year of our Lord nineteen-hundred and sixty-one is the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Kansas into the Union; and

Whereas the U.S. Navy has honored the great State of Kansas by forming a special Kansas centennial company of 100 select Kansas youth, to be trained as a unit under a Kansas officer and allowed to bear the flag of the great State of Kansas at all formations and official functions; and

Whereas 100 young men of Kansas have answered the call to their country's service by enlisting in the U.S. Navy as members of the Kansas centennial company, in keeping with the fine example and high tradition of many Kansans of the past and

present who have and are serving with great distinction in the naval forces to the lasting credit of the citizens of this State; and

Whereas the State of Kansas for several decades has been closely associated with naval aviation by having units of the naval air training command located within the borders of this State and having furnished a great number of young men and women for service in said forces; and

Whereas the year 1961 is the golden anniversary of naval aviation, thus warranting recognition for its service not only to the people of this State and Nation but to all peoples of the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the U.S. Navy be commended and the appreciation of the people of the State of Kansas be expressed for the Navy's recognition of the centennial anniversary of this State; be it further

Resolved, That the following members of the Kansas centennial company shall be and are hereby commended upon their voluntary entry into services of our country in the finest Kansas tradition:

James Dean Adkins, Topeka; J. C. Anderson, Kansas City, Kans.; George Hershel Bettis, Plainville; Gary Lee Bilyeu, Kansas City, Mo.; Richard Louis Bilyeu, Kansas City, Kans.; David Lee Boedeker, Natoma; Ray Carl Breedon, Topeka; Coy Dean Brown, Kansas City, Kans.

Sydney Louis Cain, Wichita; David Franklin Caldwell, Kansas City, Mo.; Stephen Charles Casey, Manhattan; J. J. Cecil, Hutchinson; J. L. Cheever, Hutchinson; Eugene Edward Clark, Jr., Wichita; Charles Lee Chancellor, Kansas City, Mo.; James Samuel Coleman, Haysville; William Clarence Cooper, Kansas City, Kans.; John Stephan Corson, Roeland Park.

Steven Lee Courier, Arkansas City; Donald Myron Cress, Mayetta; Larry Jean Cyre, Manhattan; Wayne Alan Dismeyer, Bonner Springs; Roger Lynn Dix, Kansas City, Mo.; Richard Dean Dobkins, Topeka; Robert Dale Dobkins, Topeka; Teddy Lynn Edwards, Wichita; Robert Claude Enslow, Kansas City, Mo.

Raymond Eugene Farmer, Shawnee; K. L. Feezor, Hutchinson; John William Filbert, Lansing; Ernest Wilson Fisher, Pittsburgh; A. R. Folkerts, Salina; Donald Deforest George, St. Joseph, Mo.; Rodney Irvin Green, Kansas City, Kans.; Frederick Allen Hall, Sylvia; Ronald Dean Harkness, Hays; Bobbie Eugene Haviland, Thayer; Rodney Roy Hays, Manhattan; Hector Edwin Hernandez, Parsons.

John Robert Hill, Manhattan; Merle Julius Ice, Wichita; Larry Ray Jeffries, Grandview, Mo.; George Vern Jones, Sylvia; L. D. Jones, Kansas City, Mo.; Trostle William Kalebough, Raytown, Mo.; Floyd Raymond Kannarr, Humboldt; Larry Joe Karman, Kansas City, Mo.; John Christopher Kramer, Topeka.

Raymond Leven Kramer, Atchison; Wayne Arthur Kratzer, Hutchinson; Ronald Norman Lavelle, St. John; Richard Dwayne Logsdon, Arkansas City; W. G. Long, St. Joseph, Mo.; Clifford Cornelius Lott, Bennington; Henry Patrick Malone, Jr., Kansas City, Mo.; John Robert Martin, Eflingham; Larry Dean Massey, Salina.

James Michael McDonnell, Kansas City, Mo.; Johnny Lawrence McMurtrey, Salina; David Lee Milks, Parsons; Ronald Anthony Miller, Coffeyville; Bernham LeRoy Mundy, Ottawa; A. O. Myers, Independence, Mo.; Joe Lewis Newsome, Kansas City, Kans.; Dewight Mac Norton, Holden, Mo.; William Clyde Osborn, Hutchinson; Willis Leslie Piepergerdes, St. Joseph, Mo.

Robert Lee Roy Pond, Hutchinson; Darrel Wayne Pummill, Topeka; George Smith Purcell, Marysville; Francis Ralph Rees, Wichita; James Douglas Reynolds, Bates City, Mo.;

Johnie Roy Roberts, Winfield; James Wesley Rupe, Horton; Howard Earl Saxton, Nettawaka; Floyd Hayward Shaver, Jr., Kansas City North, Mo.; Donald Max Sheldon, Ness City; S. J. Smith, Kansas City, Mo.

Gerald Walter Soeliner, Kanorado; William Henry Spiker, Jr., Willis; Leonard Lee Steinhardt, Hutchinson; James Lee Steinmetz, Valley Falls; David Ray Stonehouse, Fowler; E. H. Suhler, Hutchinson; John Ernest Swengel, Concordia; Larry Clarence Taylor, Osawatomie; G. E. Thomas, Kansas City, Kans.

Klaus Michael Thomas, Junction City; Patrick Michael Towle, Topeka; Edward Patrick Varnal, Overland Park; Everett Harold Walker, Wichita; George Washington Walton, Wellington; Clifford Lee Wesemann, Harrisonville, Mo.; L. W. Williams, Hutchinson; Jerry Francis Willis, Willis.

David Charles Wilson, Cottonwood Falls; Robert Samuel Wilson, Willis; Gerald Lynn Wisegarver, Topeka; Harvey Lee Wright, Independence, Mo.; Richard Alan Zaman, Overland Park; be it further

Resolved, That the State of Kansas extend its hearty best wishes to the U.S. Navy upon the golden anniversary of naval aviation; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, and the Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans., and each Member of the Kansas congressional delegation. That the clerk of the house of representatives forward a copy of the house journal in which this resolution is set out to each member of the Kansas centennial company.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body February 28, 1961.

ALLEN L. MITCHELL,

Speaker of the House.

G. E. ANDERSON,

Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 28, 1961.

HAROLD H. CHASE,

President of the Senate.

RALPH E. ZARKER,

Secretary of the Senate.

MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM—RESOLUTION OF STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution recently enacted by the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to carry into effect the plan of former Representative Aime J. Forand, by including medical care to the aged under the social security system.

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

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO CARRY INTO EFFECT THE PLAN OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN AIME J. FORAND BY INCLUDING MEDICAL CARE TO THE AGED UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM.

Resolved, That the general assembly of the State of Rhode Island be and it is hereby

urged to importune the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to carry into effect the plan of former Congressman Aime J. Forand by including medical care to the aged under the social security system; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to enact legislation which would carry out the purposes of this resolution.

RESOLUTION OF RENO COUNTY, KANS., FARMERS' UNION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Reno County, Kans., Farmers' Union at its meeting on the 18th of February adopted a resolution in regard to proposed farm legislation, urging that the farm program assure the farmer of his fair share of the national income.

This organization endorses the wheat stabilization program introduced and sponsored by the National Wheat Growers and other organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Whereas officers and members of the Reno County Farmers' Union are assembled this 18th day of February 1961, at Partridge, Kans.; and

Whereas the aforesaid organization has discussed effective farm programs, maintaining and improving farmer income, agreement among farm groups, and benefits of an effective farm program to all parts of our economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the assembly as a group adopt the general principles of the 1960 marketing program for wheat, supported by the National Grange, the National Farmers' Union, the National Association of Wheat Growers, and other farm groups, as offering the greatest possibilities for a farm program beneficial to wheat producers and all segments of our economy, including the consumer; and be it further

Resolved, That the group agrees to give active support to informing their respective memberships and the general public of the principles of the program and the reasons it merits their support; and be it further

Resolved, That the group agrees to inform the proper legislative bodies on a State and national level of the unity of their action on this farm program.

RESOLUTION OF CORONADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, GREAT BEND, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Coronado General Assembly of the Knights of Columbus adopted a resolution in regard to the proposed program of Federal aid for education.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

Whereas the Founding Fathers of this great Nation were the products of private education which before and for years after the birth of this Republic was the only system of education we knew.

Whereas it is about time that our people rise up, become vocal, and demand that their constitutional rights to educate their children in accordance with their religious beliefs, will not be frustrated by the NEA.

Whereas education must be for the benefit of all the children and the whole Nation.

Whereas a new program for Federal aid to education has now been introduced in Congress, which is discriminatory, unjust and unfair.

Resolved, That the Coronado General Assembly of the fourth degree Knights of Columbus in monthly meeting assembled at Ellinwood, Kans., on February 20, 1961, opposes this program of Federal aid to education now introduced in Congress; further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., relating to Federal aid to education.

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

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
CITY OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

Whereas America's education is facing a financial crisis. The tremendous increase in the number of children of school and college age has far outrun the available supply of educational facilities and qualified teachers; and

Whereas this educational crisis is deepening in the city of Buffalo as attested to by our superintendent of schools and members of the Board of Education of the City of Buffalo. As recently as the 8th of February of this year, those responsible for operating Buffalo's public school system have testified before the joint legislative committee on school financing that our city faces an educational state of emergency since present methods of financing public education have proved to be woefully inadequate; and

Whereas it is our deep conviction that our young people are our greatest resource for the future. Each of them deserves the education which will best develop his potentialities. Our teachers, our school administrators, our parents, our city administration have striven courageously to keep up with the increased challenge of education. With limited resources, private educational institutions have shouldered their share of the burden. Only the Federal Government is not doing its part; and

Whereas we believe that America can meet its educational obligations only with generous Federal financial support, within the traditional framework of local control. The assistance should take the form of Federal grants to States for educational purposes, to include classroom construction and

teachers' salaries. It should also include aid for the construction of academic facilities at universities and colleges and support for all phases of vocational education for youths and adults and for libraries and adult education.

Resolved, Therefore, that this common council does urge and memorialize, in the most emphatic of terms, the Congress of the United States to approve the program advanced by President Kennedy to solve the educational crisis, a program that incorporates the basic requisites mentioned above; and

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress from the 40th, 41st, and 42d Districts of New York; to both U.S. Senators from New York; and to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT ON FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLAR EQUIVALENTS UTILIZED BY ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Armed Services concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the committee in 1960 in connection with foreign travel.

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

The report is as follows:

Report on foreign currencies and U.S. dollar equivalents utilized by Senate Armed Services Committee, for the period Jan. 1 to May 13, 1960

[As provided by sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended]

Country	Kind of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Other		Total	
		Foreign currency	Dollar equivalent								
France	franc	40,000	80.00	122,500	245.00	247,500	495.00	230,000	460.00	640,000	1,280.00
Germany	mark	60	15.00	320	80.00	440	110.00	380	95.00	1,200	300.00
Spain	peseta	2,400	40.00	6,600	110.00	14,660	245.00	12,300	205.00	35,960	600.00
Total dollar equivalent			135.00		435.00		850.00		760.00		2,180.00

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard B. Russell:											
England	pound	18-12-4	52.13	5-13-10	15.94	1-0-0	2.80	1.14.1	4.77	27-0-3	75.64
France	franc	51.5	10.51	31.5	6.43	9	1.84			92	18.78
Italy	lira	11,050	17.80	12,650	20.37	940	1.51	4,743	7.64	29,333	47.32
Portugal	escudo	1443	50.51	585	20.48	75	2.63	20	.70	2,123	74.32
Spain	peseta	2975	49.58	2449	40.82	965	16.08	434	7.23	6,823	113.71
Turkey	lira	188.25	20.90	84	9.32	5	.55			277.25	30.77
Yugoslavia	dinar	2,715	3.62	1400	1.87	500	.67			4,615	6.16
Various	dollar				29.38		4.07		7.93		41.38
Total			205.05		144.61		30.15		28.27		408.08
Senator Prescott Bush:											
United States	dollar							390.80		10.20	401.00
Mexico	do		14.00		7.00					5.00	26.00
Guatemala	do		21.00		13.30		4.50			8.00	46.80
Panama Canal Zone	do									15.00	15.00
Puerto Rico	do		12.00		10.00					15.00	37.00
Guantanamo, Cuba	do									15.00	15.00
Total			47.00		30.30		395.30		68.20		540.80

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate—Continued

(Expenditure between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960)

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Wm. H. Darden:											
England	pound	18-15-0	52.50	5-13-2	15.84	1-0-0	2.80	1-9-7	4.14	26-17-9	75.28
France	franc	61.5	12.55	37.5	7.65	9	1.84			108	22.04
Italy	lire	10,350	16.67	12,300	19.81	940	1.51	3,275	5.27	26,865	43.26
Portugal	escudo	680	23.80	625	21.87	75	2.63	20	.70	1,400	49.00
Spain	peseta	2,382	39.72	2,245	37.42	965	16.08	444	7.40	6,037	100.62
Turkey	TL	188.25	20.90	129.50	14.38	5	.55			322.75	35.83
Yugoslavia	dinar	2,585	3.45	1,400	1.87	500	.67			4,485	5.99
Various	dollar				29.38		4.07		7.93		41.38
England	do				14.50		2.40				50.60
Total			203.29		162.72		32.55		25.44		424.00
Ben J. Giljeas:											
England	dollar				17.77						
Germany	do				20.03						
Spain	do				11.88						
France	do				19.97						
Various	do										
Total					69.65						347.20
D. F. McGillieudy:											
England	dollar				17.76						
Germany	do				20.12						
Spain	do				11.80						
France	do				19.97						
Various	do										
Total					69.65						304.65
Gordon A. Nease:											
United States	dollar										
England	do				21.83						
France	do										
Do	franc	247.90	31.38	236	48.62						
Luxembourg	do	353	12.76								
Germany	dollar				30.84						
Do	deutsche mark										
Total					116.81						478.24
T. E. Braswell:											
England	dollar				41.40						
France	do				26.30						
Denmark	do				15.61						
Germany	do				6.00						
Spain	do				23.55						
United States	do										
Total					112.86						816.76
Grand total					824.31						3,319.73

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds: Government department:	\$887.81
Army	S29.95
Air Force	1,601.97
Total	3,319.73

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

Committee on Armed Services, Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1209. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States to assist in the provision of facilities and services for the day care of children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 1210. A bill to amend paragraph 1102 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the cashmere goat; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1211. A bill to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1212. A bill to promote the redevelopment of economically depressed areas by establishing a Government corporation which will provide a secondary market for industrial mortgages covering property in those areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1213. A bill for the relief of Harlan D. Conkey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to treat as income derived from sources within the United States premiums for reinsurance received by certain foreign life insurance companies from life insurance companies subject to the U.S. income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) (by request):

S. 1215. A bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1216. A bill for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec; and

S. 1217. A bill for the relief of Purificacion Siat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1218. A bill for the relief of Marcelino Ormaechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1219. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Mouratidis; and

S. 1220. A bill increasing the penalty for the imparting of false information relative to an attempt or alleged attempt to destroy aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1221. A bill to regulate eavesdropping, and for other purposes; 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. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1222. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1223. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to define more specifically certain of the benefits which may be provided under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title;

S. 1224. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; and

S. 1225. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to assure freedom of choice of physicians and other providers of medical services by individuals who are recipients of assistance under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1226. A bill to increase the college housing loan authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1227. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize the granting of national defense scholarships; and

S. 1228. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend for 5 years the assistance provided under the provisions of such act, and to make certain changes in such provisions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1229. A bill to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance, and the provision of such assistance, to repatriate American nationals without available resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. BEALL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. MUSKIE):

S. 1230. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1231. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of the Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N.J.; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1232. A bill to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1233. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1234. A bill for the relief of Max Halcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1235. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for trial and appellate divisions in the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 1236. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Scaccia; and

S. 1237. A bill for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow as a tax deduction tuition and fees paid for college education; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1239. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Needles National Recreation Area, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 1240. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the 1962 Girl Scouts Senior Roundup encampment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1241. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1242. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1243. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers for the purpose of refinancing outstanding indebtedness, to purchase machinery and equipment, and to broaden use of the disaster loan revolving fund; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1244. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clay Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1245. A bill to amend title IV ("Housing for Educational Institutions") of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MILLER):

S. 1246. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. HART:

S. 1247. A bill to clarify the application of the antitrust laws to certain contracts and agreements entered into by State alcoholic beverage agencies with suppliers of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ESTABLISHMENT OF DATE FOR ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. McGEE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. PROXIMIRE, Mr. DODD, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) to establish a date for adjournment of Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

IMPROVED PROGRAM OF FEDERAL AID FOR DAY CARE SERVICES FOR CERTAIN CHILDREN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a program of Federal aid to improve day care services for children of working mothers. The bill would make available \$12.5 million a year in Federal funds to States, on a matching basis, to step up the day care program.

The lack of adequate day care centers for children of working mothers has become a national problem. Federal aid is urgently required to stimulate State and local efforts and to buttress the valuable voluntary programs now in effect.

Day care is an essential part of the total community approach to the juvenile delinquency problem. The Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor has reported that last year, 23 million women were in the labor force of the country, more than three-fifths

of whom—61 percent—were married. In the years 1949 to 1958, the number of mothers with children under 12 increased about 20 percent in the total population—from 17.3 to 20.8 million. It is estimated that today more than 7 million children in the United States under the age of 12 have mothers who work outside the home.

Where trained adult supervision is not available, young children are exposed to influences which lead to juvenile delinquency. In spite of community efforts in hundreds of cities, the quantity of day care services is insufficient and the quality often substandard.

The bill has been endorsed by the Day Care Council of New York, Inc., a voluntary group that has pioneered in the improvement of day care services; and the National Committee for the Day Care of Children.

Under terms of the bill, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be responsible for administering the program through its Children's Bureau.

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

The bill (S. 1209) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States to assist in the provision of facilities and services for the day care of children, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO DUTIES ON HAIR OF CASHMERE GOAT

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and myself, a bill to amend paragraph 1102 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the Cashmere goat.

I introduced a similar bill during the closing hours of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, so that departmental reports could be made before the 87th Congress convened. The then Senator Kennedy cosponsored the measure. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the remarks I made at that time, which are still pertinent, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this place in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1210) to amend paragraph 1102 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the Cashmere goat, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The remarks presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL are as follows:

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the trade agreement between the United States and Iran came to an end last Friday. This agreement had been in existence since 1943.

This unfortunate termination has had the effect of increasing by 16 cents per pound the tariff on raw cashmere, and this has had a disastrous effect upon the domestic cashmere industry, most of it centered in Massachusetts.

The continued importation of cashmere at the old rate is necessary for our domestic cashmere industry, and it is in the best interests of consumers in the United States. For those reasons, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to restore the old tariffs, and request that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I realize that any action on this proposed legislation is impossible at this session, but I introduce it now so that Department reports on it can be requested promptly. Introduction today also serves the useful purpose of reassuring our domestic industry of our awareness of this serious problem.

I ask that the cashmere tariff be restored to the level at which it stood for 17 years for the following reasons:

First. The increased duty will have an adverse effect on the market for cashmere in the United States, and can be expected to injure the entire cashmere industry in this country.

Second. A substantial part of the world's cashmere is produced in areas under Communist domination. These sources of supply are closed off to our domestic industry by the foreign assets control program. It is unfair that our U.S. industry be further penalized by an increase in the tariff on the cashmere that is still available to it.

Third. The American manufacturer, injured now by the increase in the tariff on his raw material, is further injured by having no added tariff protection on the manufactured products containing cashmere against which the U.S. producer has to compete. The new high tariff prevents him from securing his raw material on fair terms; but low tariffs on completed cashmere sweaters, for instance, permit foreign imports to swamp the domestic industry. Our domestic manufacturers ask for no unfair protection; they ask only for a fair chance to compete.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Departments of State and Commerce have recommended passage of the bill and the Departments of Labor and Agriculture have advised that they have no objection to its passage. Representatives MARTIN and McCORMACK have already filed the identical legislation in the House of Representatives.

Let me reiterate, Mr. President, that this bill would restore the duty of the hair of the Cashmere goat to the level at which it existed for 17 years until it was increased as an unfortunate result of the termination of the United States-Iran trade agreement last summer. The trade agreement was terminated for the sole reason of assisting Iran in solving her balance of payments problem. The cashmere duty had nothing to do with the decision to terminate the agreement.

MODIFICATION OF LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], a bill to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to reduce the local contribution otherwise required for a flood control project whenever he determines that the project should be constructed without delay because of unusual danger to life and property, if the project is located within a labor surplus area as determined by the Secretary of Labor under certain specified conditions.

The proposal, Mr. President, would bring into a more logical and helpful relationship the economic effect of such Federal public works programs as flood control projects and the needs and resources of areas suffering from chronic unemployment.

Representative HASTINGS KEITH of the Massachusetts Ninth District has filed this proposed legislation in the House of Representatives, and we are happy to introduce the companion bill.

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

The bill (S. 1211) to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

MR. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is designed to put a stop to one type of tax haven abuse. This bill will, if enacted, remove the tax incentive which has been the main force behind a type of reinsurance racket which has sprung up in the last 2 years. There is, of course, a legitimate reinsurance business and I would not for one moment wish to cast any reflection on, or in any way impede the orderly conduct of, the legitimate, proper and worthwhile operation of reinsurance through such foreign companies as Lloyd's of London.

The reinsurance operation I would like to stop is one, but only one, illustration of the way in which tax havens are used so as to avoid payment of taxes. I shall, later in my remarks, describe this type of operation as well as other types of tax haven abuses which also warrant corrective action.

President Kennedy has very wisely and properly called for an end to tax haven abuses. In his message to the Congress on balance of payments and gold, on February 6, 1961, the President said:

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.

The bill I have now introduced will carry out a part of President Kennedy's recommendation, although I do not imply that this bill is an administration measure.

There are two general types of tax haven abuses, or more properly, perhaps, abuses connected with the use of tax havens. The first type covers those schemes which are used, and there are several, to transfer income and profits which arise from business conducted in

the United States from the coverage of U.S. taxation and into the tax haven untaxed. The second type of abuses centers around the uses to which these untaxed funds are put once they get into the tax haven.

We are getting to know a little more about tax haven abuses. Unfortunately, those who use tax havens learn new wrinkles faster than those who should be interested in stopping abuses get around to taking action on the old ones. The bill which I have just now introduced operates in only one small area. I hope to introduce other measures to stop other types of abuse in the near future.

It should be noted at this point that administrative action can cure many of the abuses and stop many of the actions which I shall describe. Administrative action was not always vigorously pursued in the interest of the average taxpayer during the past 8 years. We have been promised more vigor in this respect. I hope for, and expect, it.

The Internal Revenue Service has available the provisions of section 482 of the code. This section provides for the allocation of income between or among taxpayers if two or more businesses are controlled by the same interests, and such allocation is necessary in order to prevent evasion of taxes. Of course, it is sometimes difficult to obtain the information upon which to act.

Section 316 of the code provides for constructive dividend treatment of certain payments or distributions. This also may be useful in certain instances if all the information surrounding transactions is at hand.

Administrative action can accomplish much. At the same time, administrative vigor does not excuse any lack of initiative on the part of the President or of the Congress in passing proper legislation when the need for legislation is demonstrated, as is clearly the case in many instances.

Before discussing operational details, it might be well to say a word about tax havens and to identify some of the more frequently used countries.

Several countries which have low or nonexistent income tax structures, governmental stability, and convertibility of currency can be used as tax havens. There are about 20 countries which have the requisite tax structure, but many of them do not have the other desirable characteristics.

The most popular tax havens for American "tax avoiders" appear to be the Bahamas, Panama, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Liberia, Bermuda, the Netherlands Antilles, and Venezuela. There are others which are used to some extent.

It is extremely difficult to get information about the operations of companies controlled by American interests in some of these places. It is often not even possible to get a list of companies doing business in these countries.

The Bureau of Foreign Commerce of the Department of Commerce from time to time publishes lists of American firms, subsidiaries and affiliates doing business in various foreign countries. There is a

list for Switzerland which is out of date but which shows over 300 companies. According to recent reports, about 400 American-controlled companies are now located, or have a so-called business identity, in Switzerland. There is a list for Panama which shows something less than 200 firms. I am sure there are more. There is a list of foreign companies operating in Liberia which shows more Lebanese than American companies.

There is no list available for the Netherlands Antilles. There is no list available for Bermuda, although one is scheduled for publication in April. There is no list available for Liechtenstein.

I would not for one moment want anyone to think that I am criticizing the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. Here is what they are up against. The basic information on these foreign operations must come from our officials on the spot, usually the consul, consul general, commercial attaché or some other Foreign Service official of our Government stationed in the foreign country concerned.

Here is the response of the American consulate general in Zurich to the request of the Department of Commerce for a list of firms operating in Liechtenstein having American connections:

We doubt if we will be able to compile the list since the Liechtenstein Commercial Registry Office tells us it has no way of knowing which firms registered in that country are American. We are trying to gather this information through private channels, but do not expect this approach will prove particularly successful.

Incidentally, the request of the Department of Commerce was dated August 31, 1959. The dispatch containing the above enlightenment was dated February 10, 1960.

I hope this attitude, disinterest and lack of vigor and initiative is not typical of our representatives overseas.

For the information of the consulate general in Zurich, here are the names of four American-owned so-called reinsurance companies now doing business in Liechtenstein for the purpose of tax dodging:

The First Reinsurance Corp., owned by the First Security Investment Corp. of Salt Lake City.

The Falcon Reinsurance Corp., owned by the Dixie Finance Co. of Georgia.

Intermountain Reinsurance Co., owned by Motors Acceptance Corp. of Nevada—not GMAC.

Ambank Reinsurance Co., owned by American Bankers Insurance Co. of Florida.

Tax dodging is flourishing in the Bahamas. The Department of Commerce has furnished me with the following report, the latest they have received from the Foreign Service, dated January 1960, on the situation in the Bahamas:

A large number of American firms have recently incorporated in the Bahamas for tax avoidance purposes. The majority of these firms do not establish full scale office operations but operate through a local agent. Generally, they use a different name than that of the parent firm, thus increasing the difficulty of identifying the firm as a U.S.

subsidiary. Moreover, they often prefer not to publicize their presence or the nature of their business activities in the Bahamas and generally do not wish to be considered subsidiaries of U.S. firms but rather as independent entities.

Some firms have established full scale office operations in the Bahamas, but these are usually confined to handling the bookkeeping functions of the oversea activities of the parent firm. However, they may on occasion act as sales or buying agents for the parent firm.

This is interesting and reveals what difficulties our enforcement officers are up against when information of this type is all that is available. It may be recalled that last year I introduced two amendments which were adopted and which require more reporting of this sort of information by American companies and individuals. This will help some. We shall see how helpful this additional reporting will be to enforcement agencies.

As I said in the beginning, there are two general types of abuses. The first centers around getting profits or income out of the country and into the tax haven without paying U.S. taxes on these profits. There are many schemes, but I would like to call attention to three.

First, and one of the most notorious, is the reinsurance scheme. Here is how it works. The profit on credit life insurance is extremely high, often amounting to more than 50 percent of the premium charged. After credit life insurance began to be written extensively, the lending institutions began to realize that the insurance companies were making this unconscionable profit from business which was controlled by the finance companies. The finance companies then looked for a way to participate in these profits. Some of them organized their own insurance companies. One company, whose annual statement I happen to have, has six subsidiary insurance companies of one kind or another. There is no indication whether any of these companies are foreign or domestic or which are reinsurance subsidiaries.

Other finance companies and lenders continued to deal with outside insurance companies, but some, it is reported, had these outside companies reinsure, as a form of kickback, through a dummy corporation owned by the lending institution.

With the passage of the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959, the credit life insurance companies had to begin paying appreciable income taxes for the first time. Some companies then began to cast about for a way to avoid or escape taxation.

A device was worked out, whereby a reinsurance company, in some cases a subsidiary of the domestic insurance company and in others a subsidiary of the lending institution, was established in a tax haven country. Credit life insurance was then written by the domestic insurance company, often an independent company not owned by the finance company, and this business would then be reinsured in the dummy tax haven company, sometimes actually owned by the finance company. This transferred most of the profit, really in

the form of a kickback to the finance company, out of the United States and into a foreign tax haven in such a way as to escape U.S. taxation almost altogether.

This type of kickback, in my opinion, is a sharp, if not unethical, practice. Premiums on credit life insurance should be adjusted to a level where such a kickback is not profitable. But this is not the immediate question before us now.

Some of these foreign operations are modest. Some are quite extensive. Without giving exact figures, I would venture to guess that such a company as Allstate Insurance Co., which owns an insurance subsidiary in Zurich, Altstadt Versicherungs AG, does a rather large business. Once this money gets out of the United States, many uses can be found for it.

Let us now look at another way of getting money out of the United States tax free.

One device which is becoming ever more popular is the establishment of a trading company in the Bahamas. It is a very simple matter to set up such an organization and costs only about \$550. One may start small. In fact, a well known CPA who consults and advises in this field states that you should "have a desk in some office at first rather than an office of your own, and a part-time girl to handle all the clerical work, invoices, and so on."

So, with the outlay of capital of \$550, the rental of desk space and the hiring of a part-time girl and a traveling salesman, you are in business. The salesman takes an order on behalf of the Bahamas dummy corporation. The manufacturer in the United States, who owns this dummy corporation, then sells the machinery to the Bahamas company, which in turn sells it to the foreign customer. The prices can be adjusted so that the manufacturer in the United States shows little profit on the transaction, most of the profit winding up in the dummy corporation in the Bahamas, with no U.S. tax ever having been paid on this profit.

Still a third scheme designed to get profits outside the blanket of the U.S. tax is to set up a purchasing company in, let us say, Panama.

This purchasing company may be owned by a large retail grocery chain in the United States, or a large food processor. The dummy purchasing company will purchase sugar, coffee, and other food and fiber products outside the United States at world market prices. This company will then mark up the prices when it resells the products to its parent U.S. corporation. The profit which the U.S. company would otherwise make on its final sales is thus reduced, and the real profit on the total transaction remains, to a large extent, in Panama, never having been taxed by the United States, though the profits are in reality earned in the United States.

These are but examples of schemes that are legion. In my opinion, all such maneuvers and devices constitute abuses. Perhaps some can be stopped by administrative action. Some attempts at correction would result in

long-drawn-out litigation. In many cases, the details are hard to unearth. So, a comprehensive correction will require legislation.

So much for schemes for getting money out of the United States tax free.

Of course, getting profits out of the United States is not an objective or an end in itself. But once these profits are in a tax haven, as one expert in the field put it:

The possibilities are endless for pyramiding tax-deferred profits with the Bahamas as a base of operations.

I do not want to boost the Bahamas too much. Some experts are partial to Panama, the Netherlands Antilles, Switzerland, or some other country. Each haven seems to have its own particular rooting section.

What, then, are some of the abuses connected with tax havens, once the money is there tax free? The possibilities are truly endless, but here are a few.

We often hear tax haven schemes referred to as plans for tax deferral. This is entirely misleading. A large portion of these funds never return to the United States, or if they do return, come back in a form which allows them some tax advantages.

Let us go back to our finance company which has a subsidiary, a so-called reinsurance company in a tax haven. When this company has accumulated sufficient funds the owners can move in several directions. They may decide to organize a finance company in some foreign country. In this case, the original capital may never be repatriated, and thus never be taxed by the United States.

There may be a decision to go into real estate development. In this case, the hotel or apartment house will be constructed, purchased or developed with this tax-free money, and this original capital may never be repatriated and taxed.

Foreign real estate, let us remember, is completely exempt, in the hands of individuals, from U.S. estate tax.

The owners of the corporation may decide to go into manufacturing. In this case, the tax-free capital which has been accumulated will go into buildings and machinery and may never come back to the United States to be taxed.

I hope my point is clear. Those who speak of tax haven operations merely in terms of tax deferral, that is, postponement of a tax which the United States will get in due time, are simply not giving the full facts.

There are other ways to use this tax-free, tax haven based money. In some instances, the tax haven subsidiary will make a loan to the parent U.S. company. This gives the parent corporation the use of the tax-free profits for an indefinite period. The IRS has, of course, frowned on this sort of arrangement, and, at least in some cases, when threatened with taxation for such an arrangement the parent U.S. corporation merely puts some of its debentures on the market at a ridiculously low yield, and it just so happens that the only one willing to purchase the debentures is its

own, foreign tax haven based, tax-free financed subsidiary.

One other approach is to build up the net worth of the parent U.S. corporation so the parent corporation can show a better balance sheet. This enables the U.S. corporation to borrow at lower interest rates and in larger amounts from banks or other legitimate lending institutions here at home or abroad. Perhaps this would not be classified as an abuse by some, but it does at least enhance the deferral benefits. Deferral begins to stretch out into generations instead of years.

Still another abuse connected with tax havens, after the tax-free funds have been gotten out of the country, revolves around schemes to convert ordinary income into capital gains or some other form of income taxable under our rather loophole-ridden code at lower than ordinary income rates.

One very simple means of accomplishing this is to build up the assets of one of these foreign corporations with tax-free funds, then collapse the corporation and bring the funds home to be taxed at the capital gains rate.

Heretofore, the manipulations in this area have been legion. In a great many instances a holding company has been set up in a tax haven country which, in turn, owns or controls various types of operating companies scattered around the world. Funds are shuffled about indiscriminately and the Internal Revenue Service has been unable to keep up with these manipulations.

As I said on one occasion last year, these manipulations remind me of nothing so much as the old shell game by means of which the carnival prestidigitator bilks the local folk out of their hard earned money. In this case, the U.S. Treasury is being bilked, and I do not intend to see this continued if I can help it.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill, S. 749, which, if adopted, would put a stop to all these abuses. That bill, however, constitutes a far-reaching departure from existing tax law with respect to legitimate foreign operations as well as these manipulations which constitute unquestioned abuse. While an overall approach, such as that in S. 749, is being studied, then, it is entirely appropriate to move to correct these individual abuses when they can be identified. The bill I have introduced today will correct the reinsurance abuse. I am working on other approaches to take care of other abuses, and am hopeful of arriving at some partial solutions.

I shall request the chairman of the Finance Committee to hold a hearing on this bill so that the Senate may be able to act on it by way of amendment when an appropriate measure comes over from the House.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a brief technical explanation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1214) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to treat as income derived from sources within the United States premiums for reinsurance received by certain foreign life insurance companies from life insurance companies subject to U.S. income tax, introduced by Mr. GORE, 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 section 861(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gross income from sources within the United States) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

(7) Certain premiums for reinsurance ceded.—Premiums or other consideration arising out of reinsurance ceded paid by a life insurance company (as defined in sec. 801(a)), including a foreign life insurance company taxable under part I of subchapter L of this chapter, if such premiums or other consideration are paid to a foreign life insurance company which—

(A) is not taxable under part I of subchapter L of this chapter, and

(B) is controlled (within the meaning of section 304(c)) by a domestic corporation."

Sec. 2. Section 861(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on foreign corporations not engaged in business in the United States) is amended by inserting after "premiums" the following: "(including premiums or other consideration arising out of reinsurance ceded described in section 861(a) (7))."

Sec. 3. Section 1442 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to withholding of tax on foreign corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this section, the term 'premiums', as used in section 1441(b), includes premiums or other consideration arising out of reinsurance ceded described in section 861(a) (7)."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The technical explanation presented by Mr. GORE is as follows:

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

Section 1 of the bill amends section 861(a) of the code, which defines gross income. The effect of this amendment is to include in gross income reinsurance premiums paid to foreign life insurance companies which are controlled by American corporations of any type.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 861(a) of the code. This section of the code imposes a 30-percent tax on foreign corporations not engaged in business in the United States. Section 2 of this bill specifies that "premiums," as defined in section 861(a), include reinsurance premiums paid to foreign life insurance companies controlled by U.S. corporations of any type.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 1442 of the code so as to provide for the withholding of the 30-percent tax on gross premiums paid for reinsurance purposes to foreign life insurance companies controlled by American corporations of any type.

Section 4 of the bill, in accordance with the principle of nonretroactivity, specifies that the amendments made shall apply to taxable years beginning in 1962 (the taxable year for all life insurance companies begins on January 1).

The net effect of the bill is to impose a tax of 30 percent and provide for withholding of tax, on the gross premium paid for

reinsurance to a foreign life insurance company which is controlled by an American corporation of any type.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, by request, and for Senator AIKEN the President's bill to amend the Battle Act, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

This bill is the same as S. 1697 which passed the Senate on September 12, 1959. Senators will recall that S. 1697 had been introduced by Senator Kennedy and Senator AIKEN.

This bill is also the same as the bill which was sent to the Senate on January 13, 1961, by Secretary of State Herter.

The fact that I am introducing this bill by request does not mean that I have some doubt about it. I have consistently followed the principle, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that I should introduce by request all bills which have originated in the executive branch.

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

In order that the Senate may have additional background information on the bill and have available the policy considerations which led the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1959 to recommend the bill to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the committee report on the previous identical bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, 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 section 102 of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U.S.C. 1611a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. Responsibility for giving effect to the purposes of this Act shall be vested in the Secretary of State or such other officer as the President may designate, hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator'."

Sec. 2. Section 303 of title III of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U.S.C. 1613b) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. (a) This Act shall not be deemed to prohibit furnishing economic and financial assistance to any nation or area, except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist-held areas of the Far East, whenever the President determines that such assistance is important to the security of the United States: *Provided*, That, after termination of assistance to any nation as provided in sections 103(b) and 203 of this Act, assistance shall be resumed to such nation only in accordance with section 104 of this Act. The President shall immediately report any determination made pursuant to

this subsection with reasons therefor to the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(b) The Administrator may, notwithstanding the requirements of the first proviso of section 103(b) of this Act, direct the continuance of assistance to a country which knowingly permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials to any nation or area receiving economic or financial assistance pursuant to a determination made under section 303(a) of this Act."

The portion of the report presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1697) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, reports S. 1697 favorably and recommends that it pass.

1. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 1697 would amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (the so-called Battle Act) to strengthen U.S. policy toward the Communist bloc and to encourage and help Soviet-dominated countries to loosen their bonds by making it legally possible to furnish economic and financial assistance (not military aid) to any nation or area, except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist-held areas of the Far East whenever the President determines that such assistance is important to the security of the United States.

2. BACKGROUND

S. 1697 was introduced on April 15, 1959, by Senator Kennedy and Senator AIKEN. It had been submitted to the Senate by the Acting Secretary of State on April 7 and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The present bill is similar in intent to the so-called Kennedy amendment to the Battle Act which was contained in the proposed Mutual Security Act of 1958 as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations and was rejected on June 5, 1958, by a vote of 43 yeas to 42 nays.

The administration supported the Kennedy amendment last year until shortly before it was brought to a vote. During the debate, the minority leader, Senator Knowland, stated that the administration favored a bill to amend the Battle Act separate from the mutual security bill.

There are several differences, but not ones of substance, between S. 1697 and the Kennedy amendment of last year. S. 1697 amends section 102 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, to permit the President to assign responsibility for administering the act to the Secretary of State or such other officer as the President may designate. This is an administrative change recommended by the Department of State, and merely provides legal recognition of the existing situation.

The definition of those nations which cannot be given economic and financial assistance under the act has been altered from "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Communist China, and North Korea," contained in the 1958 amendment to "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist-held areas of the Far East" in S. 1697.

Finally, S. 1697 authorizes the President to furnish economic and financial assistance to any area or nation except those categorically denied aid, as mentioned above, if he determines that such assistance "is important to the security of the United States." The 1958 amendment had stated three very broad criteria which would guide the President in his determination as to whether assistance to a nation would "strengthen the security of the United States."

In view of the extensive consideration given to this subject last year the committee considered S. 1697 in executive session on June 10, 1959, and ordered the bill favorably reported.

3. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act became law on October 26, 1951. It has never been amended. While there had been considerable sentiment for such a law before 1951, the immediate stimulus for this legislation came from the Korean war and the circumstances surrounding it. At a time when the United States was engaged in military conflict with Communist countries, there was strong feeling against trading between our allies and such countries in any items which might have a strategic value.

The Battle Act was an important defensive measure intended to deny supplies to our military opponents. Since items shipped to any nation under the influence of the Soviet Union could eventually be of some military use to our opponents, the Battle Act made no distinction among the countries in the Communist bloc.

Indeed, in 1951, the worst of the Stalinist period, this division of the world into two absolute categories—those nations under the domination of the Soviet Union and those not—may well have reflected the prevailing situation.

There have been a number of significant developments in the last 8 years, however, which have had a fragmenting effect upon the monolithic facade of the Communist bloc. Communist China has emerged as a significant power within the bloc. The explosion in Hungary in the fall of 1956, when the Soviet Union had to employ its military forces to put down a spontaneous popular rebellion against its rule, clearly demonstrated the ineffectiveness of Communist indoctrination among the people of Eastern Europe and manifested a deep national resentment against alien rule. The hostility of the Polish people toward the Soviet Union which resulted in the Gomulka regime in 1956 was also a manifestation of fissures in the bloc. While under Gomulka, Poland has followed a more independent course than other Eastern European countries, the regime is no less a Communist one. Moscow has apparently been unable to wipe out many features in Poland which it must find very annoying.

On the basis of the history of the past 8 years, it is clear that there is not a sameness, a oneness about every Communist country. Popular feelings, national pride, economic considerations, geographic location, the degree of ideological indoctrination, and the extent of contact with the West are some of the factors that differentiate the various Communist nations.

Today, as in 1951, the Battle Act is still a necessary defensive measure to deny strategic items to the Communist bloc. In its present form, however, it unduly restricts the ability of the United States to take useful actions in the complex struggle with world communism. The Soviet Union has many problems in keeping the bloc together; but, at present it need not worry seriously that the United States will compound them by offering assistance to any nation wanting to loosen its bonds with Moscow. At a time when the West is vitally concerned about Soviet efforts to economically penetrate nations in the free world, the Battle Act, in its present form, deprives our foreign policy of this important economic weapon.

The United States is spending large sums of money to make contact (indirectly) with the peoples of Eastern Europe by, for example, our overseas information program. However, the Government is legally unable (except for the limited avenue open to the President through his extraordinary powers

under the Mutual Security Act of 1954) to employ economic assistance, a potentially fruitful means of influencing developments within the Soviet bloc.

As an argument against this amendment, it has been asserted that by granting assistance to a country governed by a Communist regime we shall only aid that regime and discourage the non-Communist population. This is a double-edged argument, for it is most probable that in certain circumstances, the absence of support from the free world in a nation's attempt to loosen its bonds from Moscow would convince the people of the futility of the effort. Aid to Communist satellites in many circumstances is inappropriate, but it is a vital requisite of our foreign policy that the President be in a position to assist a nation in its efforts to gain political, economic, and social freedom when such assistance is important to the security of the United States. As evidenced by the Hungarian rebellion of 1956, events can move rapidly in the Communist bloc, and the United States must be prepared to take appropriate action.

4. WHAT THE BILL DOES

This bill provides no money for assistance to any nation, nor does it direct or urge the President to provide aid to any nation. It simply makes a change in the Battle Act allowing the President to extend economic and financial assistance to certain Communist satellite nations if he deems it important to the national security. In no case does it allow the furnishing of military equipment.

Section 303 of the act is amended to provide, in subsection (a), that when the President determines that economic or financial assistance to any nation or area, except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist-held areas of the Far East, is important to the security of the United States, the other provisions of the Battle Act shall not be a bar to such assistance. The amendment requires the President to report immediately any determination made pursuant to this new subsection to appropriate committees of the Congress.

New section 303(b) deals with the treatment to be accorded nations of the free world which trade with nations receiving economic or financial assistance from the United States pursuant to subsection 303(a) discussed above. Under existing law all military, economic, or financial assistance to a free nation must be cut off if it makes shipments of items of strategic significance—other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials—to nations under the domination of the Soviet Union; provided that the President can continue assistance to free nations under such circumstances if he determines that cessation of aid to such free nations would be detrimental to the security of the United States. New section 303(b) would permit the Administrator of the Battle Act to make a similar determination in the case of shipments by free nations of strategic items—other than arms, ammunitions, implements of war, and atomic energy materials—to any nation receiving economic or financial assistance pursuant to subsection (a). The committee expects that the Administrator will report to appropriate committees of Congress when he takes such action.

The committee is, of course, aware of the fact that some assistance has been extended to Poland through the President's use of his special authority under section 451 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. However, the restrictions and limitations on the type of aid and the methods of providing it have hindered its most effective use. This amendment to the Battle Act would permit a rapid and flexible application of assistance, such as through Export-Import Bank loans or loans of local currency pro-

ceeds from sales of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480, whenever an opportune situation arose. It would also have a beneficial psychological effect on any nation which desires to gain more independence and freedom, for it would know that the U.S. Government was in a legal position to help out.

5. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The committee is fully aware of the importance of the policy change which underlies the proposed amendment to the Battle Act. It believes that any risks involved in the enactment of this bill will be far outweighed by the opportunities it opens to assist Communist-dominated nations peacefully to gain greater independence of action. The committee urges the approval of the bill by the Senate.

PENALTY FOR GIVING FALSE INFORMATION RELATIVE TO ALLEGED DESTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for the past several years I have been disturbed by the growing number of false bomb reports on aircraft.

This problem has vexed the aircraft industry for some years, but instead of improving the situation is apparently worsening.

In both the 85th and 86th Congresses I introduced bills which would have increased to a felony the charge against one who is guilty of a bomb hoax on the theory that a more severe penalty would be an added deterrent to those who would otherwise perpetrate such a hoax.

I am very happy to learn that the present administration is also of the view that the existing penalty is not sufficiently severe.

Yesterday the Attorney General announced that he was of the opinion that those who willfully perpetrate a bomb hoax should be subjected to a felony charge and punished accordingly.

He felt, however, that there should be some distinction between the willful actor and the jokester who merely makes a chance remark to a stewardess as often happens. I quite agree. Therefore, I have redrafted my bill with that in mind and desire to introduce it now.

My bill, as now written, will make the mere imparting of false information relative to an attempt or alleged attempt to destroy aircraft a misdemeanor with a maximum penalty presently provided in the law of \$1,000 fine or 1 year or both.

The violator who acts willfully would be liable to a felony prosecution with maximum penalties of \$5,000 fine or 5 years in jail or both.

Mr. President, I am indeed happy that the administration agrees with me that an increase in penalty is imperative. I hope the committee will give early attention to my bill.

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

The bill (S. 1220) increasing the penalty for the imparting of false information relative to an attempt or alleged attempt to destroy aircraft, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF EAVESDROPPING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in a significant decision in the field of eavesdropping, the Supreme Court held yesterday that it is unconstitutional for the police to use a spike mike to listen in on a conversation. In a previous case, the Court has held that no constitutional rights were affected by the use of a detectaphone for this same purpose. In the Court's view, the critical factor in such cases is whether the listening device physically intrudes onto the premises involved.

I do not care to appear to be critical of the Court's opinion, because I fully appreciate the difficulties which confront any effort to shape a rational approach to the subject of eavesdropping. But as a legislator, I have the definite view that the problems raised by these new and incredible electronic listening devices are not going to be satisfactorily resolved on the basis of old common law concepts of trespass. A citizen's right of privacy is invaded to the same degree, in my opinion, whether the invading object is placed against a party wall—which has been held to be legal—or is protruded a fraction of an inch into the citizen's premises—which yesterday's decision says is illegal.

It is just as unwise to permit the use of detectaphones without any restraints whatever, as it is to prohibit the use of spike mikes without any exceptions whatever. Armed with a search warrant, the police can invade a citizen's home for evidence of crime and can even empty the subjects pants pockets if necessary. A man's conversations, if there is probable cause to believe they will provide evidence of a crime, are entitled to no more or less sanctity.

My position is that all forms of electronic eavesdropping are comparable to searches and seizures and should be subjected to controls similar to those applicable to other searches and seizures under the fourth amendment. Basically, this requires the supervision of such activities by a court with the power to issue or deny search warrants.

My own State of New York has been a pioneer in efforts to modernize the criminal laws to cope with the problems of eavesdropping. This is one area in which there has been a huge gap on the Federal level. The unrealistic distinctions of the Court are the direct result of Congress' own neglect of this problem which is now fully upon us.

I am today introducing a comprehensive Federal eavesdropping bill designed to close this gap. I do not contend that this bill represents a final solution to the problem, but I offer it in an effort to spur consideration of the subject. The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has compiled excellent material on this problem. I hope that it will soon be able to give attention to specific legislative proposals, such as this one I offer today.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to regulate eavesdropping, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point 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. 1221), to regulate eavesdropping, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING, 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 part I of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding thereto a new chapter:

CHAPTER 28—EAVESDROPPING

“Sec.

“570. Definitions.

“571. Eavesdropping prohibited.

“572. Possession of eavesdropping instruments.

“573. Ex parte order for eavesdropping.

“574. Admissibility of evidence.

“575. Exceptions.

“576. Duty to report violations.

“570. Definitions

“As used in this chapter—

“(1) ‘Eavesdropping’ refers to a situation in which a person—

“(a) not a sender or receiver of a telephone or telegraph communication willfully and by means of instrument overhears or records a telephone or telegraph communication, or aids, authorizes, employs, procures or permits another to do so, without the consent of either a sender or receiver thereof; or

“(b) not present during a conversation or discussion willfully and by means of instrument overhears or records such conversation or discussion, or aids, authorizes, employs, procures or permits another to do so, without the consent of the party to such conversation or discussion; or

“(c) who, not a member of a jury, records or listens to by means of instrument the deliberations of a jury or who aids, authorizes, employs, procures or permits another to do so.

“(2) ‘Person’ means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association including the subscriber to any telephone or telegraph service involved but excluding any law enforcement officer while acting lawfully and in his official capacity in the investigation, detection, or prosecution of crime.

“(3) ‘Instrument’ means any device, contrivance, machine, or apparatus or part thereof designed or used for acoustical detection including but not limited to wiretapping equipment, microphones, detectaphones, spike mikes, dictaphones, radio transmitters, and recorders.

“571. Eavesdropping prohibited

“A person who engages in eavesdropping—

“(1) in the District of Columbia or any territory or possession of the United States; or

“(2) for the purpose of aiding or abetting or perpetrating any Federal offense; or

“(3) where the conversation, discussion, or communication overheard or recorded is by wire or radio; or

“(4) for the purpose of obtaining information concerning any activity under Federal regulation; or

“(5) where the information overheard or recorded is to be transmitted in interstate commerce or outside the United States; or

“(6) where the instrument employed to overhear or record the conversation, discussion, or communication utilizes or involves facilities in interstate or foreign commerce, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year and a day, or both.

“572. Possession of eavesdropping instruments

“A person who has in his possession any eavesdropping instrument under circumstances evincing an intent to use or employ or allow the same to be used or employed for unlawful eavesdropping under section 571 of this chapter, or knowing the same to be so used, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

“573. Ex parte order for eavesdropping

“(1) An ex parte order for eavesdropping may be issued by any judge of any United States Court of Appeals or a United States District Court or any judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or any Commissioner of the United States, upon oath or affirmation of an authorized agent of any Federal law enforcement agency that there is reasonable ground to believe that evidence of Federal crime may be thus obtained and particularly describing the person or persons whose communications, conversations, or discussions are to be overheard or recorded and the purpose thereof, and, in the case of a telegraphic or telephonic communication identifying the particular telephone number or telegraph line involved. In connection with the issuance of such an order the judge may examine on oath the applicant and any other witness he may produce and shall satisfy himself of the existence of reasonable grounds for the granting of such application. Any such order shall be effective for the time specified therein but not for a period of more than two months unless extended or renewed by the judge who signed and issued the original order upon satisfying himself that such extension or renewal is in the public interest. Any such order together with the papers upon which the application was based, shall be delivered to and retained by the applicant as authority for the eavesdropping authorized therein. A true copy of such order shall be retained in his possession by the judge issuing the same, and, in the event of the denial of an application for such an order, a true copy of the papers upon which the application was based shall in like manner be retained by the judge denying the same.

“(2) Orders for eavesdropping must be obtained before the eavesdropping commences, except as hereinafter in this section provided. A law enforcement officer may eavesdrop without a court order obtained pursuant to this section only when he has reasonable grounds to believe (a) that evidence of crime may be thus obtained, and (b) that in order to obtain such evidence time does not permit an application to be made for such a court order before such eavesdropping must commence. In any such case an application for a court order pursuant to this section must be made within twenty-four hours after such eavesdropping commenced. In computing said twenty-four-hour period, legal holidays shall not be considered. The application for such a court order must contain, in addition to the requirements set forth in this section, the time when such eavesdropping commenced. If such application is granted, the order shall be made effective from the time the eavesdropping commenced. If the application is denied, the eavesdropping must cease immediately.

“(3) Except in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding, a person who willfully discloses to any person, other than a carrier whose facilities are involved, or other authorized agent of any law enforcement agency, any information concerning the application for, the granting or denial of orders for eavesdropping, or the identity of the person or persons whose communications, conversations, or discussions are the subject of an

ex parte order granted pursuant to this section shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

§ 574. Admissibility of evidence

"Evidence obtained by any act in violation of this chapter, and evidence obtained through or resulting from information obtained by any such act, shall be inadmissible for any purpose in any civil action, proceeding or hearing: *Provided, however,* That any such evidence shall be admissible in any disciplinary trial or hearing or any administrative action, proceeding or hearing conducted by or on behalf of any governmental agency.

§ 575. Exceptions

"(1) Nothing contained in this chapter shall prohibit eavesdropping by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State or any political subdivision thereof, or the introduction in any court of evidence obtained by such eavesdropping, where the eavesdropping has been authorized by a court of such State upon a determination that reasonable grounds existed for belief that such interception might disclose evidence of the commission of a crime.

"(2) There may be introduced in any court of the United States evidence relating to the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of any communication by wire or radio which has been intercepted by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, where the interception of such communication was authorized by a court of such State and upon a determination that reasonable grounds existed for belief that such interception might disclose evidence of the commission of a crime.

"(3) Information obtained prior to the effective date of this chapter by any authorized agent of any Federal law enforcement agency through or as a result of the interception of any communication by wire or radio upon the express written approval of the Attorney General of the United States in the course of any investigation of any Federal offense shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103) be deemed admissible, in evidence in any criminal proceedings.

§ 576. Duty to report violations

"It shall be the duty of every carrier subject to the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103) to report to the law-enforcement agency having jurisdiction, any information coming to his attention with regard to violations of this chapter. Any willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of up to \$500."

Sec. 2. The proviso contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103) is amended to read as follows: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to the interception, receiving, divulging, publishing, or utilizing the contents of (a) any radio communication broadcast or transmitted by amateurs or others for the use of the general public or relating to ships in distress, or (b) any eavesdropping by any person in accordance with chapter 28 of title 18 of the United States Code."

Sec. 3. The Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

§ 223. Authorized interceptions

"All carriers subject to the provisions of this chapter are hereby authorized to permit eavesdropping by any person in accordance with chapter 28 of title 18 of the United States Code."

Sec. 4. If any provision of this chapter or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this chapter and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

PENSIONS FOR HOLDERS OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide that the holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor shall receive \$100 a month, payable at any age and regardless of whether or not the holder of the medal is on active duty. This bill is identical to one which I offered in the last Congress, S. 2422.

I was most pleased that the House of Representatives yesterday approved an identical bill, H.R. 845.

Under the present law, holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor receive \$10 monthly but only if they are 65 years of age or older and have been honorably discharged from the service. The bill as passed by the House and as introduced by me today would increase the monthly pension from \$10 to \$100 and remove the age limitation, as well as make such payments available to Congressional Medal of Honor holders who are still on active duty.

In the last Congress the House passed an identical measure and the Senate passed the bill but only after modifying it so as to be applicable to those who had attained the age of 62 and had been honorably discharged from the service. The differences between the House and Senate versions of this bill were not resolved in the closing days of the session and so no legislation was finally enacted into law. I am hopeful that this Congress will pass this legislation without modification.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee has found that in some cases holders of our Nation's highest award are in destitute circumstances and several have had to go on relief or apply for welfare payments. A holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor deserves much more than this.

There is no good reason why only those men who have left the service should be eligible to receive the monthly payments attached to this award. This provision should also apply to those men who have not only given conspicuous service in the past, but who still continue to serve.

Great Britain's Victoria Cross and the French Legion of Honor's Grand Croix both carry more total benefits than the American award. In Russia, the holder of the highest military award is called a hero of the Soviet Union and is given free rides on buses and streetcars. Shall we value courage less than they?

The additional cost of this bill would be very little. As of December 31, 1960, there were only 297 living recipients of this highest honor. These payments would never become a burden on the taxpayer, and in future years a decrease in total payments would be expected.

This is a modest reward for those who have served above and beyond the call of duty, and should not be unnecessarily restricted to a few. We can never really repay the debt we owe these men, but we must try.

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

The bill (S. 1224) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate

of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE UNDER THE MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last year the Congress after extensive consideration wrote into the Social Security Act the so-called Kerr-Mills plan to provide Federal grants to the States to enable them to establish medical assistance programs for older citizens who are not recipients of old-age assistance but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services.

I joined in supporting this plan although I was disappointed that a broader program to provide medical care for the aged by way of the social security system was not accepted.

As my colleagues know, the medical care plan as offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and cosponsored by both the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and myself, would have provided hospital and nursing home care plus visiting home service in the home to those 68 or over covered by social security. Unlike the Kerr-Mills plan, our proposal did not require any means test. No person would have to prove to the establishment of a State board or inspector that he did not have sufficient funds to meet his medical needs. Medical care would be provided, under the Anderson-McCarthy-Humphrey plan, as a matter of right—not on the basis of charity.

One of the favorite arguments of those who oppose the Forand-type legislation is that it is a compulsory program. It is argued that it is wrong for the State to force wage earners to come under a medical care program and to pay an additional tax during their working years to finance it. Interestingly enough, despite the frequency with which we hear this argument, I am not aware that anyone in the Congress has made a serious effort to make the Social Security Act into a voluntary program. Apparently the Social Security Act has not been considered by American wage earners to be a burdensome infringement on their freedom. As a matter of fact, I am of the distinct impression that working men and women feel that the social security system, rather than restricting their freedom, has immeasurably contributed to it—freedom from fear of an old age spent in poverty and destitution, freedom from fear of leaving a wife and children without funds to meet the basic necessities of life.

I have been rather amazed that those who argue that medical care for the aged by way of the social security system is an encroachment on individual freedom do not express concern over the fact that the legislation we passed last year contains no provision to assure to our older citizens that they may be free to choose the hospital or nursing home or doctor

or pharmacist of their own choice. There is nothing in the present law to prevent a State from setting up a medical care for the aged program requiring beneficiaries to go only to certain hospitals or nursing homes, or to only certain physicians or dentists or druggists. There is nothing in the act—as a matter of fact—which prevents a State if it so desires from setting up a system whereby older citizens would be required to go only to State hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, dispensaries, and to doctors employed by the State. In fact, the present law would permit a complete system of socialized medicine.

Mr. President, I do not believe in socialized medicine, and I know that no Member of this body does. I deplore the thought of the Government taking over medicine, or it running the system from stem to stern, of dictating to people what hospital they must go to and what doctor they must see and what druggist they must get their prescription from. But, I repeat, the law we passed last year did inadvertently give the States such power if they should care to exercise it.

I, therefore, send to the desk a bill to make it clear that no State can set up a program of medical assistance for the aged which would deny the right to select one's own hospital, nursing home, doctor, or druggist.

My bill makes it clear that if a State establishes a medical care for the aged program—in accordance with the bill we passed last year—it cannot preclude by statute or by regulation any eligible older person from choosing a licensed provider of care and services of his own choice.

My bill would assure that recipients of medical assistance for the aged are given the same freedom of choice as enjoyed by older citizens fortunate enough to be able to meet the costs of medical care through their own income and resources. I believe very strongly that the Government must respect and assure the dignity of our older citizens—regardless of their financial position. The criteria for the manner in which the Government treats its older citizens should not be the length of their purse.

I would call to my colleagues attention the fact that the White House Conference on Aging passed a resolution endorsing this freedom of choice concept in medical care programs. The text of the resolution reads as follows:

Every governmental program of medical assistance for the aged should embody a provision granting beneficiaries full freedom in choosing a physician, dentist, hospital, nursing home, dispenser of prescription medications, or other provider of health services.

PRESCRIPTION SERVICES

My second amendment would substitute in section 6 of the act, in which are enumerated the types of care and services which may be made available by the States under the medical assistance for the aged program, for the phrase "prescribed drugs" the phrase "prescription services," and "prescription services" would be defined to mean—

Drugs prescribed by a physician and compounded or dispensed by an individual li-

censed by law to compound or dispense prescription drugs.

The sole purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that when a person obtains prescribed drugs he is obtaining not merely a commodity but the services of a highly trained and professional pharmacist.

In other words, Mr. President, my amendment would recognize the service which the pharmaceutical profession renders to society. A pharmacist does not merely sell a commodity—rather he is performing a service in the preparation of drugs as are prescribed by physicians. Compounding of such prescribed drugs can be done by a pharmacist only after he has completed a long and arduous course of study at a recognized college of pharmacy and only after he has passed a rigid examination as required by the State before a license is issued to practice his profession.

Pharmacists are understandably proud of the professional services they render, and, in my judgment, it is only fitting that we indicate recognition of such services.

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

The bill (S. 1225) to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to assure freedom of choice of physicians and other providers of medical services by individuals who are recipients of assistance under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO EDUCATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce three bills: to authorize the granting of national defense scholarships; to amend the National Defense Education Act and extend for 5 years certain of its provisions; and to increase the college housing loan authorization, and ask that they be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, I ask that an announcement I have made concerning the bills may be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the text of the bills may be printed in the RECORD following the announcement.

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

The announcement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

WASHINGTON, March 7.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH introduced today a bill authorizing the granting of national defense scholarships to winners of competitive examinations for high school graduates in the several States.

The scholarship bill was included in a three-point program designed to improve and increase opportunities for higher education in America. Other proposals simultaneously introduced by the Connecticut Senator called for an extension of the college housing program, and for continuation of the National Defense Education Act, including the student loan program.

Senator BUSH's scholarship bill would authorize appropriations of \$25 million in each of the 5 fiscal years beginning next July 1 for the award of 4-year college scholarships to high school graduates selected by State commissions on a competitive basis.

Each recipient would receive a certificate in recognition of his achievement and a minimum of \$100 annually, and additional sums up to \$900 a year would be paid to individuals determined to be in need of further assistance by the State commissions.

Under Senator BUSH's proposals, the college housing program, under which low-interest loans are made available for dormitories and other educational facilities, such as cafeterias or student unions, would be extended for 8 years. The bill would authorize appropriations of \$250 million in each year.

The bill extending the National Defense Education Act includes a number of amendments recommended by a panel of educational consultants appointed by former Secretary Arthur J. Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A major provision would continue the student loan program for 5 years, and extend the present loan forgiveness feature to students who become teachers in parochial and other private, nonprofit schools and in institutions of higher learning. At present, loans are forgiven only for students who become teachers in public elementary and secondary schools. Teachers in parochial and other private, nonprofit schools also would be made eligible for stipends now awarded public school teachers while attending training institutes.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BUSH, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the appropriate committees, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1226. A bill to increase the college housing loan authorization, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) To obtain funds for loans under subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed \$1,675,000,000, which amount shall be increased by such further amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts: *Provided*, That such further amounts shall not exceed \$250,000,000 made available on July 1 of each of the years 1961 through 1968, inclusive: *And provided further*, That the amount outstanding for other educational facilities shall not exceed \$175,000,000 plus 10 per centum of all amounts made available pursuant to this Act."

Sec. 2. Section 403 of such Act is amended by striking out "10 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "12½ per centum".

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1227. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize the granting of national defense scholarships.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after title I a new title as follows:

"TITLE I A—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS
"Appropriations authorized

"Sec. 111. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1962, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$25,000,000 for scholarships to persons who have not previously been awarded scholarships under this title and who are selected for award of such scholarships by the State commissions established in accordance with section 116 of this title. In addition there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of the eight succeeding fiscal years such sums as are estimated to be necessary for making payments to individuals who have previously been awarded scholarships under this title. Scholarships awarded under this title shall be known as "national defense scholarships."

"Amount of scholarships"

"SEC. 112. (a) Persons awarded scholarships under this title shall be paid \$100 during each academic year of the scholarships' duration as provided in section 113, and each shall be given an appropriate certificate in recognition of his achievement. Any such person who is determined by the State commission, in accordance with the provisions of the State plan referred to in section 116 (a)(3), to need additional financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, shall be paid an additional amount, not to exceed \$900, during each such year based on his financial need, such amount to be determined in accordance with such provisions.

"(b) The Commissioner shall by regulation, prescribed after consultation with the other Federal agency or agencies concerned, provide for such adjustment (including, where appropriate, total withholding) of scholarship payments under this title as may be necessary to avoid duplication of educational assistance received under programs administered by such agencies.

"Duration of scholarships"

"SEC. 113. The duration of a national defense scholarship awarded under this title shall be a period of time not in excess of four academic years, as defined in regulations of the Commissioner, or, subject to regulations of the Commissioner, such longer period as is normally required to complete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is pursuing; but in no event shall the duration extend beyond the completion by the recipient of the work for his first bachelor's degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a scholarship awarded under this title shall entitle the recipient to payments for such period only if the Commissioner finds that he (1) devotes essentially full time to educational work leading to a bachelor's degree, during the academic year, in attendance at an institution of higher education, and (2) is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution which he is attending.

"Selection of recipients of scholarships"

"SEC. 114. (a) An individual shall be eligible to compete in any State for a national defense scholarship if he (1) is a resident of the State; (2) makes application in accordance with such rules as the State commission for such State may establish; and (3) is not, and has not been, enrolled in any course of study beyond the secondary school level.

"(b) From among those competing for national defense scholarships for each fiscal year, each State commission, within the amount allotted to it for scholarships under section 115(a), shall select persons who are to be awarded such scholarships during such year. Each State commission shall select persons to be awarded such scholarships in accordance with objective competitive tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue successfully at an insti-

tution of higher education a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree.

"(c) The Commissioner shall award a national defense scholarship to each person with respect to whom he receives a certification from a State commission that such person—

"(1) has been selected for a national defense scholarship under the provisions of this section,

"(2) has been accepted for enrollment by an institution of higher education, and

"(3) (A) holds a certificate of graduation, based on completion of the twelfth grade, from any secondary school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such school is located for graduation from secondary schools accredited by such State, or (B) in the case of an individual who does not hold such a certificate, is determined by such State commission to have attained a level of advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of that required for graduation from such a secondary school.

"Allotment of appropriations for scholarships"

"SEC. 115. The sum appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the first sentence of section 111 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States as follows: Each State shall be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate sum being allotted as the number of secondary school graduates in such State bears to the total number of secondary school graduates in all States during the most recent school year for which reliable figures are available.

"State scholarship commissions; State plans"

"SEC. 116. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the scholarship program under this title may do so by establishing a State commission on scholarships, or by designating an existing agency of the State to serve as the State commission on scholarships, and by submitting to the Commissioner, through such commission, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004(a) and—

"(1) provides for the determination, in accordance with the provisions of section 114, of eligibility to compete for national defense scholarships, for the selection, in accordance with such provisions, of persons to be awarded such scholarships out of the State's allotment, and for certification of such persons to the Commissioner; and

"(2) provides (A) for the annual determination of the additional amounts to be awarded persons in need thereof under section 102 in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria established by the State commission, which the Commissioner finds provide reasonable assurance (i) that the additional amount will be based on the individual's need for financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, such need to be determined without regard to tuition, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the institution of higher education chosen by the individual, and (ii) that the maximum additional amount allowable under the plan shall be \$900, and (B) for the annual certification, of each such additional amount and the person to whom it is to be paid, to the Commissioner.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which complies with the conditions specified in subsection (a).

"Payments to institutions of higher education"

"SEC. 117. The Commissioner shall make payments to each institution of higher education in the States on account of the attendance at such institution of each person who has a national defense scholarship. Such payments shall be made at the rate of \$350 per academic year for each academic

year or portion thereof of attendance by such person within the duration of such scholarship.

"Administrative expenses of State commissions"

"SEC. 118. The Commissioner shall pay to each State one-half the amount he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan (including expenses which the Commissioner determines were necessary for the preparation of the State plan approved under this title, and expenses in contracting for the services of public or private merit or aptitude testing organizations which are approved by the Commissioner)."

Sec. 2. Section 1004(a)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or in the case of a plan submitted under title I A, that the State commission on scholarships will be the sole agency for administering the plan."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1228. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend for 5 years the assistance provided under the provisions of such act, and to make certain changes in such provisions.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1960".

Sec. 2. Title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") is amended as follows:

(1) In section 201, strike out "and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "and each of the five succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968", and strike out "July 1, 1962" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1967";

(2) In section 202 strike out "1962" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "1967";

(3) In section 203(b) strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000";

(4) In section 205(b)(3) strike out "public elementary or secondary school in a State" and insert in lieu thereof "public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school in a State or in an institution of higher education"; and

(5) In section 206 strike out "1966" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "1971".

Sec. 3. Title III of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) In the title after "mathematics," insert "history, English,";

(2) In section 301 strike out "three succeeding fiscal years" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years";

(3) In section 301, 303(a)(1), and 303(a)(5) after "mathematics," insert "history, English,";

(4) In section 302(a)(2) strike out the last two sentences and insert in lieu thereof "The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959, again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1961, again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1963, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1965, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, the second shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years

in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962, the third shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1964, the fourth shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1964, and ending June 30, 1966, and the fifth shall be conclusive for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.";

(5) In section 304(b) strike out "two succeeding fiscal years" and insert in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years";

(6) In section 305 (a) after the period at the end thereof insert "any amount from the allotment of any State or States not committed, prior to such date in the fiscal year as is established by the Commissioner, for loan under the provisions of this section shall be reallocated under such provisions among the remaining States.;" and

(7) In section 305(b)(3) strike out "month" and insert in lieu thereof "fiscal year".

Sec. 4. Title IV of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out section 402 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

"SEC. 402. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fellowships under the provision of this title, during each of the three succeeding fiscal years in the period ending June 30, 1962, he is authorized to award one thousand five hundred such fellowships, and during each of the five succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award three thousand such fellowships. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years, except that five hundred of such fellowships awarded in each of such five succeeding fiscal years shall be for periods of study not in excess of one academic year needed to complete the requirements for a doctoral degree. In the case of any such fellowship not used for the full time for which it was awarded, the Commissioner may re-award such fellowship for the period of time not used.;" and

(2) Strike out subsection (b) of section 404 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) the Commissioner shall make payments to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study. Such payments shall be made at the rate of \$2,500 per academic year for each academic year or portion thereof of attendance by such person within the duration of such fellowship."

Sec. 5. Title V of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) In section 501 after "succeeding fiscal years" insert "in the period ending June 30, 1962, and \$20,000,000 for each of the five succeeding fiscal years";

(2) In section 504 strike out "two succeeding fiscal years" and insert in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years", and strike out "three succeeding fiscal years" and insert in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years"; and

(3) In section 511 strike out "three succeeding fiscal years" and insert in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years", and insert "or other nonprofit" after "public".

Sec. 6. Title VI of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) In section 601 strike out "1962" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "1967"; and

(2) Strike out section 611 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 611. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$7,250,000 for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1959, and each of the eight succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advance training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern language in elementary or secondary schools or any modern foreign language in institutions of higher education. Each individual (engaged, or preparing to engage, in such teaching, or such supervising or training of teachers, in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school or in an institution of higher education) who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance."

Sec. 7. Title VII of the Act is amended by striking out in section 763 "and the sum of \$5,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "the sum of \$5,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years in the period ending June 30, 1962, and the sum of \$10,000,000 for each of the five succeeding fiscal years".

Sec. 8. (a) Title VIII of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STUDY

"SEC. 803. The Secretary shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education composed of such number of experts in such fields as the Secretary deems appropriate for the purposes of this section. Such committee shall make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws with respect to vocational education and the manpower needs of the United States in the years ahead for the purpose of determining what changes should be made in such laws in order to prepare for such needs. The committee shall report the results of its investigation and study, including recommendations for necessary legislation, to the Secretary and the Congress as soon as practicable. The provisions of the last sentence of section 1002 and the provisions of section 1003 of this Act shall apply to the members of such committee."

(b) Section 301 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out "three succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

Sec. 9. Title X of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out section 1001(f) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.'"; and

(2) In section 1009(a) strike out "three succeeding fiscal years" and insert in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

Sec. 10. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective after June 30, 1962.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADDITIONAL FUND FOR FISHERY RESEARCH PROGRAMS AND FISHERIES REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill in which I am joined in cosponsorship by the distinguished Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the distinguished Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL], the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

This bill is designed to provide additional Federal assistance to the States for rehabilitation and development of our depleted fishery resources. Our plan for this program of Federal aid would provide for allocation directly to State fisheries agencies by the Secretary of the Interior of a portion of the funds collected as tariffs on imported fish and fishery products. As will be recalled, this source of funds is the same as that from which funds are drawn for research by the Secretary of the Interior under terms of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act enacted in 1954. The bill introduced today would provide for the same proportion of funds derived from duties on imports to be applied to the purposes set forth as is required under terms of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act; namely, 30 percent of gross receipts.

At the last session of Congress, I introduced the bill, S. 3658, for the same purpose, which would have doubled the amount of funds transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under terms of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, thus providing an additional amount of money to be used for the rehabilitation of the depleted salmon fishery resources of the Pacific Northwest.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the statement I made on the floor of the Senate on the occasion of my introduction of S. 3658 on June 10, 1960.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I have broadened the scope of the bill to include all types of fisheries, and have not limited its scope to salmon fisheries, in view of the request now pending for a \$3 million crash research program for salmon fisheries.

The legislation I have introduced today would allow a more direct attack on the problem of declining fishery resources than is possible under the existing legis-

lation for the following reasons: First, the funds to be used would be allocated directly to State agencies having immediate responsibility for management of fishery resources and, second, the purpose for which the funds are to be used is specifically that of fisheries research and development. While the program of research and development now carried on under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act is undoubtedly beneficial, it is apparent that this program has not met the real problems of depletion of fishery resources which are evident to the States. It has long been apparent in Alaska, as in other States, that best results in fishery management can be achieved by agencies of the State acquainted with local situations and unique characteristics of the area. The Department of the Interior cannot apply the expertise with respect to specific locations where trouble with fishery resources occurs that is available from local officials in day-to-day contact with the problems this legislation is designed to solve.

The program here advocated would allow local control of local programs, and would be directed specifically to the kind of programs of research and rehabilitation needed in the areas concerned.

As the agricultural products for which vast sums of money have been expended by the Federal Government to improve and manage are magnificent resources of the land, the fish represent a great resource of the sea. These resources of our waterways certainly deserve consideration in their management at least equivalent with that given by the Federal Government to our resources of the land. The fishery resources of the United States represent great and important wealth which it is our duty to conserve and manage with utmost wisdom. It is for this purpose that I have introduced this bill. It is also quite appropriate that the funds for this fisheries restoration and development program is derived from tariffs on fish products imports since to a great extent those imports are finding markets in this country because of our neglect of our own fisheries resources.

As for Alaska, there was a time when the Alaska fishery resources were perhaps the greatest in the Nation, a treasure of the entire United States, to be conserved and husbanded for the country's welfare.

But throughout the years of territorial status this wealth was carelessly flung away through incredibly poor management on the part of the Federal Government to which Alaska was a fiefdom of the Department of the Interior.

Alaskans understood the plight of their great fisheries better than those who administered the territory. Time after time the territorial legislature adopted memorials. Time after time the people of Alaska addressed congressional committees. Time after time their voteless delegates in Congress spoke out the plain facts that Alaska fisheries were declining, and prescribed specific remedies, which the fishermen themselves knew were needed, even if the bureaucrats did not.

The Alaskan prophecy that failure to act would result in disaster was fully borne out.

In 1953, when the Alaska salmon pack fell to its lowest point in 32 years—less than 3 million cases, as compared with earlier years' harvest of packs as high as 8 million cases—President Eisenhower officially declared Alaska to be a "disaster area." While this designation brought Alaska fisheries into the same class with areas destroyed by earthquake, hurricanes, and floods, all acts of God, the natural disaster in Alaska was, in reality, an act of man in failing to act in time.

As I remarked at the time S. 3658 was introduced at the last session of Congress, it is only fitting that the Federal Government assume its rightful responsibility for rehabilitation of the Nation's fishery resources when it is remembered that large sums of Federal funds have gone into the restoration and rehabilitation of the fishing resources of numerous foreign countries as recipients of foreign aid programs. Last session I recounted that \$11,759,064 had been expended by the United States on improving fisheries of 19 other countries. Now that information is available for expenditures in 1960, I find that another \$2,231,000 has been distributed for this purpose by the International Cooperation Administration to 12 countries, including Spain, which is a new beneficiary of the program. If we have spent some \$14 million to rehabilitate and promote the fisheries of 19 foreign countries and are continuing this course, it would seem incontrovertible that we should at least appropriate approximately one-third of that amount to restore our own fisheries and invest such amount annually until restoration has been accomplished.

The following is the list of countries, and expenditures made, during the 1960 fiscal year by the International Cooperation Administration for fishery rehabilitation and development:

	Fiscal year 1960
Far East:	amount
Cambodia: fisheries conservation	\$31,000
China, Republic of: fisheries development	26,000
Indonesia: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries	77,000
Korea: Fisheries development (typhoon rehabilitation)	1,451,000
Vietnam: Fisheries development	409,000
Near East and south Asia:	
India: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries	40,000
Pakistan:	
Fisheries development	44,000
Reobligation—fisheries development	30,000
Africa:	
Liberia: Fresh water fisheries	38,000
Somali Republic: Fisheries improvement	61,000
Tunisia: Aid to commercial fisheries	18,000
Europe:	
Spain: Inland fishing	2,000
Latin America:	
British Guiana: Fisheries	4,000
Total	12,231,000

It is my hope that the Congress will enact the legislation I have introduced as soon as possible. In Alaska, as in other States, there is an urgent need for the relief that would come from the availability to the States of increased Federal funds to be applied to the research that can be undertaken by qualified scientists, and to the execution of projects to augment supplies of fish. To underscore the serious nature of the problem with which Alaska is confronted, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, Senate Joint Memorial 2 of the Alaska State Legislature, calling upon the Congress for appropriation of sufficient funds to undertake the program that is needed, and a letter I have received from Mr. P. S. Ganty, president of the Pelican Cold Storage Co. of Seattle, describing the critical decline in supplies of salmon at Pelican and Sitka, Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD, and to have it lie on the desk until the close of business this coming Friday, March 10, so that additional Senators desiring to join as cosponsors may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska, and the bill and other matters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1230) to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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 Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry," approved August 11, 1939, as amended (15 U.S.C., sec. 713c-3), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1961, from moneys made available to carry out the provisions of section 32 of the Act approved August 24, 1935, an amount equal to 30 per centum of the gross receipts from the duties collected under the customs laws on fishery products (including fish, shellfish, mollusks, crustacea, aquatic plants and animals, and any products thereof, including processed and manufactured products), which shall be maintained in a fund separate from that created by section 2 of this Act.

"(b) Funds made available under subsection (a) of this section shall annually be apportioned by the Secretary of the Interior among those States having commercial fisheries subject to their regulation on a percentage basis determined by the ratio which the average of the value of raw fish landed within each State (regardless where caught) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of the Interior plus the average of the value to the manufacturer of manufactured and processed fishery merchandise manufactured

within each State for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of the Interior bears to the total average value of all such raw fish landed and fishery merchandise manufactured within all participating States for the three most recent years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of the Interior.

"(c) Funds apportioned pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of subsection (f) of this section to State agencies authorized to regulate commercial fisheries in their respective States for expenditure, either directly or through arrangements with other State and local public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations or institutions of higher learning, on fisheries research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall approve any such program or project which he finds has a reasonable expectation of making a contribution to the advancement of fisheries research or to the rehabilitation and development of the State's fisheries resources: *Provided further*, That funds granted under this section shall not be used to supplant State and local funds heretofore made available for the same purposes.

"(d) The amount of any apportionment to a State under subsection (b) of this section for any fiscal year remaining unpaid to such State at the end of such fiscal year shall be available for payment to such State under subsection (f) of this section until the end of the second succeeding fiscal year. No payment to a State under subsection (f) of this section shall be made out of its apportionment for any fiscal year until its apportionment for the preceding fiscal year has been exhausted or has ceased to be available.

"(e) The State agency specified in subsection (c) of this section shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time require and comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(f) The Secretary of the Interior shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to be paid to the States from the apportionments available under subsection (b) of this section and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, make payment of such amounts from such apportionments at the time or times specified by the Secretary.

"(g) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make such rules and prescribe such procedures as may be reasonable and necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

The statement, joint memorial, and letter presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

RESTORATION OF THE PACIFIC SALMON FISHERY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for the rehabilitation of the salmon fishing resources of the Pacific Northwest, particularly those in Alaska.

I offer this bill on behalf of myself and the two Senators from the State of Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON, the two Senators from the State of Oregon, Mr. MORSE and Mr. Lusk, and the junior Senator from the State of California, Mr. ENGLE.

The depletion of the salmon fishing resources in Alaska is a prime example of how, over the years, the Federal Government, both through acts of commission and of omission, has wantonly permitted the ruin of

what was once one of the Nation's most valuable natural resources, and the Nation's greatest single fishery resource.

Had it not been for the Federal Government's neglecting and permitting the abuse of the salmon fisheries resources of Alaska, they would today constitute a great and rich heritage for this and future generations.

Almost three-quarters of a century ago, the prophecy was made by one well versed in the subject—Mr. Tarlton H. Bean of the U.S. Fish Commission—that without proper conservation measures on the part of the Federal Government—trustee for the Alaska salmon resource—its plight in future years would be sad indeed.

In a report issued in 1889, Mr. Bean made the following prophecy:

"Whether these [Alaskan] fisheries shall continue to furnish the opportunity for profitable enterprise and investment depends upon the policy to be inaugurated and maintained by the Government. Under judicious regulation and restraint these fisheries may be made a continuing source of wealth to the inhabitants of the territory and an important food resource to the Nation; without such regulation and restraint we shall have repeated in Alaska rivers the story of the Sacramento and the Columbia, and the destruction of Alaska will be more rapid because of the small size of the rivers and the ease with which salmon can be prevented from ascending them. For a few years there will be wanton waste of that marvelous abundance, which the fishermen—concerned only for immediate profit and utterly improvident of the future—declare to be inexhaustible. The season of prosperity will be followed by a rapid decline in the value and production of these fisheries, and a point will be eventually reached where the salmon canning industry will be no longer profitable."

Unfortunately for Alaska—and unfortunately for the rest of the United States, as well—Mr. Bean's prophecy was an accurate one. It has been tragically fulfilled.

What followed were years of sordid double-dealing on the part of the Federal Government which played the game of the absentee salmon canners with the result that the Alaska fishing resources—once so rich and plentiful—were despoiled, and the wealth they represented drained out of the then territory and used, not for its orderly development, but rather for its further exploitation and the enhancement of the capital of other areas of the Nation.

It is not easy, Mr. President, to stand here on the floor of the Senate and speak thus of our Government—to indict it, so to speak, for having participated actively and deliberately in bringing to the very point of disaster the Alaska fishing resources entrusted to its care, preservation, and development.

But this is a nonpartisan indictment, Mr. President.

It applies equally to Democratic and Republican administrations and to Democratic and Republican dominated Congresses. All must share alike the blame for what has happened.

For the facts cannot be disproved—they are no secret—they are written in bold script in the record since 1889 when Mr. Bean warned that the road ahead could lead to plenty or to poverty, depending upon how true to its trust the Federal Government remained.

For the fact is, Mr. President, that, with respect to Alaska fisheries, the Federal Government, regardless of what administration was in power, was shamefully false to its trust and did not act in the public interest.

Through the years, until January 1 of this year, Alaska, both as a territory and for 1 year as a State, was bound hand and foot by the Federal Government. The absentee interests had prevailed on the 62d Congress back in 1912 and over the protests of Alaska's

voteless Delegate, James Wickersham, to deny the territory of Alaska the right to manage its fisheries resource. No other territory had suffered this discrimination. Alaska was thereby rendered helpless to take any move to preserve and protect, in a meaningful way, its own fishery resource. That duty and responsibility was, by act of Congress, vested in the Federal Government, its agency at that time being the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Because it offers an interesting—and tragic—case history of how our Federal Government betrayed a sacred trust, let me trace briefly the facts relating to the decline, to the point of disaster, of the Alaska salmon fisheries.

With the discovery of the great commercial value of the Alaska salmon resources and the establishment of the first canneries there in 1878, the extension and expansion into Alaska of the northwestern salmon entrepreneurs followed. By 1928, Alaska had become the world's principal salmon producer; its salmon fisheries were surpassing mining as Alaska's major industry, representing there the largest investment of capital, the biggest annual financial yield, the greatest employment, direct and indirect, of labor, the largest single source of territorial revenue, and the dominant factor in Alaska's political, economic, and social life.

Thus, in less than a quarter of a century Alaska's salmon pack rose from almost 1.9 million cases in 1905 to over 6 million cases in 1928—an increase of 300 percent in 23 years.

But this increase was obtained at the sacrifice of sound conservation measures. It was obtained principally through the use of fish-traps, a costly structure anchored or moored in the path of the salmon returning to their spawning beds, a mechanism highly efficient in catching fish but likewise highly destructive. Alaskans never ceased to protest against its use. But in vain.

Now the conservation of salmon has always been presumed of basic concern to all interested parties—fishermen, canners, the public and the governments, both Federal and territorial. The essence of conservation—it has universally been assumed—has been in permitting an adequate escapement, that is, allowing salmon to get back to the spawning grounds in numbers sufficient to insure an adequate reproduction of their species and to perpetuate the supply of that stream or lake.

But with the Federal Government indifferent and, at times, even hostile, with the territorial government prevented from acting, with the majority of fishermen and canners coming from "outside" and interested in immediate profits and indifferent to the destruction caused, conservation measures in Alaska were either totally lacking or totally inadequate.

In the beginning, in Alaska, conservation was totally ignored. Finally, on March 2, 1889—on the next to the last day of the 50th Congress—legislation was passed prohibiting the erection of obstruction which would impede the ascent of salmon into their spawning beds in streams and lakes.

But, setting a pattern that was to be repeated often in the years ahead, Congress appropriated no funds to enforce the law.

At that time, the Alaska salmon pack already far surpassed the other Pacific coast salmon fisheries combined, with 719,196 against a total of 477,659 for the California, Oregon, and Washington canners.

Seven years later, in 1896, and again in 1906 attempts were made to strengthen conservation measures through the enactment of additional legislation. But again little in the way of enforcement machinery was provided. Only three inspectors were authorized. With the best of intentions, three inspectors could scarcely, in the few weeks of the fishing season, discover violations and report on conditions requiring correction in an area one-third the size of

the United States and containing hundreds of salmon streams.

For 18 years efforts were made to obtain needed conservation legislation. As Alaska's able Delegate Wickersham correctly summed up the end results of those efforts:

"All Alaska gets is a volume of hearings and never any laws for protection."

Efforts, during those years, to secure the enactment of meaningful conservation legislation ran into strong opposition from two sources.

In the first place, the absentee canners objected to any attempt to curb their unrestricted fishing practices and were determined that any legislation passed would recognize and perpetuate their right to exploit the Alaska salmon fisheries.

As Delegate Wickersham stated during hearings in 1912 on one of the bills which, through the years were introduced in each Congress without tangible results, his objection to the testimony on behalf of the Alaska Packers' Association of San Francisco was that:

"It exhibits as plainly as the English language can be made to exhibit it their (the Alaska Packers' Association's) desire to get everything they can out of Alaska and give absolutely nothing in return. They represent the suggestion that Alaska or the people of Alaska have any right or interest in the salmon or the fisheries of that country. They are nonresidents themselves, they do nothing toward the upbuilding of the territory, and they resent it when it is suggested that they pay some little portion of the tax for the building of roads or the development of the country."

The other obstacle encountered by conservation legislation was the Federal agency entrusted with the responsibility for Alaska fisheries. Like any bureaucracy, it resisted any attempts to curb its powers or to give direction to its actions.

Both the absentee fishing interests and the Federal agency, all through the years were united on one major objective: both determined to keep the territory from regulating and controlling its own fisheries. And they were successful.

Meanwhile during the years since the enactment of the 1906 legislation, salmon fishing in Alaska continued at an accelerated rate and by the end of the second decade in 1920 depletion was evident—so evident in fact that it was generally admitted.

Finally, after much pulling and hauling, Congress, in 1924, passed the White Act, which was widely considered a milestone in the long effort to perpetuate Alaska's salmon fisheries.

But as Alaska had learned through bitter experience over the years—passing conservation legislation was one thing; appropriating sufficient funds to enforce the legislation and having Federal officials with the will to enforce sound conservation practices were still other things.

The nearly third of a century which followed the passage of the White Act was uncannily repetitive of what had gone before.

There were the repeated assurances by the two controlling powers—Federal and industry officials—that the resource was now amply protected.

There was, paradoxically, the chronic and well-justified complaint by the regulatory officials, concurred in by industry spokesmen and admitted by congressional authority, that Congress, despite increased appropriations, was providing insufficiently to conserve the resource.

The bane of Alaska conservation of salmon fisheries continued to be the fishtrap. Repeated efforts to curb or do away with their use entirely met with stiff and successful opposition from the large absentee canners both in the Halls of the Congress and of the territorial legislature. And the Federal regulatory agency went along with the industry. Indeed, instead of regulating the in-

dustry, the Federal agency was in fact regulated by it.

And this despite the valiant efforts of Alaska's voteless Delegates, including those of my able and distinguished colleague, Mr. BARTLETT, for 14 years Alaska's Delegate.

And this despite the unceasing memorials by the territorial legislature to the Congress protesting against the continued unbridled use of fishtraps in Alaska waters.

And this despite a referendum taken in October 1948, showing the people of Alaska as being overwhelmingly opposed to fishtraps—19,712 to 2,624.

Meanwhile, what was the state of salmon fishing in Alaska while the Federal officials and the cannery interests locked arms in opposition to effective conservation?

The fisheries were declining.

One salmon pack was 8,454,948 cases in 1936. By 1941 it has dropped to 6,906,503 cases. Then it went into a steady, continuing decline—5,089,109 cases in 1942, 5,396,509 cases in 1943, 4,877,796 cases in 1944, 4,341,120 cases in 1945, 3,971,109 cases in 1946, 4,302,466 cases in 1947, 4,010,612 cases in 1948, 4,391,051 cases in 1949, 3,272,643 cases in 1950, 3,484,468 cases in 1951, 3,574,128 cases in 1952, 2,925,570 cases in 1953, 3,207,154 cases in 1954, 2,457,969 cases in 1955, 2,950,354 cases in 1956, 2,441,894 cases in 1957, 2,948,371 cases in 1958, until finally—in 1959—we reach a low water mark of 1,600,000 cases—a decline of 6,854,948 cases in 24 years or a decline in that period of 81 percent. It is the smallest pack in 60 years.

Why have the fisheries declined in the face of the apparent guarantees of the White Act against their destruction?

There are several reasons for this decline.

In the first place, the Federal Government had never appropriated sufficiently to safeguard the resource.

In the second place, the regulatory services were often in the dark as to what to do to conserve the salmon. The fault was by no means wholly theirs. Denied funds even for proper enforcement, Congress had never supplied the means for research which over the years would have accumulated a body of needed knowledge.

In the third place, the regulatory decisions were by and large never freely made by the regulatory agencies. The successful pressures exerted on the Federal agencies charged with conservation responsibilities were tremendous, stemming from the shortsightedness of the industry they were supposed to be regulating, but which through the years imposed its will on the regulatory agency.

In the fourth place, the fishermen themselves, in desperation because of the increasing monopolization of the fishing ground by untouchable and unassassable powers and their decreasing opportunity to make a livelihood has tended to become breakers of laws—laws which they considered profoundly unjust.

Thus as statehood came to Alaska, it found that through mismanagement by the successive agencies of the Federal Government entrusted with the regulatory responsibility and the avarice of the industry, Alaska's salmon fisheries were steadily depleted—unlike the fisheries of British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon, the governments of which were not rendered helpless by their Federal Government from taking needed conservation measures during the years.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table showing the steady decrease in recent years of the Alaska salmon pack.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRENING. Mr. President, even after statehood had been achieved, the very act of statehood contained an act of discrimina-

tion against the new State with respect to its fisheries. For 1 year it was without powers to regulate its fisheries.

And now—when those powers are finally vested in the State—even now those who would continue to despoil Alaskan fisheries refuse to recognize the sovereignty of Alaska over its own resources and the absolute right of the State of Alaska to take necessary and proper steps to preserve those resources.

Recently, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, presumed to authorize the continued operation of certain native fishtraps in Alaskan waters.

In doing so he relied on an interpretation of the law which, to say the least, was very strained. His interpretation of the law was that he was compelled to permit the operation of these fishtraps in Alaska—compelled to do so by statute.

Yet, at the time he made such a claim, he had in his possession an interpretation by the Attorney General of the United States to the effect that the purported power of the Secretary of the Interior over this matter was discretionary and not mandatory.

This latest action by the Secretary of the Interior merely climaxes a long, long course of such arbitrary actions by various units of the Federal Government over a long, long period of time which have led to the present sorry state of the Alaskan fisheries.

The experts have said that with proper rehabilitative work the salmon fishing resources of Alaska can be restored.

There is thus still time.

But there is still time only if we act promptly and vigorously.

The steady downhill slide of the Alaska fishery resources must be stopped and the trend reversed without delay.

To do so, I, together with some of my colleagues, have introduced a bill which would increase to 60 percent—from 30 percent—the amount set aside for fishery rehabilitation purposes under the Kennedy-Saltostall Act from imports levied on fish products.

Mr. President, it is only fitting and proper that the funds for the rehabilitation of the Alaska salmon fishing resources come in part from the Federal Treasury. This is not a handout which Alaska seeks. It is but applying an age-old legal principle that a trustee who is false to his trust must make restitution. In the law, this principle is applied even though the trustee acted negligently rather than willfully. In the case of the despoiling of the Alaska salmon resources, even if one wishes to be as charitable as possible, one cannot even assert that the loss of this once great resource was due merely to the negligence of the Federal Government. It was done deliberately in the face of repeated and repeated warnings, pleas, and protests of the people of Alaska and their representatives. Actually, with obviously inadequate means to do, unaided, the job which the Federal Government, whose sole responsibility it was, failed to do for three-quarters of a century, the State, now confronted with the mammoth task of recovering the lost resource, has initiated a program of fisheries conservation and rehabilitation.

It consists of careful and vigorous regulation of the salt water harvest to assure adequate spawning escapement into the streams and lakes.

It consists further of the protection of salmon spawning and rearing areas in the watersheds of Alaska consistent with the balanced development of industry and agriculture.

It consists of increasing and enhancing the productive capacity of important watersheds by controlling scrap fish populations, by removing or bypassing barriers to migratory salmon, by the improvement of spawning beds and by the establishment of new runs in waters which previously have not produced salmon. Nearly all this needs to

be buttressed by adequate fundamental research to secure the data on stream runs from year to year by each of the five varieties of salmon.

With such a program, if the funds are made available for strict enforcement and continuous application of these sound conservation, rehabilitation, and research procedures, we may confidently hope that this great national fishery resource may gradually be restored. With its restoration would come greater employment, greater tax revenue, and economic rehabilitation of areas now in, or close to, disaster. As an evidence of the State of Alaska's earnestness in prosecuting this program, it has appropriated in the 1960 fiscal budget for the Alaska State Department of Fish and Game \$2,867,697, a very substantial portion of which goes to this program.

However, Mr. President, the Alaska salmon fisheries were wrecked through deliberate nonfeasance and malfeasance of the Federal Government, after warnings by the people of Alaska in words as strong and as plain as words could be. The record is there. It is, therefore, fitting and proper that the trustee who failed the trust—the Federal Government—should now do its part to make whole the trust—to rehabilitate the Alaska fishing resources.

It is also fitting and proper, Mr. President, that the source of the Federal funds to be used in this rehabilitative process should be the funds derived through impost on fish products. While foreign exporters of such products were, on the whole, not responsible for the depletion of Alaska salmon resources—except more recently in the case of the Japanese—nevertheless they are the beneficiaries of that depletion. In all justice, therefore, a portion of the imposts they pay should be devoted to making whole the once great natural resource of the State of Alaska and of the Nation.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is also fitting and proper that the Federal Government should immediately assume its responsibility for the rehabilitation of the salmon-fishing resources of the Pacific Northwest, because it is already furnishing Federal funds in large amounts for the rehabilitation of building up of the fishing resources of many, many countries throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a list compiled from information furnished by the International Cooperation Administration showing the grants which have been made by that agency to foreign lands for the improvement of their fishing industries.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the total for the 5 years from 1955 through 1959 for aid to foreign fisheries is \$11,073,064, to which must be added the loan of \$686,000, last year, to the Government of Taiwan, for the further improvement of its fishing industry. The latter loan is repayable in new Taiwan dollars, so that, for all intents and purposes, it can also be called a grant.

Thus, in 5 years, the Federal Government has given various countries \$11,759,064 for the improvement of their fishing industries and resources. And, undoubtedly, more will be granted abroad in the years ahead.

Let us take a closer look at these grants: Republic of China, \$1,487,000. Indonesia, \$727,198. Korea, \$3,949,000. Laos, \$13,450. Thailand, \$147,000. Vietnam, \$1,414,500. India, \$1,048,620. Pakistan, \$1,250,670. Turkey, \$18,500. Ethiopia, \$43,200. Liberia, \$99,280.

British Guiana, \$6,000. Yugoslavia, \$22,020. El Salvador, \$23,055. Peru, \$151,970. Tunisia, \$84,000. Somaliland, \$141,000. Cambodia, \$76,000. South China Sea, \$960,000.

Finally, we come to Iceland, which received \$14,600 for the rehabilitation of its fisheries—Iceland, whose fishermen roved the coasts of the world and were fishing there before Leif Ericson came to America.

With such largess abroad, can the Federal Government afford not to do as much here at home for the rehabilitation of a once great natural resource—the Alaska salmon-fishing resources—which the Federal Government itself was largely instrumental in debilitating?

For me, there can be but one answer; and I shall press strongly for the enactment of the bill which I am introducing today.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I emphasize that the State of Alaska is already doing everything within its means to restore the salmon fisheries resources in Alaska. It has diligently set about—even in the first year of its statehood—to repair the damage wrought by the Federal Government over the course of the last three-quarters of a century.

But the State of Alaska cannot, and should not, in all fairness, be expected to do the entire task of rehabilitating these salmon fisheries.

The State of Alaska has every reason to expect that in the rehabilitation task that lies ahead, it will have behind it the cooperation and the resources of the Federal Government.

To secure such cooperation, therefore, Mr. President, I introduce this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3658) to amend the act authorizing the use for fishery research and other purposes of 30 percent of amounts collected as customs duties on fishery products in order to increase such percent to 60, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXHIBIT 1

Pack of Alaska canned salmon by districts

Year:	Total cases	Fiscal year
1905	1,894,516	1955
1906	2,246,989	\$204,000
1907	2,202,100	
1908	2,618,048	224,700
1909	2,403,669	51,000
1910	2,438,777	
1911	2,820,963	82,000
1912	4,060,129	59,000
1913	3,756,433	
1914	4,167,832	3,000
1915	4,489,002	95,000
1916	4,919,589	
1917	5,922,320	NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND
1918	6,677,369	SOUTH ASIA
1919	4,591,110	
1920	4,395,509	10,200
1921	2,604,973	
1922	4,501,355	278,100
1923	5,063,340	
1924	5,305,923	22,000
1925	4,450,898	364,000
1926	6,652,882	
1927	3,566,072	6,500
1928	6,070,110	8,000
1929	5,370,242	
1930	4,988,987	Expansion and modernization of
1931	5,432,535	marine and inland fisheries
1932	5,260,488	150,498
1933	5,226,698	Korea: Fishing boat construction
1934	7,470,586	1,000,000
1935	5,155,826	Laos: Inland fish culture
1936	8,454,948	18,450
1937	6,654,038	Thailand: Fisheries
		71,000
		Vietnam: Development of inland fisheries
		13,500
		Development of marine fisheries
		46,000
		NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA
		India: Expansion and modernization
		of marine and inland fish-
		eries
		437,520
		Pakistan: Fisheries development: West
		Pakistan
		Fisheries development: East
		Pakistan
		129,295
		Turkey: Purse seine fishing spe-
		cialists
		10,000
		AFRICA
		Ethiopia: Fisheries survey
		7,000
		Liberia: Marine and fresh-water
		fisheries
		25,280

Pack of Alaska canned salmon by districts—Continued

Year:	Total cases
1938	6,791,544
1939	5,239,211
1940	5,028,378
1941	6,906,503
1942	5,089,109
1943	5,396,509
1944	4,877,796
1945	4,341,120
1946	3,971,109
1947	4,302,466
1948	4,010,612
1949	4,391,051
1950	3,272,643
1951	3,484,468
1952	3,574,128
1953	2,925,570
1954	3,207,154
1955	2,457,969
1956	2,950,354
1957	2,441,894
1958	2,948,371
1959	1,600,000
Average	3,165,360

EXHIBIT 2

Agriculture and natural resources—Fisheries
FAR EAST

	Fiscal year
China: Ocean fisheries improvement	1955
Indonesia: Expansion and modernization of marine fisheries	\$204,000
Expansion and modernization of inland fisheries	224,700
Philippines: Fisheries development	51,000
Thailand: Fisheries	82,000
Vietnam: Development of inland fisheries	59,000
Development of marine fisheries	3,000
Peru: SCIPA project fisheries	95,000
Total	1,431,561
	FAR EAST
	Fiscal year
Ethiopia: Fisheries survey	10,200
India: Project for modernization and expansion of marine and inland fisheries and exploratory fishing program	278,100
Liberia: Marine and fresh water fisheries	22,000
Pakistan: Karachi fish harbor	364,000
Turkey: Purse seine fishing specialists	6,500
Peru: SCIPA project fisheries	32,061
Total	1,431,561

	Fiscal year
China (Taiwan): Fishing fleet rehabilitation	1956
Fish propagation (RETSE) ---	\$5,000
Indonesian Republic: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries	8,000
Korea: Fishing boat construction	150,498
Laos: Inland fish culture	1,000,000
Thailand: Fisheries	18,450
Vietnam: Development of inland fisheries	71,000
Development of marine fisheries	13,500
Pakistan: Fisheries development: West	46,000
Pakistan	371,375
Fisheries development: East	129,295
Pakistan	10,000
Ethiopia: Fisheries survey	NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA
Liberia: Marine and fresh-water fisheries	437,520
Pakistan: Fisheries development: West	
Pakistan	
Fisheries development: East	
Pakistan	
Turkey: Purse seine fishing specialists	
Ethiopia: Fisheries survey	AFRICA
Liberia: Marine and fresh-water fisheries	7,000
Pakistan	25,280

Agriculture and natural resources—Fisher-
ies—Continued

EUROPE

Fiscal year
1956

Iceland: Canning industry team for the fish industry—third country training
Yugoslavia: Fisheries

LATIN AMERICA

El Salvador: Fisheries
Peru: Fisheries development program (SCIPA project fisheries)

Total

FAR EAST

Fiscal year
1957

China: Fishing fleet rehabilitation program
Fisheries
Tuna long liners
Indonesia: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries
Korea: Fisheries development
Thailand: Fisheries
Vietnam: Development of inland fisheries
Development of marine fisheries

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries
Pakistan: West Pakistan fisheries development
Fisheries development—East Pakistan
Turkey: Purse seine fishing specialists

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Fisheries development project
Liberia: Fresh water fisheries
Tunisia: Aid to commercial fisheries
Overseas territories—Somalia: fisheries development

EUROPE

Iceland: Canning industry team for the fish industry third country
Fish byproduct utilization
Herring processing study third country

LATIN AMERICA

El Salvador: Fisheries
Peru: Renewable resources development

Total

FAR EAST

Fiscal year
1958

Cambodia: Fisheries conservation
China (Taiwan): Fisheries development
Indonesian Republic: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries
Korea: Fisheries development
Vietnam: General fisheries development

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries
Pakistan: Fisheries development—West Pakistan
Fisheries development—East Pakistan

Agriculture and natural resources—Fisher-
ies—Continued

AFRICA

Fiscal year
1958

Liberia: Fresh water fisheries
Tunisia: Aid to commercial fisheries
Overseas territories—Somalia: Fisheries

EUROPE

Yugoslavia: Fisheries

LATIN AMERICA

Peru: Renewable resources development (forestry and fisheries)

ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

Marine research in South China Sea and the Gulf of Thailand

Total

Agriculture and natural resources, fiscal year 1959 projects—Fisheries

FAR EAST

Amount

Cambodia: Fisheries conservation
China (Taiwan): Fisheries development (JCRR)
Indonesia: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries
Korea: Fisheries development
Vietnam: Fisheries development

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries
Pakistan: Fisheries development—West Pakistan
Fisheries development—East Pakistan

AFRICA

Liberia: Fresh-water fisheries
Tunisia: Aid to commercial fisheries
Overseas territories—Somalia: fisheries

EUROPE

Iceland: Fish control survey

LATIN AMERICA

Overseas territories—British: Guyana: Snapper fishing equipment demonstration project

ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

Marine research development in South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand

400,000

Total

2,201,000

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To the HONORABLE JOHN F. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; THE HONORABLE STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR; THE HONORABLE E. L. BARTLETT, AND THE HONORABLE ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. SENATORS; AND THE HONORABLE RALPH J. RIVERS, REPRESENTATIVE FROM ALASKA

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Alaska in second legislature, first session assembled, respectfully submits that:

Whereas the salmon fisheries resources of Alaska have declined to a level which is alarming and causing widespread hardship throughout the coastal regions of the State;

Whereas the decline has continued for such a long period that it cannot be a part of any cycle but must be a basic downward trend which can lead to the complete closure

of large salmon fishing areas and widespread loss of livelihood; and

Whereas the causes of the decline can be checked only as a result of intensive research and exploration with funds and resources which no State is able to supply; and

Whereas labor and capital from all the Pacific Coast States are utilized in the fishing industry of Alaska; and

Whereas the decline in the salmon runs of Alaska is related to factors in other Pacific Coast States: Now therefore

Your memorialist prays that the Congress of the United States authorize and from year to year appropriate sufficient funds for a crash program of extensive research and exploration to restore the salmon fisheries of Alaska to their former state of productivity and to furnish basic information needed to deal with other nations in a salmon fisheries conservation and utilization plan for the North Pacific Ocean.

SEATTLE, WASH., February 24, 1961.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As you know, our company operates several Alaska enterprises which I enumerate and describe below:

1. Pelican Cold Storage Co., Pelican, Alaska, basically a cold storage fish freezing plant, operating a store, oil dock and small electric-water utility in connection. There are employed in total in this location during the season about 50 people. The livelihood of the entire community derives from fish landings at Pelican. In Pelican there is also a salmon cannery not directly connected with our operation.

2. Sitka Cold Storage Co., Sitka, Alaska—a cold storage fish freezing plant and large retail store in conjunction, employing a total of about 25 people. This is the largest local industry, except the pulp mill, in Sitka.

3. Coastal Glacier Sea Foods, Hoonah, Alaska—a small crab processing plant, retail store and marine oil station, employing seasonally to 50 people. Hoonah is almost entirely a native community with a total population of about 500.

During recent years the production of salmon in the Sitka-Pelican-Hoonah area has declined until last year it reached an all-time low for both troll and net-caught, with disastrous economic results—particularly in Pelican and Hoonah, where there is no other industry to take up the slack. The following tabulations will show just how seriously salmon (and other fish products) have fallen off:

Comparative troll-caught salmon production, Pelican and Sitka

[In thousands of pounds]

	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Silver salmon, frozen	1,385	1,606	2,048	2,729	3,169
King salmon, frozen	652	715	627	687	441
Salmon, mild cured	822	1,236	1,202	885	741
Total	2,859	3,557	3,877	4,301	4,351

Comparative total fish landings (all species), Pelican and Sitka

[In thousands of pounds]

	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Pelican	4,416	5,078	5,907	5,849	5,687
Sitka	2,250	2,144	1,934	2,197	3,041
Total	6,672	7,222	7,841	8,046	8,728

NOTE.—Above includes salmon, halibut, and cod.

Comparative canned salmon pack at Pelican, Alaska: 1954, 127,208 tall cases; 1955,

68,761 tall cases; 1956, 64,390 tall cases; 1957, 47,685 tall cases; 1958, 42,952 tall cases; 1959, 57,145 tall cases; 1960, 16,150 tall cases. In perusing the production figures above, the conclusions drawn therefrom are even more disconcerting when it is realized that the catches of fish these days are made with greatly improved boats and gear and more of both.

Salmon trolling at Pelican, when I first became connected with the operation in 1949, commenced in April and kept the fleet on the grounds well into September. This year the fleet operated from the middle of May and most of the boats had dispersed for the season by the middle of July because there were no fish.

Net-caught salmon, most of which goes into the can, were practically nonexistent and the seine boats engaged in the fishery couldn't even pay their bills in many cases. The pack figures for the Pelican cannery tell this story. The operating result, so far as the cannery goes, is not difficult to imagine; the loss was staggering. A direct result—the Pelican cannery will close down next season and pack with another company for the first time since it was built (except for 1 year during the war) and quite possibly join the ranks of the other "ghost" plants dotting Alaska. Since a good proportion of the net-caught salmon canned at Pelican are produced by resident seiners living in Hoonah the economic hardships are felt more keenly in the failure of the fishery than in any other southeastern community of similar size because there is nothing else to which these people can turn for a livelihood.

The effects in Sitka, while softened to some extent because of pulpmill activities, are no less real to the fisherman involved and to ourselves as fish processors.

It has and continues to be a real question whether or not we can continue the operation of our cold storage plant unless we can get more salmon on which to operate.

It is my conviction that we need a greatly expanded and accelerated salmon rehabilitation program—and we need it now—or our small, resident Alaska operations are doomed with the resource. This is a doleful picture but it is a realistic one.

Sincerely yours,

PELICAN COLD STORAGE CO.,
P. S. GANTY, President.

nee. In other cases, little or no attention has been given to this aspect of the nominee's qualifications.

It is right and proper that we know the financial interests of officials in high positions. But such information should be disclosed—not once but regularly—not by some but by all top officials—not just by those in the executive branch but by those of us in the legislative branch as well.

Regular disclosure of such information is a primary purpose of this bill. It would require that top officials in the Government—in the legislative as well as in the executive branch—should file periodically reports of their income and financial transactions.

Our bill is based upon the premise that full disclosure of financial interests offers the most effective protection against the misuse of public position for private gain. This is not a new principle. It is, for example, the basic approach embodied in our laws governing campaign expenditures, though here too its application should be broadened. And generally we believe that a requirement of full disclosure of the facts is a far more workable approach than an attempt by law to draw a precise line between proper and improper interests, relationships, and conduct.

We emphasize the inclusion of Members of Congress and top staff serving the Members or congressional committees because it is time, we believe, that we had a single standard in these matters. For too long we have had a double standard. Congress is diligent in holding the executive branch to strict accountability. And we do not hesitate to give nominees a real grilling. This is as it should be. At the same time, however, the whole process would be more seemly, in our view, if Members of Congress as well were subject to the same requirements of disclosure as officials in the executive branch. The public has a right to know the facts in either case.

Our bill would also apply the principle of disclosure to all *ex parte* communication concerning particular cases with regulatory agencies. It would require that any communication—oral or written—from a Member of Congress or anyone in the executive branch, or from anyone at all, to a regulatory agency concerning a particular case before that agency be made a part of the public record of that case. This would, we believe, effectively do away with the backdoor approach which has no place in regulatory or licensing proceedings. It would help to dispel the innuendo and suspicion that now clouds this area.

This is, of course, just one aspect of the so-called influence problem. There are many others. For example, where does one, where should one, draw the line between legitimate representation of constituents' interests—what might be called proper influence—and so-called improper influence or pressure? Every Member of Congress has confronted, at one time or another, and most likely many times—a problem of this sort. For that reason, our bill also proposes to establish a commission to study and make recommendations on handling

problems like this which inevitably arise in relations between the administrative and the legislative branches of our Government.

Last year Congress did act to require reports of expenditures by congressional committee members and committee staffs, and these reports are at last available to the public. This was a real step forward. We hope Congress will take the further steps proposed by our bill in the interests not only of the public at large, but of the Congress itself.

NEEDLES NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would create the Needles National Recreation Area in San Juan County, Utah.

The bill implements a detailed field investigation report prepared by the National Park Service in September 1959 and revised in August 1960. The report is entitled "Proposed Needles National Recreation Area, Utah."

For more than a year, I have been working closely with the Department of the Interior and with interested groups and individuals in Utah to obtain appropriate development of the magnificent Needles area. There is general agreement that this area is fully deserving of national recognition.

The area included in my bill covers 75,200 acres and includes Salt Creek Canyon, Horse Canyon, Chesler and Virginia Parks, Chesler Canyon, and Butler Wash. Generally, it is bounded on the west and north by the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and on the south and east by the township and section lines necessary to effectively control the drainages of Salt and Horse Canyons and Butler Wash. On the north, a quarter township is included to permit access to Lost and Salt Canyons and to control more effectively the logical entrance to the plateau upon which the main Needles formations are located. Domestic water and terrain suitable for a headquarters area also require the acquisition of land in the northeast corner of the proposed tract. Within the boundaries of the area are 11 surveyed State sections. The remainder is public domain.

The Needles country of southeastern Utah lies east and somewhat south of the junction of the Green and Colorado Rivers. It is an area of spectacular sandstone formations sculptured by the forces of weathering into bizarre pinnacles, fins, and arches. Parallel faulting has resulted in an erosional pattern forming literally a maze of slitlike, sheer-walled canyons.

The National Park Service in the summary section of its report describes the area in the following terms:

The area is scenically and geologically of national significance. It seems certain that citizens from all sections of the United States would be impressed by the scenic grandeur of the spectacular sandstone minarets, arches, and other forms of rock sculpturing, including Druid, Angel, and Castle Arches, and in the faulting, the uplifts and the graben valleys caused by the displacement of underlying saltbeds, and in

PROMOTION OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN INTEGRITY OF CONGRESS AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of our governmental processes.

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

The bill (S. 1233) to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am especially happy to be associated with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] in the introduction of this bill since her husband, the late Senator from Oregon, and I were cosponsors of similar legislation in the 86th Congress.

Since the 87th Congress began, much of its time has been spent in hearings on the confirmation of various Presidential appointees. In some cases, there has been an extensive inquiry into the financial interests of a particular nomi-

the hues of the formations of red, rose, and pink contrasted with cream and buff tints. Other features extensively scattered throughout the area which would elicit visitation are the prehistoric Indian ruins and writings which remain much as they were when abandoned 900 years ago by the Anasazi or "Ancient Ones." Examples are Tower Ruin and All-American-Man Cave.

There are many stories which might be told about this area. Any and all of the following deserve interpretation: The formation of the arches, spires, sandstone bastions, and the canyons and cross-canyons (grabens); the history of the area with mining, grazing, Butch Cassidy, so-called Moqui civilization, and river runners; and the story of the plant and animal association.

I have been advised that the National Park Service is continuing its studies of the Needles and surrounding areas. The National Parks Advisory Board last September, for example, made the following recommendation:

The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, having considered the scenic and scientific values of the Needles region of southeastern Utah, finds it to be of national significance, suitable for and in need of preservation for public use as a unit of the national park system.

The board therefore strongly recommends to the Secretary of the Interior that steps be taken at the earliest practicable moment for establishment of the Needles area as a national monument.

Not only is the Needles area worthy of national monument status as recommended by the advisory board, but it is even more majestic than many of our national parks. However, unless a new type of national park or national monument permitting multiple use of the area is developed, such a designation would be opposed by the people of the Needles area and by the State of Utah. It is my understanding that nearly all of the national conservationist groups would oppose such a change of policy in a new national park or monument, so I have introduced a bill creating a national recreation area in which multiple use of public lands will be permitted.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD following my remarks the text of eight letters which I have received from State and local governmental leaders and other interested groups favoring national recognition of the Needles area provided multiple use of the area is continued thereafter.

I think we are now entering a new era in the development of the rugged and unique beauty of southern Utah. I recently introduced a bill establishing a national parkway across southern Utah to join the national parks of the southwest with the Glen Canyon Recreation Area and the national monuments of the southeast. I also sponsored a bill to make a national park of Rainbow Bridge National Monument, a proposal which has the support of the Secretary of the Interior.

This development of the Needles area would fit in perfectly with these other proposals to make southern Utah more accessible and more attractive to tourist travel.

The Needles area fully deserves national recognition and protection, and I hope that Congress and the administra-

tion will take early favorable action on the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1239) to provide for the establishment of the Needles National Recreation Area, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letters presented by Mr. BENNETT are as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, Utah, August 16, 1960.
The Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I have discussed the matter of the Needles area with Harold Fabian, chairman of the park and recreation commission, and we are agreed that if this could be designated as a national recreation area, and attached to the recreational area around Lake Powell, it would probably be better than anything that we could do here in the State, and we would, at this moment, not want to oppose it. If it were to be made a part of a national park I would look at it differently, but under a national recreational area, where multiple use of the resources may be developed, I would have no objection to it.

Yours sincerely,
GEORGE D. CLYDE,
Governor.

SAN JUAN COUNTY,
Monticello, Utah, June 17, 1960.
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: It is the opinion of the board of county commissioners that the Needles area should not be closed to grazing, nor to mineral and oil exploration, but we still would like to acquaint the people of the United States with the breathtaking scenery that is found in this particular area. We therefore suggest that it be made a national park on a multiple-use basis, permitting it to be continued as a grazing area and also permit development of natural resources.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM C. WALTON,
Chairman, County Commissioners.

SAN JUAN COUNTY,
Monticello, Utah, August 9, 1960.
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: Thank you for your letter of July 23. After reviewing the matter of the Needles area, the board of county commissioners are of the opinion that the area should be designated a national recreation area, so that it will receive national recognition for its exceptional scenic, educational, and recreational facilities and still permit the exploration for and extraction of oil and gas, and the continuation of livestock grazing.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM C. WALTON,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners.

GRAND COUNTY,
STATE OF UTAH,
Moab, Utah, April 14, 1960.
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I have your letter to the Grand County Commission seeking

our thoughts on creating a national park or monument in the Needles area.

We are very much sold on the idea of the National Park Service taking over an area in the Needles. However, we feel that if at all possible, it should be set aside with multiple use. This is a large area and is mostly unexplored, at least for the possibility of oil, and with the oil play in this area we would not want to stop all that. There is also some grazing in the area. All multiple use would have to be regulated by the Parks Commission, but we believe this could be worked out somehow.

While we are on the subject of parks we believe that it is foolish to spend several millions to stop the water from backing up under the "Rainbow Bridge." As we understand the situation, the water will just back up under the bridge and not cover it. It doesn't seem to us that a little water under the bridge would hurt anything, probably no more than a lot of dams and change of channel. However, if the bridge is going to be covered we think the dams should be built and save this landmark.

Thanks for your inquiry.

Sincerely,
GRAND COUNTY COMMISSION,
WINFORD BUNCE,
Commissioner.

THE STATE OF UTAH,
STATE LAND BOARD,
Salt Lake City, Utah, August 3, 1960.
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I have your letter of July 29. From our point of view, designation of the area as a national recreation area would be superior to "park or monument designation" simply because of the continued availability for multiple use. We feel some compulsion to oppose any further withdrawal of public lands from industrial use. We must favor any recreational development which does not impede it.

The Utah Tourist and Publicity Council is conducting one of a series of travel clinics at Monticello on August 19. I have referred your letter and enclosure to Mr. James Cannon, the council's director, who intends, if you approve, to consider them with the area's business and political leaders during the travel clinic as a matter of formal discussion.

I believe Mr. Cannon would like to know what kind of Federal development is likely to attend the recognition of an area as a national recreation area. If information could be sent him before August 19, I'm sure he would appreciate it.

Very truly yours,

FRANK J. ALLEN,
Director.

THE STATE OF UTAH,
STATE LAND BOARD,
Salt Lake City, Utah, April 13, 1960.
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: I have your letter of March 31, 1960, in which you solicit my comments on the proposed inclusion of the Needles in the national parks system. The area is remote, and we are not aware that its surface values are of any consequence except as scenery. Nevertheless, the tract is in the southeastern part of the State where every acre gives some promise of oil, particularly since the recent Pure discovery at depth has revived interest in areas previously dismissed as sterile.

The land board has consistently opposed the withdrawal of lands from commercial development where there was some reason to be optimistic about their potential. We must, therefore, express opposition to any

action which would be prohibitive of mineral development in southeastern Utah at this time.

Sincerely,

FRANK J. ALLEN,
Director.

Blanding, so that they may express their opinion.

Yours very truly,

JAMES A. HOOPER,
Secretary.

UTAH PETROLEUM COUNCIL,
Lake City, Utah, June 3, 1960.
The Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senator from Utah,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: You will recall that some time ago you wrote about the possible creation of a national recreational area under the jurisdiction of the national park system in an area known as the Needles in northwestern San Juan County. My delay in answering your letter was attributable to the fact that it took some time to get the exact legal description of the proposed recreational area.

After securing this description and researching the present status of these lands, I find that 100 percent of the area is now under lease to oil companies and individuals concerned with oil development.

In addition, a substantial amount of seismicographic work has been done in this area recently. Since 1955, five dry holes have been drilled there. The dry holes furnished such significant and promising geological information that further exploratory work has been deemed worth while. It is conservatively estimated that between \$1,500,000 and \$1,250,000 has been spent on oil exploration work within the confines of the Needles area.

It should be pointed out that the Needles area lies only 25 miles west of the very important, recently discovered, Lisbon Valley field, 25 miles south of the Big Flat field in Grand County where Pure Oil is in process of completing a new discovery, and about 60 miles northwest of the Aneth area. Also, this area is located in the heart of the Paradox Basin which is the source of almost 90 percent of Utah's present oil production. Thus it is apparent that the Needles area is certainly in a favorable geographical location for future oil development.

Consequently, our organization is definitely opposed to any utilization of this area which would in any way preclude the development of oil resources, as I understand the creation of a national recreational area under the Park Service would. On the other hand, we would certainly not be opposed to a development which would utilize the great scenic benefits of the area and also permit development of natural resources as well.

Cordially yours,

JOHN H. KLAS,
Executive Director.

UTAH WOOL GROWERS, INC.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, August 1, 1960.
The Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: Thanks for your letter of July 29, 1960, regarding the creation of a national park in the Needles area of Utah.

The basic question is, How much free recreation and how many national parks can we afford? It seems time for the public to pay for their recreation and vacation and not depend upon Government help.

My personal view is that the Needles area, provided that there is little or no expense involved, be designated as a "recreation area." This would then permit grazing and the extraction of oil and gas if found within the area in commercial quantities.

I am sending a copy of this letter to our directors in Grand County, M. H. Young, Moab; and San Juan County, Reed E. Bayles,

CONTINUATION OF COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM

MR. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a measure relating to the continuation of the college housing program. I introduce it on behalf of myself, my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until Friday of this week for additional cosponsors who may wish to add their names, and I ask unanimous consent to have the bill, which is very brief, 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 and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 1245) to amend title IV ("Housing for Educational Institutions") of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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 section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) To obtain funds for loans under subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed \$1,775,000,000, which amount shall be increased by \$250,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1961 through 1965: *Provided*, That the amount outstanding for other educational facilities, as defined herein, shall not exceed \$175,000,000, which limit shall be increased by \$25,000,000 on July 1 of each of such years: *Provided further*, That the amount outstanding for hospitals, referred to in clause (2) of section 404(b) of this title, shall not exceed \$100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by \$25,000,000 on July 1 of each of such years."

SEC. 2. Section 403 of such Act is amended by striking "10 per centum" and substituting therefor "12½ per centum".

CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1961

MR. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a cropland adjustment program on behalf of myself and Senators LAUSCHE, DIRKSEN, COOPER, BENNETT, and MILLER.

Without taking the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation and purpose of the bill in connection with my remarks.

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

and, without objection, the statement of purpose will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1246) to establish a cropland adjustment program introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement of purpose presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to bring the supplies of wheat and other grains in line with current demand so that the surplus of these commodities can be reduced; farm prices and per family farm income increased; and the tax cost of farm programs decreased.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall determine annually the overall acreage adjustment of feed grains, wheat, soybeans, and flax necessary to bring the total estimated annual production plus the anticipated release from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks in line with anticipated disappearance. The Secretary shall also establish annually the percentage of cropland which must be placed under contract to qualify for price support on these commodities.

2. To be eligible for price supports on wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and flax, producers must participate in the cropland adjustment program. Cropland already in a retirement program shall be counted in determining compliance with this requirement. Producers of other commodities may also participate. (Whole farm participation should be encouraged.) Any cropland retired under the program in excess of the minimum requirement for price support must be placed under contract for at least 3 years.

3. Cropland adjustment payments shall be made at a level which will encourage sufficient voluntary participation to attain the desired adjustment.

4. Adjustment payments may be made in cash or in kind. Emphasis should be placed on payment in kind, with care to minimize disturbance of the market price structure for grain.

5. Cropland retired under this program must be in addition to land normally left idle or fallowed.

6. Acreage retired under the program may not be harvested or grazed.

7. A maximum limit shall be placed on the percentage of cropland acreage that may be retired in any county after allowing for the minimum acreage required for price support. Acreage retired under previous programs shall not prevent participation in the annual adjustment programs.

8. Wheat acreage allotments shall be terminated.

9. The price support level on corn shall be left unchanged and related to the average price received by farmers during the immediately preceding 3 years with a floor of 65 percent of parity, the same as the Agricultural Act of 1958. The support levels for other feed grains and wheat shall be comparable to the level for corn with adjustments for differences in weight, nutritive value, buyer preference, and supply-demand conditions. The support price for wheat of the 1962 crop shall not be less than 120 percent of the support price for corn of the 1962 crop.

10. Adequate measures shall be taken to protect farmers from the competition of Commodity Credit Corporation sales from accumulated stocks.

The cropland adjustment program outlined above proposes to remove a basic cause

of continuing low farm income by starting an immediate reduction of the agricultural productive plant to a size which will better fit farm output to market needs and open the way to orderly liquidation of accumulated Government stocks. It provides for voluntary participation by producers of all crops but requires producers who wish to qualify for price support on wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and flax to participate. Greatest emphasis is placed on the retirement of land from wheat and feed grains as these crops are in most serious surplus difficulty.

The attached table shows approximate cropland acreage nationally, how the acreage is currently being used, and what the status of land devoted to specified crops would be under the proposed adjustment program.

U.S. cropland acreage by principal uses

	Planted acreage [Thousands]
Cropland (grouped by principal use):	
Group A: To be supported (without acreage controls) (producers of these commodities desiring price support must participate in the proposed cropland adjustment program): ¹	
Corn (all).....	82,906
Wheat (all).....	55,633
Oats, barley, rye.....	52,177
Sorghum (for grain).....	15,444
Soybeans (for beans).....	23,516
Flax (all).....	3,527
Subtotal, group A.....	<u>233,203</u>
Group B: To be supported (with acreage controls) (participation in the proposed cropland adjustment program is not required for price support on these commodities): ¹	
Cotton.....	16,068
Rice.....	1,614
Peanuts.....	1,579
Tobacco.....	1,144
Subtotal, group B.....	<u>20,405</u>
Group C: Other crops and uses: ²	
Conservation reserve.....	*28,432
Hay, cropland pasture, other crops, fallow, idle, failure, etc.....	177,609
Total cropland, all uses ³	<u>459,649</u>

¹ Planted acreage for 1960 as reported by USDA.

² Currently supported and controlled, but controls to be terminated under proposed adjustment program.

³ 1954 U.S. Census of Agriculture—data now used by USDA in Land Retirement Computations. New census data to be available in about 6 months.

⁴ Under contract in 1960.

Under the proposed bill all land listed in the table under groups A, B, and C—except for an amount in group C equal to that which is customarily summer fallowed or left idle—would be eligible for the land retirement program on a voluntary basis.

CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS TO CERTAIN CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the government of each of the following States has the direct responsibility for the purchase and distribution of all alcoholic beverages within its State: Alabama, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, Montana,

New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming. For this reason these are known as liquor control States. Each obtains individual warranties with all suppliers to insure each that alcoholic beverage purchases by it would be at a price no higher than that paid by any other purchaser for the same product.

Experience having shown that the warranties had been breached by manufacturers and distributors, the control States joined together to exchange price information. This exchange resulted in many of the States recovering thousands of dollars under the warranties.

Pricing practices in this industry, such as special discounts, free goods, and large advertising allowances, all tend to make detection of price discrimination most difficult, if not impossible. This difficulty applies even in the "open States," where all transactions are required to be posted publicly.

The State official of a control State has an obligation to make every effort possible to see that alcoholic beverages are purchased by him at the lowest price available to anyone in the country. Because of these experiences the control States seek Federal legislation to assist their efforts to prevent price discrimination and make their warranties effective.

The bill I introduce will clarify the antitrust laws with respect to two or more States designating the same agent to enforce the warranty provisions of each State with the alcoholic beverage suppliers; it will permit such agent to act for the several control States in examining sales records of a supplier to insure against price discrimination.

Under this legislation there can be created an efficient, relatively inexpensive procedure which will assure adequate protection against price discrimination of the type which control State officials believe develops absent such a procedure. State officials could discharge their responsibilities more efficiently and with a resultant saving to the consumer.

I ask that the bill lie on table for 1 week, so that others who share this view may join in sponsorship of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1247) to clarify the application of the antitrust laws to certain contracts and agreements entered into by State alcoholic beverage agencies with suppliers of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROGRAM TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN DISTRESSED AREAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1) to establish an ef-

fective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1, *supra*, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL FUELS STUDY—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR RESOLUTION TO LIE ON DESK—MORE THAN 50 SENATORS ARE COSPONSORS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 105, which would provide for a Select Committee of the Senate to study energy fuels, be allowed to remain on the desk through Friday of this week. More than 50 Senators have joined as cosponsors of the resolution.

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

INCOME TAX CREDIT ON CERTAIN TUITION FEES—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] be added as cosponsors of a bill I introduced, S. 634, to provide for an income tax credit on fees paid for tuition to institutions of higher learning.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 986) to assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local public bodies, the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy, the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] may be added as a cosponsor.

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

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF CERTAIN SCHOOLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California

[Mr. KUCHEL], who is not present today, I request that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added as a cosponsor to the bill introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], S. 1109, to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities.

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

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 2, 1961, the names of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1187) to amend the Federal air pollution control law to provide for a more effective program of air pollution control, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER on March 2, 1961.

ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR PERSONS CONVICTED OF VIOLATING THE ANTITRUST LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 20, 1961, the names of Senators YOUNG of North Dakota, LONG of Hawaii, and BARTLETT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 996) to amend the Sherman Act to provide additional public relief from repetitive criminal violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE on February 20, 1961.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF RALPH PAIEWONSKY TO BE GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to announce that hearings on the nomination of Ralph Paiewonsky to be Governor of the Virgin Islands will be held by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at 10 o'clock a.m., Friday, March 10, in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee room.

Any Senators who desire to make statements with respect to Mr. Paiewonsky are requested to appear at that time. We shall be happy to hear from Senators at 10 o'clock next Friday morning in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee room.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH ITALY FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on January 17, 1961, President Eisenhower submitted to the Congress a proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Italy for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

The proposed agreement is similar to agreements entered into with the Governments of Greece, Turkey, West Germany, and the Netherlands in 1959, which would authorize the AEC and Defense Department to transfer to an ally nonnuclear parts of atomic weapon systems and to exchange classified atomic energy information necessary to:

First, the development of defense plans;

Second, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy;

Third, the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; and

Fourth, the development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons.

On Thursday, March 9, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold an open public hearing in room F-39, U.S. Capitol Building, beginning at 10 a.m. to receive testimony with regard to the proposed Italian agreement.

In order that all Members of Congress may be familiar with the details I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record the text of the proposed agreement with the Government of Italy, as well as the accompanying recommendations from the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record the public announcement that I, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee and Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, as chairman of the Joint Committee, issued on March 3, 1961, announcing the planned public hearing.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In December 1957 the heads of government of the nations members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization reached agreement in principle on the desirability of achieving the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive strength, taking into account the most recent developments in weapons and techniques. In enunciating this agreement in principle the heads of government made it clear that this decision was the result of the fact that the Soviet leaders, while preventing a general disarmament agreement, had left no doubt that the most modern and destructive weapons of all kinds were being introduced into the Soviet armed forces. The introduction of modern weapons into NATO forces should be no cause for concern on the part of other countries, since NATO is purely a defensive alliance.

It is our conviction and the conviction of our NATO allies that the introduction into NATO defenses of the most modern weapons available is essential in maintaining the strength necessary to the alliance. Any alliance depends in the last analysis upon the sense of shared mutual interests among its members, and by sharing with our allies certain training information we are demonstrating concretely our sense of partnership in NATO's defensive planning. Failure on our part to contribute to the improvement of the state of operational readiness of the forces of other members of NATO

will only encourage the Soviet Union to believe that it can eventually succeed in its goal of destroying NATO's effectiveness.

To facilitate the necessary cooperation on our part legislation amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was enacted by the Congress in 1958. Pursuant to that legislation agreements for cooperation were concluded with four of our NATO partners in May and June 1959. A similar agreement was also recently concluded with our NATO ally, the Republic of Italy. All of these agreements are designed to implement in important respects the agreed NATO program.

This agreement with the Government of Italy will enable the United States to cooperate effectively in mutual defense planning with Italy and in the training of Italian NATO forces in order that, if an attack on NATO should occur, Italian forces could, under the direction of the supreme allied commander for Europe, effectively use nuclear weapons in their defense.

These agreements previously concluded and this Italian agreement represent only a portion of the work necessary for complete implementation of the decision taken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in December 1957. I anticipate the conclusion of similar agreements for cooperation with certain other NATO nations as the alliance's defensive planning continues.

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the agreement with the Government of Italy. I am also transmitting a copy of the Secretary of State's letter accompanying an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, a copy of a joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of this document and a copy of my memorandum in reply thereto setting forth my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 17, 1961.

DECEMBER 31, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President with a view to its transmission to the Congress, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, an authoritative copy of an Agreement for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Italy, signed at Rome on December 3, 1960.

This agreement was signed on behalf of the United States pursuant to the authorization granted in the President's memorandum of November 8, 1960 to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. A copy of this memorandum was received by the Secretary of State from the President.

Faithfully yours,

LIVINGSTON T. MERCHANT,
Acting Secretary.

Enclosures.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., November 8, 1960.
Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

In your joint letter to me of August 25, 1960, you recommended that I approve a proposed Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Italy for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

Italy is participating with the United States in an international arrangement pursuant to which it is making substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security. The proposed agree-

ment will permit cooperation necessary to improve the state of training and operational readiness of the armed forces of Italy, subject to provisions, conditions, guarantees, terms, and special determinations, which are most appropriate in this important area of mutual assistance, in accordance with the agreement in principle reached in December 1957.

Having considered your joint recommendations and the cooperation provided for in the agreement, including security safeguards and other terms and conditions of the agreement, I hereby—

1. Approve the program for the transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapon systems involving restricted data under the terms and conditions provided in your joint letter and the proposed agreement; however, types, quantities, and conditions of transfer of such parts are subject to my further approval.

2. Determine that the performance of this agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States.

3. Approve the proposed agreement and authorize its execution for the Government of the United States in a manner designated by the Secretary of State.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1960.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is hereby submitted for your consideration and approval a proposed Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Italy for Cooperation on the Use of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

The proposed agreement will permit, under the authority of sections 91c and 144b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the transfer of classified information and certain equipment necessary for the purpose of improving the state of training and operational readiness of the armed forces of Italy. The December 1957 NATO Heads of Government meeting established the concept of a stockpile of arms for the strengthening of NATO's defenses, and this present agreement is an important part of the implementation of this concept. The carrying out of this agreement should do much to advance our mutual defense interest, including the vital cause of strengthening the NATO defensive alliance, and will thereby aid materially in the defense of the United States.

Article II of the agreement provides for the transfer of classified information, including "restricted data" and "formerly restricted data," necessary to the development of defense plans; the training of personnel in the employment of and the defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; the evaluation of the capability of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; and the development of delivery systems capable of carrying atomic weapons.

Article III of the agreement provides that the United States will transfer nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems involving restricted data (other than nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons) for the purpose of improving the state of training and operational readiness of the armed forces of Italy. However, in view of section 91c of the Atomic Energy Act, the applicability of which is reflected in article IV of the agreement, no transfer can be made if it would contribute significantly to the recipient nation's atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability. It is not possible to determine

at this time the types, quantities and conditions of transfer, whether by sale, lease or loan, of those parts which it will become necessary to transfer for our mutual defense during the period of the agreement. Accordingly, under the terms and conditions of the agreement, it will be necessary to determine from time to time the types, quantities and conditions of transfer and such determination shall be submitted for your approval.

The agreement would remain in force until terminated by agreement of both parties, thus assuring continued protection for the information and equipment transferred in accordance with the provision of the agreement. However, cooperation for the transfer of information and equipment under articles II and III of the agreement may be discontinued by either party in the event of the termination of the North Atlantic Treaty.

In accordance with the provisions of sections 91c and 144b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement specifically provides in article I that all cooperation under the agreement will be undertaken only when the communicating or transferring party determines that such cooperation will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to its defense and security. Article I of the agreement also provides, in accordance with the act, that all cooperation under the agreement will be undertaken only while the United States and Italy are participating in an international arrangement for their mutual defense and security and making substantial and material contributions thereto. Cooperation under articles II and III of the agreement would be undertaken only when these conditions prevail.

Article IV of the agreement stipulates that the cooperation under the agreement will be carried out by each of the parties in accordance with its applicable laws. Article IV also makes clear that there will be no transfer under the agreement of atomic weapons, non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons or special nuclear material.

In addition to the foregoing provisions on the terms, conditions, duration, nature and scope of cooperation, the agreement provides that the parties will maintain agreed security safeguards and standards. The agreement also contains particular commitments that the recipient of any equipment or information that is obtained pursuant to the agreement will not transfer it to unauthorized persons and will not transfer it beyond the jurisdiction of the recipient party, except in limited circumstances specifically provided in the agreement.

Italy is now participating with the United States in an international arrangement pursuant to which Italy is making substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security. It is the view of the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission that this agreement is entirely in accord with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. It is the considered opinion of the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States.

Accordingly, it is recommended that you—

(a) Approve the program for the transfer of non-nuclear parts of atomic weapon systems involving restricted data under the terms and conditions provided in this letter and the proposed agreement; however, types, quantities and conditions of transfer of such parts are subject to your later approval;

(b) Determine that the performance of this agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

(c) Approve the proposed agreement and authorize its execution for the Government of the United States in a manner specified by the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State concurs in the foregoing recommendations.

With great respect, we are,

Faithfully yours,

JOHN A. MCCONE,

Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

THOMAS S. GATES,

Secretary of Defense.

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Italy,

Considering that they have concluded a Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement, pursuant to which each Government will make available to the other equipment, materials, services, or other military assistance in accordance with such terms and conditions as may be agreed;

Considering that their mutual security and defense require that they be prepared to meet the contingencies of atomic warfare;

Considering that they are participating together in an international arrangement pursuant to which they are making substantial and material contributions to their mutual defense and security;

Recognizing that their common defense and security will be advanced by the exchange of information concerning atomic energy and by the transfer of certain types of equipment;

Believing that such exchange and transfer can be undertaken without risk to the defense and security of either country; and

Taking into consideration the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and all the applicable Italian statutes;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

General provisions

While the United States and Italy are participating in an international arrangement for their mutual defense and security and making substantial and material contributions thereto, each Party will communicate to and exchange with the other Party information and transfer non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems involving Restricted Data to the other Party in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement, provided that the communicating or transferring Party determines that such cooperation will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to its defense and security.

ARTICLE II

Exchange of information

Each Party will communicate to or exchange with the other Party such classified information as is jointly determined to be necessary to:

A. the development of defense plans;
B. the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy;

C. the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; and

D. the development of delivery systems compatible with the atomic weapons which they carry.

ARTICLE III

Transfer of non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems

The Government of the United States will transfer to the Government of Italy, subject to terms and conditions to be agreed, non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems involving Restricted Data as such parts are jointly determined to be necessary for the purpose of improving Italy's state of training and operational readiness.

ARTICLE IV
Conditions

A. Cooperation under this agreement will be carried out by each of the parties in accordance with its applicable laws.

B. Under this agreement there will be no transfer by either party of atomic weapons, non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, or special nuclear materials.

C. The information communicated or exchanged, and non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems transferred by either party pursuant to this agreement shall be used by the recipient party exclusively for the preparation or implementation of defense plans in the mutual interests of the two countries.

D. Nothing in this agreement shall preclude the communication or exchange of classified information which is transmissible under other arrangements between the parties.

ARTICLE V
Guarantees

A. Classified information and non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems communicated or transferred pursuant to this agreement shall be accorded full security protection under applicable security arrangements between the parties and applicable national legislation and regulations of the parties. In no case shall either party maintain security standards for safeguarding classified information, and non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems, made available pursuant to this agreement less restrictive than those set forth in the applicable security arrangements in effect on the date this agreement comes into force.

B. Classified information communicated or exchanged pursuant to this agreement will be made available through channels existing or hereafter agreed for the communication or exchange of such information between the parties.

C. Classified information, communicated or exchanged, and any non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems transferred pursuant to this Agreement shall not be communicated, exchanged or transferred by the recipient Party or persons under its jurisdiction to any unauthorized persons or, except as provided in Article VI of this Agreement, beyond the jurisdiction of that Party. Each Party may stipulate the degree to which any of the information and non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems communicated, exchanged or transferred by it or persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement may be disseminated or distributed; may specify the categories of persons who may have access to such information or non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems; and may impose such other restrictions on the dissemination of distribution of such information or non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE VI
Dissemination

Nothing in this Agreement shall be interpreted or operate as a bar or restriction to consultation or cooperation in any field of defense by either Party with other nations or international organizations. Neither Party, however, shall so communicate classified information or transfer or permit access to or use of non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems made available by the other Party pursuant to this Agreement unless:

A. It is notified by the originating Party that all appropriate provisions and requirements of the originating Party's applicable laws, including authorization by competent bodies of the originating Party, have been complied with which would be necessary to authorize the originating Party directly so to communicate to, transfer to, permit access

to or use by such other nation or international organization; and further that the originating Party authorizes the recipient Party so to communicate to, transfer to, permit access to or use by such other nation or international organization; or

B. The originating Party has informed the recipient Party that the originating Party has so communicated to, transferred to, permitted access to or use by such other nation or international organization.

ARTICLE VII
Classification policies

Agreed classification policies shall be maintained with respect to all classified information and non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems communicated, exchanged or transferred under this Agreement.

ARTICLE VIII

Responsibility for use of information and non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications) or non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems communicated, exchanged or transferred under this Agreement shall be the responsibility of the Party receiving it, and the other Party does not provide any indemnity or warranty with respect to such application or use.

ARTICLE IX
Patents

The recipient Party shall use the classified information communicated, or revealed by equipment transferred hereunder, for the purposes specified herein only. Any inventions or discoveries resulting from possession of such information on the part of the recipient Party or persons under its jurisdiction shall be made available to the other Party for all purposes without charge in accordance with such arrangements as may be agreed and shall be safeguarded in accordance with the provisions of Article V of this Agreement.

ARTICLE X
Definitions

For the purposes of this Agreement:

A. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

B. "Classified information" means information, data, materials, services, or any other matter with the security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied under the legislation or regulations of either the United States or Italy, including that designated by the Government of the United States as "Restricted Data" and "Formerly Restricted Data" and that designated by the Government of Italy as "Atomic Restricted" and "Atomic Most Restricted".

C. "Non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons" means parts of atomic weapons which are specially designed for them and are not in general use in other end products and which are not made of, in whole or in part, special nuclear material; and "non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems involving Restricted Data" means parts of atomic weapons systems, other than non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, which contain or reveal atomic information and which are not made of, in whole or in part, special nuclear material.

D. As used in this Agreement, the term "atomic information" means:

1. So far as concerns information provided by the Government of the United States, information which is designated "Restricted Data" and "Formerly Restricted Data".

2. So far as concerns information provided by the Government of Italy, information which is designated "Atomic Restricted" and "Atomic Most Restricted".

ARTICLE XI
Duration

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all legal requirements for the entry into force of this Agreement, and shall remain in force until terminated by agreement of both Parties except that either Party may terminate its cooperation under Articles II or III upon the expiration of the North Atlantic Treaty.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Agreement.

DONE at Rome, in duplicate, in the English and Italian languages, both texts being equally authentic, this 3rd day of December, 1960.

For the Government of the United States of America:

For the Government of Italy:

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, MARCH 3, 1961

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold open hearings on a proposed Agreement for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes With the Government of Italy, Thursday, March 9, 1961, at 10:00 a.m. in room F-39, The Capitol, it was announced today by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD and Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, respective chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee.

The proposed agreement which is similar to agreements entered into in 1959 with Greece, Turkey, West Germany, and The Netherlands would authorize the AEC and Defense Department to transfer to Italy nonnuclear parts of atomic weapon systems and to exchange classified atomic energy information necessary to:

1. The development of defense plans;
2. The training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy;
3. The evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; and
4. The development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons.

By law, the transfer of the material and the communication of the information will occur whenever the President determines that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

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

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:
Address entitled "Capital Budget Makes Commonsense," delivered by Senator HARTKE at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Dallas on February 16, 1961.

By Mr. WILEY:
Address delivered by him entitled "Revival of Pioneering Spirit To Meet Challenges of Space Age."

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ZALES N. ECTON, OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with regret that I inform the Senate that a former colleague of ours, Zales Ecton, of Montana, passed away at the end of last week.

Zales Ecton was a good man, a decent man, a fine man, and we will miss him in Montana, as we have missed him in this Chamber.

He was a man who was honest and straightforward in what he had to say and in his beliefs; and it is with a sense of extreme regret and deep sorrow that I make the announcement at this time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I first knew Zales Ecton as a member of the Montana Legislature, when he and I were colleagues in 1937. He made an outstanding record in that legislature as a friend of the ranchers, of the small businessmen, and especially of the Indians of Montana. As a result of his fine record he was elected to this body, and in this body he also made an outstanding record.

When Zales Ecton returned to Montana he returned as a friend of Montana State College, at Bozeman, where he lived, and also a friend of the educational institutions throughout the State of Montana. He was an outstanding and distinguished citizen of my State. We all mourn his passing. We have lost one of our fine American citizens.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I knew Zales Ecton as a Senator, and rather intimately, because it was my pleasure to go to Montana to campaign for him on a number of occasions. One gets to know and to understand a man and what makes him tick when one goes from community to community in his home State, lives with him, and shares fellowship over a period of time. Zales Ecton was a noble man in every sense of the word. He was one of the dedicated persons who are close to the soil, whose thinking is basic and fundamental.

I developed not only a high regard but also a deep affection for him. I join in extending sympathy, and I concur in the condolences expressed today.

TRIBUTE TO PHILIP L. GRAHAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune, March 5, there appears an article by Don Irwin, a distinguished Washington correspondent of that newspaper. The article concerns the career of another newspaperman, Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The article articulates what many of us have long felt about Mr. Graham and the great newspaper over which he presides. It tells of a highly responsible man with the intellectual capacity to recognize the great significance of a free press in a free society and with the energetic determination to see to it that his paper—as part of the American journalistic profession as a whole—

meets, with ever-increasing effectiveness, its obligation to the people of this city and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the article previously cited.

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

PHILIP GRAHAM OF THE WASHINGTON Post
(By Don Irwin)

WASHINGTON.

"It is arithmetically true that 49.5 percent of publishers are below average."

Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post Co., produced this facetious statistic last year to make a far-from-facetious point to a Minnesota University journalism seminar. It was his characteristically dry way of voicing concern that the men who direct the American press are not doing enough to meet the urgencies of the times.

At the time he spoke, Mr. Graham held the titles of president and publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, the only morning paper in the Nation's Capital. In a reshuffle recently, he passed the publisher's title along to John W. Sweeterman, formerly the paper's business manager. But Mr. Graham, as president, remains very much the paper's guiding spirit.

Mr. Graham considers the Post a "fairly good paper that needs a lot of improvement." The comment is interesting because most of its critics—and there are plenty of them—will concede that there has been considerable improvement in the Post during the nearly 15 years Mr. Graham has been its operating head.

Materially, the improvement is evident. The paper's circulation is over 400,000, more than double the 1946 figure. It ranks seventh in the Nation in advertising volume. It is produced in an 8-year-old, \$6 million plant and is now expanding into a \$6,500,000 addition that includes some of the newspaper industry's most modern equipment. It is substantially in the black.

To the lanky, 44-year-old ex-lawyer who is the Post's president, the paper's solvency is "just luck."

BOUGHT IT AT AN AUCTION

The luck was the merger on St. Patrick's Day, 1954, in which the Post bought and swallowed up its only morning competitor, the old Times-Herald. Until the merger gave the Post a morning monopoly, the hard-ribbed conservative Times-Herald and the militantly liberal Post had halved circulation and advertising in an era of rising costs. Neither was prospering.

The merger was made possible by two contrasting, powerful personalities: the late Eugene Meyer, former publisher of the Post, and the late Col. Robert R. McCormick, then publisher of the Chicago Tribune and, incidentally of the Times-Herald.

Mr. Meyer, who was Mr. Graham's father-in-law, was a retired banker until 1933, when he bought the Post at a bankruptcy auction for \$825,000. Mr. Meyer provided the leadership and the funds to bring the paper back from a circulation low of 51,534 and start it on a course that now makes it required breakfast reading for President Kennedy and most other informed Washingtonians.

Colonel McCormick had taken over the Times-Herald upon the death of its previous publisher and had modernized it mechanically even as he tried to cast it in the ultra-conservative mold of his Chicago paper. After 3 years the ailing colonel abandoned the experiment and let it be known that he was ready to sell out to the competition.

The \$10,300,000 deal gave Washington's surviving morning paper a solid base for circulation and advertising. It showered the paper with a cornucopia of features, columns, news services, and comic strips. It also afforded a safe chance to raise the newsstand price from a nickel to a dime without any appreciable circulation loss.

The price rise has occasioned the most concrete of the criticisms leveled at the paper. The Post is also a regular target for attacks from isolationists, segregationists and a whole spectrum of conservatives. (The late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy called it the Washington edition of the Daily Worker.) Many far more moderate Republicans charge that it is biased for the Democrats.

Mr. Graham is a liberal—if independent—Democrat, and his thinking is reflected both on the editorial page and in the play of stories. But he has been known to intervene personally to tone down editorial comment which he considered unfairly slanted toward the liberal side. Among them have been especially acid depictions of former Vice President Nixon by Herbert L. Block (Herblock), the Post's prize-winning cartoonist.

Despite its orientation, the Post has a tradition of independence, and Mr. Graham is anxious to keep party labels off the paper. It was partly because of this policy that the Post made no formal endorsement during the 1960 election, although its heart was plainly in the Kennedy camp. Mr. Graham is glad the paper avoided formal commitments.

For similar reasons, Mr. Graham is cool to recurrent suggestions that he would ornament a Democratic administration. It would be impossible in the ultrapolitical atmosphere of the District of Columbia, he feels, to be both an officeholder and the chief executive of a newspaper which aggressively reserves a right to independence.

"The only way I'd go into Government would be to sell the paper," Mr. Graham said recently. "And I wouldn't sell it to be President of the United States."

THE FAMILY FORTUNE

Philip Leslie Graham was born July 18, 1915, in a South Dakota mining town, but was taken by his family to Dade County, Fla., in 1921 so his engineer father could become supervisor of an experimental sugar plantation. Adverse weather killed off the experiment after 12 years, but the elder Graham salvaged a big parcel of land from the liquidation. The land was first developed as a dairy and beef ranch. As nearby Miami expanded, it became the foundation for a seven-figure family fortune in which Mr. Graham shares.

When young Phil Graham entered the University of Florida at 16, he was a scrawny 6-footer known ironically as "Musclebound." He roomed there with George H. Smathers, now a Democratic Senator from Florida and a power in the Capital. Mr. Graham's capacity for making influential friends has continued.

Later, at Harvard Law School, Mr. Graham edited the august Law Review before he was graduated tenth in the class of 1939. He walked out into a job as law clerk to Associate Justice Stanley Reed, of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Graham moved from the Court to the bureaucracy of the prewar Defense Building as an expeditor for the old Office of Emergency Management and the Lend-Lease Administration. He entered the Army Air Force as a private in 1942 and was discharged in 1945 as a major, after serving on the intelligence staff of the Far East Air Force.

Then Mr. Graham switched careers. He had continued in the law after his marriage in 1940 to Mr. Meyer's daughter, Katherine.

But Mr. Meyer was 70 at the war's end. His only son had become a doctor. He invited his evidently able son-in-law to become associate publisher. Mr. Graham moved to the Post on January 1, 1946. Six months later he was named publisher. Mr. Meyer became board chairman, but remained the paper's influential consultant and financial anchor until his death in July 1959.

When Mr. Graham came to the Post it was edging into the black in the course of the lengthy rebuilding process underwritten by Mr. Meyer at a reputed eventual cost of \$20 million. It was already celebrated for a lively editorial page that had been one of Mr. Meyer's prime interests. But it was limited in circulation, news coverage, and resources. Mechanically, progress was blocked by a picturesque but wholly inadequate plant.

Mr. Graham gave first priority to a new plant. He and his associates inspected modern newspaper buildings all over the country and borrowed new ideas liberally. Added circulation flowing from the merger strained the facilities of the new Post building within months after it was occupied. Mr. Graham pressed plans for the addition.

SOMETHING BESIDES SURVIVAL

"The merger means we can work for something beside sheer economic survival, which is good," Mr. Graham says in retrospect. "I think the paper will grow economically. The big question is: Will it grow journalistically?"

Journalistic growth is now Mr. Graham's main interest. He devotes much of his formal workday to editorial problems. World affairs from many viewpoints are the central theme of his voracious reading when he enjoys a free night at his substantial Georgetown townhouse or a weekend rest at Glen Welby, the family's country place at Marshall, Va., 53 miles from Washington.

Since the merger, the Post's editorial roster has risen from 160 to over 200. Mr. Graham has personally superintended the recruiting. Pay scales have increased substantially.

The Post's president keeps his informally modern seventh-floor office open to hands from the fifth-floor newsroom. They report him ready to discuss anything with anybody and to enjoy an argument that gives full range to his salty vocabulary. He is frequently an idea man—and sometimes a leg-man—on news stories. His queries are known to have provided the impulse that led the Post's star White House man, Edward T. Follard, into investigations that later produced a Pulitzer Prize and a Raymond Clapper Award.

Policy, as such, is seldom laid down in hard terms by Mr. Graham. He relies heavily on the judgment of J. Russell Wiggins, the paper's editor, and Robert H. Estabrook, editor of the editorial page. Mr. Wiggins, who received his present title only recently, was responsible as managing editor for assembling most of the Post's present staff. He is a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and an unremitting crusader for freedom of information—in Washington as well as overseas. Mr. Estabrook is a founder and former chairman of the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

Mr. Graham has top-drawer entree in the new Democratic administration. He was a Georgetown neighbor of President Kennedy and has long been considerably more than an acquaintance of the President. He is far closer than that to Vice President JOHNSON, whom he has known intimately for years.

Mr. Graham declines to discuss reports that he played a prominent part in assembling the Kennedy-Johnson ticket last July—but he hasn't denied them. The best available information is that he acted as a middleman, first counseling the Kennedy camp to ignore hard words that came from

the Johnson camp during the Texan's losing fight for the first place, then encouraging Mr. JOHNSON to run for second place.

Mr. Graham's connections aren't exclusively Democratic. His Republican friends include Governor Rockefeller in New York and former Attorney General William P. Rogers. He was on good terms with the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, even though the Post attacked some Dulles policies.

The Post and its then publisher had more formidable Republican credentials in 1952, when the paper deviated from the path of independence to endorse General Eisenhower. The endorsement induced a kind of editorial schizophrenia for a time. The endorsement wasn't repeated in 1956.

Mr. Graham polishes his contacts with appearances two or three times weekly on the Georgetown dinner circuit, where he confines his drinks to vermouth on the rocks and smokes filter cigarettes. He generally ducks massive receptions. He frequently returns from social events with news tips, but his staff regrets that he doesn't tell all. He scrupulously observes confidences and has sat on some good stories in the process.

Like Mr. Meyer before him, Mr. Graham takes a close personal interest in the Post's editorial page, which is daily reading for most of the Government's "chiefs," as well as thousands of "Indians." Mr. Graham submits many editorial ideas and sometimes blocks out a piece himself in longhand on a lawyer's long, yellow pad.

Mr. Graham encourages study and specialization among Post reporters. He recently arranged for the paper's Supreme Court reporter to take in a one-semester course at Harvard Law School.

A NAGGING DISSATISFACTION

The semester at Cambridge is a symptom of a nagging dissatisfaction with traditional news treatment that has led Mr. Graham into a still unfulfilled quest for a new approach to news.

Last year, at the same Minnesota journalism seminar at which he jabbed at his fellow publishers, Mr. Graham also found fault with the press in general.

"Our staleness and our disorientation are caused by our basic assumptions," Mr. Graham said. "They are shallow, out of date, and almost entirely unexamined because we spend all our time with techniques."

Instead of resorting to journalistic panaceas Mr. Graham suggested, newspaper executives should work hard for answers to two basic questions: "What are we doing? Where are we going?"

"If we transfer our energies from merely tinkering with techniques to serious consideration of where we really are and what we really are," he said, "we might possibly emerge with a press less stale and less disoriented than it is today. And it seems to me possible that in the years of our immediate future, mankind may have need of a press every bit as good as we are capable of re-creating."

FORMER SENATOR TYDINGS' WORK FOR PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the memorable services performed by the late former Senator Millard H. Tydings for the United States and the free world was his authorship of the Philippine Independence Act of 1946.

Shortly after Senator Tydings died, the distinguished Philippine Ambassador to the United States, the Hon. Carlos Romulo, wrote to the editors of three outstanding newspapers, relating the determined and courageous fight Sena-

tor Tydings conducted to secure the passage of the Philippine Independence Act. As Ambassador Romulo reminds us, this act placed the United States in the vanguard of those seeking to assist colonial peoples in their drive for independence.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters, to the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Star, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1961]
TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TYDINGS: HIS ADVOCACY OF INDEPENDENCE FOR THE PHILIPPINES PRAISED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Philippine flag was flown at half staff on February 10 by the Philippine Embassy as a tribute to the memory of Millard H. Tydings, who died on February 9. As a Member of the U.S. Senate he coauthored the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act. It was this act that declared the independence of the Philippines on July 4, 1946.

The Filipino people will always remember with gratitude the name of the former Maryland Senator who fought on Capitol Hill for their freedom. Our late national leader, the first President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, Manuel L. Quezon, considered him one of the most effective advocates of Philippine independence.

At a critical time, when the independence bill was in danger, it was Senator Tydings to whom President Quezon appealed for assistance, and both of them collaborated closely until the bill was passed. Without the late Senator's militant and consistent advocacy of our independence we would have met with obstacles difficult to surmount.

The name of Millard H. Tydings deserves a high place among the great Americans who will be gratefully remembered not only by their fellow countrymen but also by other peoples of the world. For while sometimes it seems a thankless task to fight for that which is not of immediate benefit to one's constituency, yet due to the demands of the present cold war, when every effort is exerted by America to win friends, the value of the service rendered by Millard H. Tydings, which may not have been given due recognition by his countrymen, now takes on a new significance and a vital import.

His memory should serve to emphasize what Communist propaganda has tried to deface and distort: that when the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act was enacted into law, America really started the libertarian chain reaction that swept Asia and Africa and marked the end of Western imperialism.

We in the Philippines mourn the death of such a good and devoted friend whose name is enshrined in every Filipino heart.

I have been requested by President Garcia to personally extend the condolence of the Philippine Government and of the Filipino people to the family of Senator Tydings.

CARLOS P. ROMULO.

WASHINGTON, February 10, 1961.

FEBRUARY 13, 1961.
The EDITOR, THE EVENING STAR,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Your editorial "Millard E. Tydings" pays just tribute to a great American. He was a man of principle and of conviction. He fought for that which he believed right, no matter what the consequences to him personally. He was not an opportunist. This was never better shown than in his advocacy of Philippine independence.

Since his death, I have been reading his obituary as well as the editorials eulogizing him and honoring his memory as published

in the American press. That no mention was made of his service to the cause of human freedom as exemplified in the bill that he authored, sponsored, and fought for declaring Philippine independence, highlights better than anything I can say how oftentimes service that ranks a high place in history is overlooked for that which in the long perspective of tomorrow is merely transient and ephemeral. If Millard E. Tydings would not have had the courage and the persistence to work for the passage of his independence bill, if those who were at the time opposing Philippine freedom in quarters that were strong and powerful would have succeeded in subduing him, who would have succeeded Nikita Khrushchev's indictment of America as an imperialist nation in the General Assembly last year with the irrefutable argument of the fact of Philippine independence?

Many nations have won their independence after we in the Philippines achieved ours. Future generations will accord to Millard E. Tydings high honor for his dominant role in placing his country in the vanguard of the struggle to free colonial peoples from imposed subjection. Long after his electoral ups and downs in Maryland are forgotten he will be gratefully remembered by millions of emancipated peoples the world over who owe to his vision and statesmanship that they now walk with head erect, with the dignity of freemen.

Very truly yours,

CARLOS P. ROMULO.

FEBRUARY 11, 1961.

THE EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST
AND TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: You paid a well-deserved tribute in your today's editorial to the late Senator Millard E. Tydings. I would like to add to his achievements one that I believe is of far-reaching significance not only to his district or his country but to mankind itself. I refer to his militant and effective advocacy of Philippine independence.

On the floor of the United Nations General Assembly in Paris in 1948, Soviet Russia's Foreign Minister Andrei Vishinsky attacked the United States as an imperialist nation. I quote a portion of his speech:

"There is too much prattling about the American people being a liberty-loving people. That is just talk, a sample of American propaganda. The Americans may love liberty but it is liberty only for themselves, for the white Americans. There is no liberty for other peoples. The truth is America is the most imperialistic of all nations."

As the Philippine delegate, I answered him thus:

"Mr. Vishinsky, as is his wont, distorts facts. I will set the record straight for him and for all his minions in the Communist orbit. When the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act proclaiming Philippine independence was passed by the U.S. Congress, America started the cycle of human freedom that subsequently sparked the liberation of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Malaya, and others. History will record the truth and this is the unvarnished truth, Mr. Vishinsky's misrepresentations to the contrary notwithstanding. If the grant of Philippine independence is American imperialism, it is the kind of imperialism the satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain are yearning for."

I recall this exchange now because it was Senator Millard E. Tydings who had the vision and the courage to fight for Philippine independence and every nation that won its freedom after we won ours owes a debt of gratitude to the late Maryland Senator. America, in setting the precedent of relinquishing its sovereignty over the Philippines as provided in the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act, really sounded the death knell of imperialism.

It is not easy to pioneer as Senator Tydings did, nor is it personally advantageous for a politician to advocate a measure not immediately beneficial to his bailiwick constituents. But when Millard H. Tydings, against strong opposition from some quarters, determinedly fought and succeeded in having his independence bill enacted into law, he served his country in a manner that is today of incalculable value to American prestige. This one act of his entitles him to a place among America's great.

We in the Philippines will always remember him gratefully and reverentially.

Sincerely yours,

CARLOS P. ROMULO.

ONE HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

MR. BUSH. Mr. President, it is fitting that we set aside a few moments today to honor Thomas G. Masaryk on the occasion of the 111th anniversary of his birth. This great leader, who passed away in 1937, was the founder of the free Republic of Czechoslovakia, its first president, from 1918 to 1935, and one of the most illustrious statesmen of this century.

The Czechoslovak people were most fortunate in having an astute and eloquent spokesman in the late Thomas Masaryk, the unyielding champion of the Czechoslovak cause.

During the trying and difficult years between World War I and World War II, Thomas Masaryk was looked upon as the living Czechoslovak spirit and he was honored as such. He guided the destiny of Czechoslovakia for more than 15 years. Today, this great intellect, philosopher-statesman, and man of letters, is best remembered as the founding father of the Czechoslovak Republic and as a great champion of democracy.

Unfortunately, freedom does not exist in Thomas Masaryk's homeland today. The insidious system of communism has been imposed on its people. Yet, we know that the people of Czechoslovakia still love liberty. We trust that one day soon a democratic system of government will be reestablished in their homeland and in all the countries behind the Iron Curtain. It was for this that Thomas Masaryk devoted his boundless talents and energy.

The forceful symbolism of Masaryk's spirit and his love for freedom will surely manifest itself once again among his countrymen. In so doing, we trust that the tyranny of communism will pass as an evil interlude in the history of Czechoslovakia, and that liberty will be restored and abound in that land once again.

PORTRAIT GALLERY AND NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM IN THE SMITHSONIAN

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on February 24 the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced two bills concerned with the Smithsonian Institution, of which I am a member of the Board of Regents. S. 1057 provides for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian, and S. 1058 es-

tablishes a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the same institution.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that statements I have prepared on these bills be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL IN SUPPORT OF S. 1057, TO PROVIDE FOR A NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY AS A BUREAU OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

I wish to endorse S. 1057, introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], on February 24, 1961, to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution.

Public Law 85-357, approved on March 28, 1958, provided for the transfer of the existing Civil Service Commission Building (formerly known as the Patent Office Building) to the Smithsonian Institution and authorized such action as is necessary to remodel the building to make it suitable to house certain art galleries. Specific consideration was given by the Congress to using a portion of this building for a portrait gallery. Senate Report No. 1354 (85th Cong., 2d sess.) supporting the enactment of the above law stated in part:

"An art-museum building is urgently needed to display national collections of fine arts, comprising paintings, sculptures, bronzes, glass, porcelain, tapestry, furniture, jewelry, and other types of art. It would also be used to display portraits of eminent American men and women, and to exhibit the works of artists deserving of recognition."

House Report No. 1533 (85th Cong., 2d sess.) includes the following quotation:

"The building (the existing Civil Service Building) is well suited for use as the home of the century-old National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery and would require very little in the way of expenditures to adapt it to this purpose. Its use has been advocated not only by me [Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR.], but by a number of persons including David E. Finley, Chairman, and other members of the Commission of Fine Arts; by the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Institution; by Mr. Floete, Administrator of General Services; and by many other individuals interested in securing the establishment of such a museum for the Nation."

Construction of the new Civil Service Commission Building has begun and it is expected that the present building will be available for transfer to Smithsonian in fiscal year 1963. This leaves a relatively short time for planning and organizing the new portrait gallery.

The proposed legislation, S. 1057, was drafted with the assistance of the Office of the Legislative Counsel, House of Representatives, at the request of Congressman Bow, of Ohio, for review by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution endorse the language which is now before the Senate in S. 1057.

The Regents consider the proposed National Portrait Gallery and its organization of outstanding importance. A committee of the Regents under the chairmanship of Dr. John Nicholas Brown, of Rhode Island, has been appointed to further this important objective.

It should be pointed out that the need for a National Portrait Gallery, to house portraits, sculpture, and related materials of America's most distinguished citizens, has long been recognized. Both the Smithsonian Institution's National Collection of Fine Arts and National Gallery of Art have

portraits of eminent Americans which could be shown in such a portrait gallery. In addition there are numbers of portraits of persons who should be represented in a National Portrait Gallery, now in the hands of private collectors, which are expected to become available once a suitable gallery is provided.

We are aware that the National Portrait Gallery in London has helped the British focus the public mind on the nation's great leaders of the past.

A National Portrait Gallery will serve as an outstanding educational, cultural, and patriotic center for the American people. Its purpose would be to exhibit, and to provide documentation on, the national collections of portraits and statuary of men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of America.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL IN SUPPORT OF S. 1058, PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD, TO AUTHORIZE EXPANSION OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION'S FACILITIES FOR PORTRAYING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

I wish to endorse S. 1058, a bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board in the Smithsonian Institution, and to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes. This bill was introduced on February 24, 1961, by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. ANDERSON.

This bill is the same as S. 3846, of the 86th Congress, which Senator ANDERSON and I joined in introducing during the last session and which passed the Senate without amendment. S. 3846 was considered during the last session by the House of Representatives but was lost in the final days of the Congress.

The Board proposed by this bill would continue the work of the Committee on the American Armed Forces Museum appointed by President Eisenhower. The members of that Committee were: Chief Justice Earl Warren, Chairman; Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Representative Overton Brooks, Dr. John Nicholas Brown, Representative Clarence Cannon, Gen. Kenyon A. Joyce, Secretary Neil McElroy, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Senator H. Alexander Smith, Representative John M. Vorys, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, executive director.

At the time the Committee made its final report, General Joyce was no longer living and Representative John M. Vorys had resigned from the Committee. In the place of Secretary Neil McElroy, Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., was appointed to membership.

Chief Justice Warren, on June 21, 1960, transmitted the final report of the Committee to the President.

This final report recommended the establishment by congressional action of an advisory board to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution as well as authorizing the expansion of the Armed Forces exhibits therein. The advisory board would provide advice and assistance to the Board of Regents on matters concerned with the portrayal of the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to American society and culture.

The bill also authorizes and directs the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, with the advice and assistance of the advisory board, to investigate and survey lands and buildings in and near the District of Columbia suitable for the display of military collections, including large military objects not appropriate for the Mall. After consulting with the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commis-

sion, and the General Services Administration, the Board of Regents shall submit recommendations to the Congress with respect to the acquisition of lands and buildings for such purposes.

The report of the President's Committee on the American Armed Forces Museum stated in part:

"The Committee feels that the magnitude of American military achievement, the greatness of America's contributions in the cause of freedom, and the supreme importance of deterring war in the present age clearly point to the need for an effective and comprehensive museum-type exhibition in Washington, D.C., of the contributions that the Armed Forces of the Nation have made and are making toward creating, developing, and maintaining a free, peaceful, and independent society and culture in the United States. Such an enterprise requires the collection, preservation, and exhibition of military objects of historical significance together with the provision of appropriate means and materials for studying the meaning of war, its effect on civilization, and the role of our Armed Forces in maintaining a just and lasting peace."

The report in full appears in Senate Report No. 1932 (to accompany S. 3846, dated Aug. 29, 1960, 86th Cong., 2d sess.).

RESIDUAL OIL QUOTAS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have an editorial from the Boston Herald of February 22, 1961, entitled "N.E., by Courtesy of W. Va." and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, without endorsing any intersectional antagonism which this comment might impart, I feel it is important because it represents the feelings and some of the real facts involved in an important issue—the fuel needs of the Nation, and resulting ramifications in resource allocation and foreign economic policy. Hard policy decisions on the so-called coal-oil situation in general and on import quotas for residual fuel oil in specific will also affect the chances for healthy economic recovery and diminished unemployment throughout the Nation.

EXHIBIT 1

N.E., BY COURTESY OF W. VA.

New England is to be permitted to have a little more residual oil. This is the cheap, leftover product of crude oil used here for industrial purposes, public building heating, and utilities. Most of it comes from Venezuela.

It is now rationed to us through import restrictions. In view of the cold winter which is bringing inventories of residual below the danger point, Secretary of the Interior Udall has raised the permitted imports a little—by 100,000 barrels a day for the east coast.

He did this gingerly, for he knew how the coal interests would react. The coal interests want us to replace oil with coal.

Mr. Udall said he raised the quota for no other reason than to meet the demands of an exceptionally cold season. He hastened to add that the increase would have no effect on the status quo of the coal-oil situation.

"I reject any arguments that it would disturb this status," he maintained. "Such arguments are unwarranted, and I dare anyone to prove it."

Angry response came quickly from West Virginia. Senator ROBERT BYRD of that coal State termed the increase unjustified, and "absolutely counter to the purpose and effect of the antirecession policies already activated."

It seems that what happens to New England is of small concern to West Virginia.

The import quotas have boosted the cost of residual oil to New England by \$10 million a year, and if we take into account a falling world price, the restrictions may be costing us up to \$30 million a year. The import regulations have created exclusive dealerships, destroyed competition, and closed sources of supply to manufacturers wishing to come into New England.

If industry is forced into the use of coal, it will locate, not in New England, but nearer the source of supply.

To be sure, West Virginia is suffering from a coal depression. But choking off New England's oil won't help that any.

Vice President Caverly of the New England Council explained why to the Interior Department hearing on Monday on residual oil quotas. If all present users of residual oil who could convert to coal did so, coal production would increase only 3.5 percent, an increase that could be accomplished by technological means without hiring one additional miner. Such a shift is highly unlikely, and many oil users might shift to natural gas instead of coal.

In any event, why should New England be injured to help West Virginia?

Are we to exist by courtesy of that State? All residual oil quotas should be removed.

AWARD TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, former Gov. Herbert Lehman, who was also a former colleague of many of the Members of this body, recently presented an award to the great Negro leader, Dr. Martin Luther King. The award was given by ADA in recognition of Dr. King's leadership at their annual Roosevelt Day dinner.

In his remarks Governor Lehman said:

This new generation knows that to avoid the third and undoubtedly final world war new initiatives are called for. A fresh and vigorous start must be made on what President Kennedy has called the unfinished business of this generation—chief of which, in my judgment, and I hope his, is the matter of human rights.

Mr. President, I believe that the tribute and the philosophy expressed in these remarks is worthy of being included in the RECORD, and I ask for unanimous consent to have them so printed.

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

Those nations and those generations which produce true leaders of the people usually count themselves as fortunate. And indeed they are fortunate if such leaders are not only beloved and trusted by their people but also, in turn deeply love and trust their people, leaders who also love truth and justice and virtue, leaders who love not only their own people—but all people—all humanity. Such leaders are rare. Blessed are the times that produce them.

Such a leader—an apostle of tolerance and understanding—a statesman of deep faith in mankind as well as in God—is among us to-

night—a rare, chosen and dedicated man—a young man already old in the uses of leadership—the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King.

The qualities in Dr. King which I have mentioned are accompanied, above all, by an indomitable courage—a courage which has many times reached the heights of heroism. It is a courage of the flesh joined to a courage of the mind—a courage based on a bedrock of faith in the principles to which Dr. King is so deeply committed.

Dr. King has already written his name large in the social history of our times. He was the innovator, the leader, and the voice of the trumpet who called forth from the faith and spirit of the individually weak people of Montgomery, Ala., a collective strength and zeal which defied and broke the gathered forces of prejudice and discrimination in that city.

Dr. King did not summon his followers to the barricades; he did not call upon them for acts of heroic violence. Instead he called upon them to pray and to love—and to walk. "My feet are tired, but my heart is strong," said the nameless woman who walked the long miles to and from work in Montgomery, rather than ride on the segregated bus. And in the end, to the accompaniment of a world's wonder and admiration the bus strike was completely won, by the plain people of Montgomery, and their inspired leaders, the chief of whom is our honored guest here tonight.

There was pride among all the Negroes of America in the heroic achievement of victory in Montgomery. This pride was, in fact, shared by most Americans, regardless of color, for it was a mighty triumph for the human spirit, a victory of ideals over power, of nonviolence over naked force.

Since his first emergence on the national scene, Dr. King has broadened and deepened his leadership experience. He has, I am sure, known defeats as well as victories in his efforts these past 7 years; but the evidence is that both have served to enrich his spirit and his leadership.

He is a man of the church who has brought the church and its essential religious meaning into the daily lives of the people. He has translated faith into action, and action into faith. He has helped to arm faith with fervor and courage, and thus to conquer hate and those who would deny the dignity of the human soul and spirit.

I am sure that he is the first to be aware that the struggle for equality and for justice for every American, regardless of race, creed, or color, is far from over. It has only begun. Each victory, small or large, marks but a new beginning—the emergence of a new front where more and more human beings may join in the struggle.

Most of us feel that we stand today in the possible dawn of a possible new era, an era of action, progress and sure advance toward the common goals of mankind. Most of us have heard and felt the stirrings of the new and exciting spirit in Washington. It seems that this is to be an era led by the generation born after the first decade of this century and made its turn—by men and women neither responsible for nor involved in the holocaust of the First World War, but who did experience, at firsthand, the horrors of the Second World War—and who are not willing to contemplate a third.

This new generation knows that to avoid the third and undoubtedly final world war new initiatives are called for, and old patterns of diplomacy and power may need to be discarded. They know, too, that a fresh and vigorous start must be made on what President Kennedy has called the unfinished business of this generation, chief of which, in my judgment, and I hope in his, is the matter of human rights.

We have far to go to complete this unfinished business. Many difficult programs of action will be required of the executive departments; new legislative authority and supporting appropriations will be needed from Congress. The steadfast courage of the Federal courts must be matched henceforth by the executive and legislative branches, acting now in concert.

I have hopes that under the national leadership of President Kennedy we are going to move ahead speedily on all these fronts. But this does not minimize or reduce the need for the kind of inspired leadership that Dr. King has been providing—or which, on an organizational level, the ADA has been providing.

We must not rely solely on what comes down from above. We shall have to push harder than ever from below, in order to encourage and to support leadership from above.

That is the prospect and the challenge that we of ADA face. And that is also the burden of responsibility which you, Dr. King, must bear in the days and years ahead. You are of the generation which now has the reins of leadership. In paying you our tribute tonight, we anticipate that what you do in the times ahead will be of even greater service to the cause of humanity than what you have done hitherto.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider all the nominations except that of Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Edward K. Mills, Jr., to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, which nominating message was referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Neal J. Hardy, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

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

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund.

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

CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Burton Ellis, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have known Mr. Frank B. Ellis for quite some time. I must say that I learned to know him very well about 6 or 7 years ago. At that time I was a candidate for my fourth term in the Senate. Mr. Ellis was one of my opponents. We had quite a debate throughout Louisiana. But as soon as the election was over, our ranks closed and we worked together for the good of our State. Mr. Ellis comes from a very prominent family in Louisiana. He is a fine lawyer. He is a man of sterling character, patriotism, and ability. I urge favorable consideration of his nomination.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a biography of Mr. Frank Burton Ellis.

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

BIOGRAPHY OF FRANK BURTON ELLIS

Frank Burton Ellis, attorney, who was born in Covington, La., near New Orleans, 53 years ago, comes from a family prominent in the civic, political, business, and cultural life of Louisiana and Georgia for more than four generations.

Educated at Gulf Coast Military Academy, the University of Virginia, and LSU, from which he received an LL.B. degree, Mr. Ellis was editor in chief of the academy's paper, a member of the University of Virginia boxing team, and captain of the LSU football team. He was admitted to the Louisiana bar in 1930 and then joined his father's law firm. In 1943, he opened his own law offices in New Orleans and is now senior partner of Ellis, Lancaster & King.

He was elected to the Louisiana Senate in 1940 and served as president pro tem from 1940 to 1944. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Conventions of 1952 and 1956, national committeeman from 1952 to 1954, and director of the Kennedy-Johnson forces in 1960. He has served as a special assistant to the attorney general of Louisiana, as a member of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, and vice chairman of the New Orleans Aviation Board which built the \$20 million Moisant International Airport.

As attorney for the Greater New Orleans Expressway Commission, he was instrumental in bringing about the construction of the 24-mile, \$52 million Lake Pontchartrain bridge and causeway which has been an outstanding financial success and has helped develop the New Orleans metropolitan area.

A member of the Louisiana State, American, and International Bar Associations, and of the American Judicature Society, he served as a delegate to the International Bar Association meeting in London and Paris in 1957.

A founder and now director of the New Orleans Opera Foundation, a former deacon of the Presbyterian Church and Sunday

school superintendent, he has also been active in the Red Cross and various charitable and community organizations.

He is a member of a number of civic associations, including the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans and the chamber of commerce, in which he has served on numerous committees.

In 1934 he married Alice Grima and they have three children—Lilian Emerson (now Mrs. Stuart McLendon), Stephen Grima, and Frank Burton, Jr.

Home address, 4718 St. Charles Avenue, and office, Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

NAVAL RESERVE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Naval Reserve.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Naval Reserve be considered en bloc.

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

AIR FORCE RESERVE AND AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force Reserve and Regular Air Force.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. HICKEY subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate earlier today confirmed the promotion of Col. William Rader to be a brigadier general in the Air Force. General Rader commands the 13th Air Division at Warren Air Force Base at Cheyenne, Wyo. Under this division come the 706th Strategic Missile Wing at Warren and the 703d Strategic Missile Wing at Lowry Air Force Base at Denver, Colo.

As Governor of Wyoming, I have had many occasions to deal with General Rader. As a former soldier and officer, I know that one of the marks of an excellent commander is the dedication to his command. Such dedication has been much in evidence on General Rader's part. It is a pleasure to know it has been recognized by his superiors as has been shown by their recommendation for promotion, which has now been confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE—AMBASSADOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George F. Keenan, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

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

PHILIP H. COOMBS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip H. Coombs, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

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

UNITED NATIONS—FRANCIS T. P. PLIMPTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

MR. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to say a few words in behalf of Francis T. P. Plimpton, who has been nominated to be a representative of the United States to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Foreign Relations Committee acted so promptly in approving the nomination of Francis Plimpton that I did not have an opportunity to speak up for him when he appeared before the committee.

A born and bred New Yorker, Francis Plimpton has had a long and distinguished career in the city, as a lawyer, as an eager and enthusiastic participant in many community programs, and as a member of the board of several well-known educational institutions. He served briefly as General Solicitor for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Washington, D.C., at the start of the New Deal.

In all his activities, Francis Plimpton has won the respect and esteem of his associates. I am sure he will be conscientious and devoted in his new role at the United Nations. I should like to take this opportunity to urge his prompt confirmation so that he can take up his new and challenging burden as soon as possible.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, Francis T. P. Plimpton, whose nomination is being considered, as a deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations and the representative to the General Assembly, is a very old friend of mine, and a colleague of the New York bar. Due to yesterday's fog in New York, I did not get the opportunity to come down and introduce him to the Foreign Relations Committee until after his hearing was over.

I wish to state to the Senate the outstanding position which Mr. Plimpton holds in the life of New York, as a civic leader and as a responsible and very highly placed lawyer. He is a man who, by virtue of his deep interest in foreign affairs, his extensive study of the subject, and the work he has done on it for most of his adult life, should make a very outstanding representative. I am delighted to see this high preferment come to so distinguished a New Yorker, and, I might say personally, such a close friend of mine.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Francis T. P. Plimpton?

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

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the nomination of Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York. Jonathan B. Bingham was secretary to Governor Harriman, of New York. His nomination is to be confirmed today as alternate representative to the General Assembly. He was secretary to Governor Harriman when I was attorney general. I enjoyed not only a personal friendship with Mr. Bingham and his wife, but also the opportunity to observe him as a public servant. I gained a high opinion of his efficiency and of his dedication to the public interest. I know he has the most profound concern with the growing issues which will be heard by the United Nations, and again, though we are not of the same party, I am delighted to see such high preferment go to a man whom I know so well and whom I have seen perform a great deal.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

JOHN HOWARD MORROW

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Howard Morrow, of New Jersey, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

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

CHARLES P. NOYES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles P. Noyes, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a biographical sketch in connection with the confirmation of the nomination of a friend of mine, Charles P. Noyes.

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

CHARLES P. NOYES

Present position: Counselor of the United States Mission to the U.N.

Considered for: Personal rank of Minister during the tenure of the above designation.

Born: St. Paul, Minn., February 18, 1911. Education: Student University of Minnesota, 1929; A.B., Yale, 1933, LL.B., 1936.

Marital status: Married.

Experience:

Nongovernment: 1937, admitted to New York bar; 1938-41, practiced with Winthrop, Stimpson, Putnam, & Roberts, New York City; 1953, consultant to Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

Government: 1941, legal staff, Lend-Lease Administration, Washington; 1942-43, executive assistant to Averell Harriman, Presi-

dent's representative to Great Britain, London; 1943-44, executive assistant to Chief of Mission for Economic Affairs, London; 1945-46, assistant to Edward Stettinius (Secretary of State and later U.S. Representative to U.N.); 1945, attended San Francisco U.N. Conference; 1946, meetings of U.N. General Assembly and Security Council, London; 1946-51, member staff of U.S. Mission to U.N. as adviser; on Security Council and General Affairs to present U.S. Representative to U.N.; 1947-48, adviser to U.S. delegation second, third, fourth and fifth sessions, of General Assembly and Special Assembly sessions; 1949, appointed by President Truman as Department Representative of United States of America on Interim Committee of the General Assembly of U.N.; 1951-53, Department of Defense Representative, senior staff, National Security Council.

Office: 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, N.Y.

Home: Peacock Tower, Syosset, Long Island, N.Y.

Legal residence: New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles P. Noyes?

The nomination was confirmed.

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Without objection, the nomination was confirmed.

FHA COMMISSIONER—NEAL HARDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the name of Neal Hardy, to be FHA Commissioner, has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have consulted with the distinguished minority leader on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

The Chair hears none, and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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 so notified.

EDGAR H. REEDER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before returning to legislative session, I should like to say that Montana is honored to have in the list of nominations the name of Edgar H. Reeder, of Butte, Mont., who this day becomes by action of the Senate a rear admiral of the Supply Corps of the U.S. Navy. He performed outstandingly not only during the Second World War, but he has kept up his activity since. We feel it a signal honor to have this man become, I believe, the 13th admiral from the State of Montana, which is not a bad record for an inland State.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.

THE 16-POINT PROGRAM OF MR. KENNEDY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a very interesting and well-reasoned editorial appeared in a recent edition of the Chicago Tribune, which is very timely and appropriate in connection with the program of the new administration. I am sure there will be many others who may be interested, and hence I 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:

THE TWO ENDS OF THE FUNNEL

America's future under the Kennedy New Frontier seems to be a retreat into the past. The 16-point program Mr. Kennedy has sent to Congress with a priority label for action rehearses most of the dreary nostrums of the Roosevelt New Deal and the Truman welfare state. In total effect, the country would be given another push toward debt, inflation, and socialism.

The most modest estimate of the starting cost is around \$5 billion. Tacked onto a budget of almost \$81 billion bequeathed by Mr. Eisenhower, this would indicate a budget headed toward \$90 billion in the immediate future.

There are two ways to socialism. The first is to socialize the means of production—the plant and machinery which produce wealth—and appropriate them to the state's purposes. That is Khrushchev's way. It is the Communist way.

The second way is to socialize the fruits of production. Ownership and managerial direction are ostensibly left in private hands, but the rewards that come into those hands are snatched from them by the state. The state does not have to go to the trouble of running the productive plant. It merely collects the proceeds. These it distributes among the groups whose votes will then be bound through gratitude.

This is the Kennedy way, as it was the way of his Democratic predecessors. Its political virtue is that it is less obvious than direct confiscation. But the taxpayers, individual and corporate, who foot the bill know that the rate of taxation already approaches the confiscatory, and various of Mr. Kennedy's new programs will add to the burden on both employer and employee.

Now, it is one thing to say that all this may be so, that this redistribution of the wealth is justified on grounds of need and humanitarianism. But the reverse of that is that the productive talents of the people are progressively being preempted. And, in addition to this, there is the consideration of what is accomplished.

For there are two ends to the Federal funnel. The wide end is where the revenue pours in. The narrow end is where the aid trickles out. Before any of this cash can be translated into food, or clothing, or shelter, or school buildings, or medical research, or any of the other things listed in Mr. Kennedy's sales brochure, it must first support a bureaucracy of $2\frac{1}{2}$ million, with all its satrapies, its perquisites, edifices, trappings, and appointments. The brokerage comes high.

So we do not think that the billions Mr. Kennedy would throw about will do much to alleviate hardship, promote progress, abate

recession, or anything else. But they will serve to confirm the Government's whip hand over everyone—over those from whom the money is extracted, over those who may expect to be the beneficiaries. And the process into socialism will achieve another advance.

Here, we think, is where the Republicans have been given their opportunity. Every Member of Congress who believes in restricted and prudent government should address himself to these proposals and their implications. If they see clearly, they will start plugging up both ends of the Federal funnel.

VISIT OF SECRETARY G. MENNEN WILLIAMS TO AFRICA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an interesting editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times dealing with the visit of Secretary G. Mennen Williams to Africa. It appeared under the informal title "Soapy" Williams Goes to Africa," and it speaks for itself.

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

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 28, 1961]

"SOAPY" WILLIAMS GOES TO AFRICA

When President-elect Kennedy stood on the windswept steps of his Georgetown home last December to announce the appointment of G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, he termed the post "a position of responsibility second to none in the new administration."

That being the case, we wondered at the time, why on earth "Soapy" Williams?

His experience in foreign affairs was nil. In six terms as Democratic Governor of Michigan, he displayed little diplomacy in his dealings with the Republican legislature. He lacked the administrative skill to solve the financial ills of the State which teetered on the brink of bankruptcy for years.

On the other hand, we were under no illusions as to why there was a job in the Kennedy administration for "Soapy." He is Walter Reuther's protege and the darling of the AFL-CIO. Between them, Reuther and "Soapy" delivered Michigan's 20 votes to Senator Kennedy at the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles.

But we couldn't see turning over even nominal responsibility for one of the world's most crucial areas to a man whose renown up to that point had rested largely on polka-dot bow ties and a passion for square dancing.

Events since the day "Soapy's" appointment was announced have certainly justified Mr. Kennedy's measurement of the importance of the job. They have done anything except justify the choice of the man to fill it.

From Algeria to the Cape of Good Hope, Africa today is a seething caldron of explosive nationalism and hair-trigger relations between the races.

Into this crisis-laden atmosphere last week plunged "Soapy" Williams on a tour which the State Department described as "a combination of good-will building and fact-finding."

It is too early, obviously, to attempt to weigh the facts "Soapy" may be finding. Unfortunately, there isn't much doubt about the good will he is building.

It is so good that Prime Minister Macmillan is going to have to make a full-dress explanation to an angry British Parliament next month of statements regarding British affairs that "Soapy" made as an official representative of the U.S. Government.

In British Kenya, "Soapy" endorsed "Africa for Africans," a slogan of militant Negro nationalists. This precipitated a sharp outburst in the South African Parliament and charges that he was meddling in Britain's business in Africa.

When he reached Uganda, he explained he meant both whites as well as Negroes. The fact remains that in Africa, the word, "African," means Negro, something a U.S. diplomatic representative should have been aware of.

But "Soapy" wasn't through sounding off. At a news conference in Uganda, he gratuitously warned against a vacuum in Africa where another kind of tyranny could move in.

When reporters asked him to enlarge on the phrase, "Soapy" delivered himself of this gem of New Frontier diplomacy:

"Well, worse than they suffered before. But I withdraw that phrase. I did not mean British administration is tyranny."

But "Soapy" saved the final hair-raiser for last. He told newsmen in British Tanganyika that his tour was undertaken to demonstrate American interest in Africa "in order that I may be better prepared to make quick decisions and fair judgment on future issues affecting Africa."

In the light of recent events, the thought of "Soapy" exercising his judgment and making quick decisions is frightening indeed. And it must be found so in Africa as nowhere else in the troubled world.

While the Kennedy administration has been muzzling admirals and housemaids, we hope it has saved one gag for its freewheeling Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT WOULD STRENGTHEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACROSS THE NATION

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 1021, the School Assistance Act of 1961, I am first concerned with what this bill carrying out President Kennedy's proposed education program will mean to public schools across the Nation.

There is no question but that public schools in every State of the Union will be substantially strengthened and improved. Assistance to public schools in my own State of Texas is a typical example.

Under this bill, public schools in Texas would receive in the 1961-62 school year funds totaling approximately \$40,262,000. Of this amount, 10 percent would be used for educational research projects for either gifted students or handicapped pupils.

The other \$36,236,000 would be utilized in whatever manner the State and local school boards decided was the case of greatest need—for classroom construction, employment of additional teachers and other instructional staff members, or for both purposes.

In the case of Texas, based on current construction costs and average teacher salaries, here is what the various school boards could do with the \$36,236,000 at their discretion: If all this money were used for classroom construction, 979 new school rooms could be built. My State currently has a shortage of 4,400 classrooms.

If all the money were utilized to increase teachers' salaries (and teacher pay raises for teachers in Texas are long overdue) it would mean an increase in pay for teachers and other instructional

staff members such as librarians and others, of \$412 a year. Thoughtful Texans, who believe Texas boys and girls should have schools second to none, are not proud that Texas ranks in 34th place in average salaries paid classroom teachers and ranks in 50th place in the percent of salary increase provided teachers since 1950.

The need for improving our public schools in Texas and across the Nation is so great that we must have action at the local, State, and National levels of government. The need is so great that none of these levels of government acting alone is likely to be able to meet the requirements, and all acting together are not likely to do too much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Texas Public Schools Slip in National Competition," from the February 15, 1961, issue of the Corpus Christi Caller.

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

[From the Corpus Christi Caller, Feb. 15, 1961]

TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS SLIP IN NATIONAL COMPETITION

President Kennedy's Federal-aid-to-education bill is now coming before Congress, while the Texas Legislature is embroiled in a tax controversy in which the need for more State school aid is the greatest pressure.

It is timely, therefore, to note how Texas schools are now faring in comparison with those in other States. Each year, the research division of the National Education Association issues a "Rankings of the States" in educational effort. The 1961 report, just released, shows that Texas schools are slipping in the interstate competition.

From 1960 to 1961, Texas school-age population increased from fourth to third rank among the States, while enrollment remained third. But in the percentage of school-age population enrolled, Texas was a low 33d both years, and in average daily attendance of those enrolled dropped from 33d to 35th place. In such indicative factors as percent of illiteracy and school years completed by the adult population, this State still places 40th and 30th, respectively, far below the national average.

Between 1960 and 1961, Texas dropped from 32d to 34th place in average salaries for classroom teachers, and 34th to 35th in expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance. Possibly the most telling statistic of all is the proportion of personal income in the State going to the public schools, which is a fair gage of relative effort or sacrifice; in this, Texas dropped from 32d to 34th place.

NEA compares 66 factors in ranking the States' educational programs. Altogether they compare the effort the States are making in relation to their resources and the quality and quantity of the results of that effort. Except for a few items, such as commendable fourth place in teachers' college training, Texas is generally below the national average and losing ground in several key factors.

The lost ground is largely explained by the failure of the previous legislative session to make the State-aid improvements that are now before the current session. We simply cannot afford for this session to fail to recover that lost ground and renew the catching-up process. The statistics say that we have the economic means to do this; the test now underway in Austin is on whether we have the will.

EIGHTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

MR. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at the request of the Voice of America, I have recorded a short message in recognition of the 83d anniversary of Bulgarian independence. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McNAMARA

The celebration of the 83d anniversary of Bulgarian Independence Day provides us in America with an opportunity to reaffirm our friendship with the Bulgarian people.

We sincerely regret that the Bulgarian people, themselves, are unable to freely celebrate the joys of liberty because they are today living under the yoke of dictatorship.

The price of freedom has always been high, and many a Bulgarian patriot has given his life in past struggles against oppression.

We in America are fortunate in knowing and enjoying freedom, and we cherish our institutions and heritage.

The people of Bulgaria also know the meaning of freedom and they will keep that knowledge alive during these dark years of their history.

This, then, is the common bond between us, even though thousands of miles separate our two nations.

Political dictatorships imposed upon a free people cannot last forever. We pray that in the not-too-distant future the people of Bulgaria and of America, will be able to join together in a true celebration of their freedom and a better, more peaceful world.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to join in the celebration of the 83d anniversary of Bulgarian independence, which was commemorated on March 3. The brave people of Bulgaria have been spirited fighters in the ranks of freedom for many generations, and although they are now held captive by the Soviet Union, no conqueror has been able to suppress for long their spirit and determination to be free.

American ties with the people of Bulgaria are of long and historic standing. The Bulgarian people have responded to the many instances of American assistance and concern by demonstrating their high esteem and strong affection. They have kept fresh and alive their hopes for freedom from Communist chains and for complete independence. Their brothers in the free world speak where they in Bulgaria cannot of their continuing struggle for national identity. I deem it a privilege to be able to contribute my voice to their heroic struggle.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

MR. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on February 9 I introduced S. 895, the administration bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act.

For the information of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Labor has completed its hearings on the bill and we expect to begin executive sessions in the near future.

Meanwhile, the staff of the subcommittee has prepared a summary of the

bill which I believe may be useful to many of my colleagues in answering questions on the bill's provisions.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary of S. 895 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Summary of minimum wage bill, S. 895

PRESENTLY COVERED EMPLOYEES

For presently covered employees (23,900,000) the new rate will be \$1.15 an hour the 1st year, \$1.20 the 2d year, and \$1.25 an hour thereafter.

NEWLY COVERED EMPLOYEES

[Estimated number employees covered]

1. Retail and retail service enterprises, which have annual gross sales of \$1,000,000 or more (exclusive of excise taxes at retail level), wage and hour coverage according to following schedule.....	Hourly rate	Overtime after.....	2,920,000	6. Fish processing: Fish processing (freezing, preserving) same minimum wage schedule as 1(a) above; no overtime coverage. (Fish canning already covered for minimum wage under present law.).....	33,000
(a) Effective date:				7. Establishment coverage: Establishments (which have \$230,000 or more in annual receipts) some of whose employees are already covered by existing law (except in construction companies where the dollar cutoff is \$350,000). Minimum wage and overtime coverage same as schedule 1(a) above.....	
1st year.....	\$1.00	No overtime requirements.....		8. Local retailing capacity employees: Same minimum wage and overtime schedule as 1(a) above.....	1,000,000
2d year.....	1.05	44 hours.....			10,000
3d year.....	1.15	42 hours.....			
4th year.....	1.25	40 hours.....			
(b) Motion picture theaters. Not covered.					
(c) Hotels, motels, and restaurants. Also not covered.					
(d) Gasoline service stations with annual gross receipts of \$250,000 or more will have minimum wage coverage but excluded from overtime requirements of act.					
2. Laundries.....					
(a) In enterprises with annual gross sales of \$1,000,000 or more, same minimum wage and overtime schedule as retail service 1(a) above.			130,000	Total.....	4,333,000
(b) Same coverage will apply to any laundry which has \$250,000 or more in gross sales if it is in substantial competition in same metropolitan area with another laundry which is not exempt because more than half of its sales is made outside the State in which it is located.				f. Other provisions:	
3. Local transit: Same minimum wage schedule as 1(a) above, no overtime coverage.....				(a) Nonprofit hospitals, educational and other eleemosynary institutions not covered.	
4. Seamen: On American flag vessels same minimum wage schedule as 1(a) above; no overtime coverage.....				(b) Canning and processing of agricultural commodities: 20 weeks overtime exemption each year (10 weeks limited to 12 hours a day, 56 hours a week, plus 10 weeks unlimited overtime exemption) instead of present 28 exempt overtime weeks each year.	
5. Telephone operators: Switchboard operators (except those employed by an independently owned public telephone company which has not more than 750 telephones) same minimum wage and overtime schedule as 1(a) above.....				(c) Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: Employees whose minimum wage rates are set by industry committees, will have their present rates increased by 15 percent the 1st year and by an additional 5 percent in each of the next 2 years, subject to review by an industry committee in hardship cases. Newly covered employees will have their rates set by industry committees.	
				(d) Automobile salesmen: Auto salesmen employed by a retail auto dealer will be exempt from overtime requirements, even if dealer has more than \$1,000,000 in annual sales.	
				e) Effective date: 120 days after enactment.	
			110,000		
			100,000		
			30,000		

THE NATIONAL PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since President Kennedy issued his Executive order just a few short days ago establishing the Peace Corps on a temporary pilot basis, the response to this most vital program has been overwhelming—as it should be. The appeal of the corps is not limited to the young, for it is touching the sincerity of all Americans across the country. The proof in point is the 12,000-plus inquiries and requests which have flooded into the Peace Corps Office. Even before the corps had been established, over 6,000 inquiries had been received by the makeshift office of the corps.

One may ask why the public enthusiasm has been so great. I think the answer is quite obvious. This program not only offers a challenge to the American, but gives him an opportunity to play an important role in working toward a peaceful world through direct people-to-people contact. By sincerely and enthusiastically offering his services, working toward the goal of raising living standards and conditions in underdeveloped countries, I can think of no more effective way to erase the oftentimes referred to "ugly American" image.

Mr. President, I wish to commend President Kennedy and his most able Peace Corps staff for moving ahead so dynamically and for instilling the pioneer spirit, which embodies the New Frontier, into the hearts of all Americans. As an indice of this grassroots support, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the following articles: The Washington Daily News, March 6, 1961, "Foreign Aid Where It Counts"; the Washington Post, March

6, 1961, "Youth Wants To Go"; the Washington Post, March 7, 1961, "Peace Corps Head Sees Pioneer Spirit Revival," and "Questions About Peace Corps Are Answered by Its Director"; the New York Times, March 5, 1961, "The Moral Equivalent," and "Excerpts From Shriver's Proposals for Setting Up Peace Corps"; the New York Times, March 6, 1961, "College Presidents Give Approval in Poll by Margins of 9 to 1," and "Peace Corps Wins Support of Students and Educators"; the New York Times, March 7, 1961, "Dedicated to Peace."

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 6, 1961]

FOREIGN AID WHERE IT COUNTS

The Peace Corps idea, now officially launched by President Kennedy, has a chance to revolutionize the American attitude toward foreign aid—and the attitude of many foreigners toward America.

The billions of dollars loaned and given away since the last World War have served a necessary purpose, even though a lot of the money has been wasted on grandiose, hurry-up projects of doubtful benefit to anyone.

These expenditures have preserved order when civil chaos invited communism. Undoubtedly they made possible the recovery of Europe and Japan. But there has been little warmth in them, either for the American taxpayer, putting up the money, or for foreign peoples who were benefiting, at least in theory.

For this there are several reasons, including the uncomfortable feeling in America that we were trying to buy friends and military support—the widespread instinct abroad that this was the case.

The dozens of private American organizations which have been in the foreign aid business for years have made an entirely different impression.

They have furnished shovels and hoes to farmers, plus cattle and chickens for breeding stock. Sewing machines have been accompanied by sewing lessons. Building tradesmen have helped erect houses and schools. Doctors and nurses have tended the ailing at posts deep in the jungles or across wide deserts. Food packets by the millions have been furnished directly to the hungry.

In all this there is the feeling of direct, friendly contact between the world's unfortunate and their better-off fellow human beings in America.

The type of aid being furnished by American universities, church and nonsectarian groups more nearly fills the needs of underdeveloped countries anyhow. Industrialization is the fad but benefits from this lie in the distant future, if ever.

What these countries need first is a sound basis in agriculture, which will enable them to feed themselves, in the mechanical trades which will permit them to house themselves, and in basic education which will enable them to understand the new kind of world they are entering.

There is so vast a void for these things in Asia and Africa and even in Latin America, that no amount of American effort can fill it. But American Peace Corps men and women can establish small islands of instruction and aid, setting an example for neighboring communities to imitate.

The Peace Corps idea thus starts at the bottom, with food and medicine, plows, seed and fertilizer, instead of showy buildings of little present use to primitive people whose routine is hunger and disease, millions of whom never heard of democracy, or communism, or the United Nations.

The Peace Corps idea appeals to the American missionary spirit—particularly so since the wages will provide a bare existence, hence emphasizes personal sacrifice in a good cause.

If our missionaries are carefully chosen for dedication and special skills, if they are carefully placed where they obviously are wanted, this Peace Corps idea can work wonders.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1961]

YOUTH WANTS TO GO

It is a tonic for tired blood to read of the extraordinary response to President Kennedy's appeal on behalf of the Peace Corps. Even before the Corps was formally established, some 6,000 letters had piled up at the agency's makeshift headquarters, while 1,000 persons had taken the trouble to telephone. This emphatically ought to allay the laments about a generation variously described as soft, silent, and beat.

In truth, we suspect that for some years there has been an unarticulated desire among American youth to lend a hand to their country and the cause of peace. Too often foreign policy is couched in impersonal and remote terms—or is discussed primarily in military language. Thousands of young people are eager to serve in a constructive way to help combat man's oldest enemies of ignorance and want—to take part in the search for what William James called the moral equivalent of war. Some of them, indeed, already are serving with private voluntary missions abroad.

To be sure, there are potential pitfalls, some of them described in a recent letter to this newspaper from H. R. Vohra, the correspondent of the Times of India. The best answer to the skeptics has been the record of various existing programs which have used the talents of youngsters in farms and villages abroad. If the volunteers are carefully selected, and if they are sent where wanted to do jobs for which they are equipped, the net gain can be enormous.

This is what makes the initial response so encouraging. It looks as if the first 500 or so candidates for the Corps can be picked from a pool of applicants that is large, enthusiastic, and brimful of energy.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1961]

PEACE CORPS HEAD SEES PIONEER SPIRIT REVIVAL
(By Chalmers M. Roberts, staff reporter)

The Peace Corps will be no picnic. Instead, it will demonstrate that the pioneering spirit is still alive in the United States.

These were the words—and the hope—yesterday of President Kennedy's 45-year-old brother-in-law, Robert Sargent Shriver, who is the new agency's Director. He put it this way:

"The Peace Corps, I hope, is going to take many people, here and abroad by surprise—people who think America has gone soft—people who doubt that our pioneering spirit is still alive—people who do not think our youth have the stamina, the curiosity, the sympathy, and the responsibility to become working representatives of the United States abroad."

"But it is time to take the world by surprise and prove that the American Revolution is on the move again."

EXUDES CONFIDENCE

Words alone will not silence the skeptics and the doubters. But Shriver, a former head of the Chicago Board of Education and manager of that city's huge Merchandise Mart, sounded at his news conference yesterday like a man determined to make the words come true—and like a man who could pull it off, too.

There certainly is no lack of public enthusiasm. Yesterday, said Shriver, some 4,000 pieces of mail arrived, bringing to at least 12,000 the inquiries and requests to volunteer since President Kennedy formally got the idea underway last week.

No single proposal of the new administration seems to have caught public imagination the way the Peace Corps has. Shriver has rounded up some high-class talent for his initial staff.

In his statement, delivered in staccato fashion, and in replies to questions Shriver made it evident, as he put it, that this ad-

venture in government "won't be a picnic nor will it be a children's crusade or an international Boy Scout or Girl Scout movement."

MISSIONARY ZEAL

What the Peace Corps has seemed to touch is the old American missionary zeal without any specific religious overtone. The young people will go forth, said Shriver, "to make a real contribution to peace."

The harder the life he described the more attractive the idea appears to many. The idea of no salary other than living expenses plus a sort of GI-discharge bonus appears to have added a note of sacrifice which satisfied a lot of longing to do something for the Nation.

Not much has been said yet about the playback or feedback aspects of the program. Shriver did announce that he has set up a board to help find jobs for the returning corps men and women.

It is too early to calculate the effect on this country, on its long-term foreign policy direction for example, but it could be immense if the corps is indeed successful over the next decade. Foreign corpsmen could provide a bank of men and women with the kind of foreign experience which would enrich the public service.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1961]

QUESTIONS ABOUT PEACE CORPS ARE ANSWERED
BY ITS DIRECTOR

(By Julius Duschka)

What will life be like in the Peace Corps?

R. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Corps, outlined the administration's plans at a press conference yesterday.

Here, in question-and-answer form, are the details as Shriver set them out:

Question. Who will be eligible to serve in the Corps?

Answer. Anyone from 18 to 60 years old who can meet the rigorous physical fitness tests that will be set up. Most persons will probably be college graduates who are under 30.

Question. Will married persons be eligible?

Answer. A limited number of married couples will be included, provided that both husband and wife have skills to contribute. The man might teach school, the woman serve as a nurse.

Question. How long will members of the Corps be expected to serve?

ONE TO THREE YEARS

Answer. Minimum service overseas will be 1 year, the maximum 3 years. Most persons probably will be abroad 2 years. Re-enlistments may be permitted.

Question. Will a person be obligated to serve out his entire period abroad?

Answer. No. Service in the Corps will be voluntary, but every effort will be made to recruit only persons who will not quit in the middle of their term overseas.

Question. How much will members of the Corps be paid?

Answer. The Peace Corps will pay only for food, clothing, housing, transportation expenses and small out-of-pocket expenses. There will be no salary.

Question. Will there be any mustering-out pay?

WILL EARN BONUS

Answer. Yes. A "retirement bonus," accumulated at the rate of \$50 to \$75 for each month of service overseas, will be paid to Corps members at the end of their service abroad. Thus, a person who is overseas for 2 years would get from \$1,200 to \$1,800.

Question. Will the Government help Corps veterans get jobs?

Answer. Yes. A Career Planning Board has been set up to assist persons to re-establish themselves in civilian life.

Question. Will members of the Corps be able to supplement their pay with money from home?

Answer. The Youth Corps will seek to discourage contributions from "over-solicitous parents," as Shriver put it.

Question. When will recruitment for the Corps begin?

Answer. The Corps hopes to have application blanks available by the end of the week. When the blanks are ready, Shriver will announce the details of procedures for applying for service in the Corps.

TRAINING STARTS IN JUNE

Question. When will training start?

Answer. In June, on perhaps six college and university campuses that have not yet been selected.

Question. How long will the training program last?

Answer. Throughout the summer.

Question. What will the training programs be like?

Answer. It will include courses on American Government and other institutions, the philosophy of democratic government, economics, the culture and customs of the country to which a person will go and intensive study of the language of the country.

Question. What about physical training?

Answer. Forrest Evashevski, athletic director and former football coach at the University of Iowa, will set up a physical training program. Evashevski, Shriver noted with a smile, is the Peace Corps' answer to touch football.

THREE-MONTH LANGUAGE COURSE

Question. How tough will the language requirement be?

Answer. Corps members will be expected to spend 4 to 5 hours a day for 3 months or more studying a language.

Question. How will Corps members be expected to live overseas?

Answer. Their standard of living will be the same as that maintained by persons in a country doing the work that a Corps member is doing. A teacher in Pakistan, for example, would live like a Pakistani teacher, who earns only \$7 a month.

Question. Would Corps members be able to select the country where they would serve?

Answer. There would be some options, but no guarantees.

Question. Where will the first recruits serve?

Answer. No country has yet been selected, but it is expected that one country in Africa, one in Asia, and one in Latin America will be chosen from among the following: Nigeria and Gabon in Africa; Thailand, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines in Asia; and Colombia, Mexico, Chile, and Haiti in Latin America.

Question. Could Corps members serve in the United States, too?

Answer. This question is still under discussion. It is possible that part of the training program might include service in depressed areas, slums, and even on Indian reservations.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1961]

THE MORAL EQUIVALENT

Half a century ago our most thoroughly American philosopher wrote a final essay in which he outlined a plan for the moral equivalent of war. What William James proposed was to draft young people "to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against nature." He believed that the combative instinct was present in us when we were young, but that it could be taken care of by a certain amount of hardship, hard work, and possibly danger in the mastery of rivers and waters and other great natural forces.

We are not so sure now that combative ness is born into us, although competitiveness surely is. In two great wars since William James died our young men have fought

well but not with pleasure. War has become so impersonal that it is no longer a matching of courage against courage and strength against strength. It is, at least in its atomic form, an effort to break the will of the strong by destroying the weak.

Yet William James' conception of "the moral equivalent" lingers with us, in a sort of afterglow. Some thought that Franklin D. Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps took its inspiration from James. Perhaps it did, but now we have a more imminent vision in President Kennedy's proposal for a permanent Peace Corps. The young men and women who respond to this call will be assigned abroad, in the words of President Kennedy's message, "to help teach in the schools, construct development projects, demonstrate modern methods of sanitation in the villages and perform a hundred other tasks calling for training and advanced knowledge." They will be paid their expenses and no more. The young men will not be released from the military draft.

Some factors might have been overlooked in the plan as the President outlined it. The appeal shouldn't be to young men and women of a limited economic class who don't need to earn money for a few years. Provisions should be made, one would imagine, for those who do not mind personal sacrifices but who have relatives with claims upon them.

Nobody's heart leaps at the thought of intercontinental missiles or of heroic efforts to save our own cities by destroying other peoples cities. The international crisis might come to this. But that isn't what we want. What we want in our hearts is goodness and mercy, brotherhood and peace. And it is this yearning that a national, and later perhaps an international, Peace Corps might help us to satisfy.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1961]

**EXCERPTS FROM SHRIVER'S PROPOSALS FOR
SETTING UP PEACE CORPS**

Having studied at your request the problems of establishing a Peace Corps, I recommended its immediate establishment. * * *

I am satisfied that we have sufficient answers to justify your going ahead. But since the Peace Corps is a new experiment in international cooperation many of the questions considered below will only be finally answered in action, by trial and error. Our tentative conclusions are therefore submitted as working hypotheses.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY A PEACE CORPS?

The essential idea is the placement of Americans in actual operational work in newly developing areas of the world. Unlike most International Cooperation Administration technical assistance advisers, who go as members of an official U.S. mission to demonstrate or advise, Peace Corps volunteers will go to teach, or to build, or to work in the communities to which they are sent. They will serve local institutions, living with the people they are helping. Most Peace Corps volunteers will probably be young college graduates, but there should be no rigid age limit. Younger or older workers with skills needed abroad but without college degrees will carry out some important projects. The length of service should normally be from 2 to 3 years.

IS THERE A NEED FOR IT?

The need of most newly developing nations for skilled manpower in many critical positions is manifest. The Colorado State University team reports that the need for trained Peace Corps workers is felt in every country in Latin America, Africa and Asia visited. If the shortages of able personnel are not made up from outside, some development programs will grind to a halt—or fail to progress fast enough to satisfy the newly aroused and volatile expectations of the peo-

ple of these lands. The Peace Corps can make a significant contribution to this problem.

The major programs in which Peace Corps volunteers are wanted are these:

(a) **Teaching:** Literacy and higher levels of knowledge and skills are a prerequisite to successful national development. The United States concentration on public education in the 19th century was a major factor in our industrial revolution. In most newly developing nations the shortage of teachers is a major bottleneck. In Nigeria an official commission has just documented how dangerous this bottleneck is—and how badly outside teachers are needed. Since in many African and some Asian countries teaching is conducted in English, U.S. college graduates could play a vital role teaching in primary or secondary schools and in trade schools. In many other developing nations the teaching of English is wanted. And in Latin America the teaching of literacy in Spanish is required—a useful field for Spanish-speaking U.S. graduates.

(b) **Fighting malaria and working in other health projects:** The worldwide malaria eradication program is another important contribution to economic development. The loss of productivity and social energy in malaria-infected areas causes a serious slowdown in progress. The United Nations-sponsored campaign to eradicate malaria needs a large number of workers, many of whom would not need to be college graduates. Similarly, along with doctors and nurses, personnel are needed for work in inoculation campaigns against typhoid, smallpox and tetanus and in water sanitation programs.

(c) **Working in agricultural projects and rural development programs.** In addition to toplevel technical advisers already being provided by ICA and other agencies, skilled agricultural workers are needed to assure the effectiveness of demonstration programs for animal husbandry, new farm techniques, improvement of seed, and irrigation. Peace Corps volunteers are needed to work alongside host country citizens in community development programs. In many countries the educated young people cannot be persuaded to return to the villages or to do manual labor. The presence of U.S. Peace Corps volunteers challenge them to undertake this essential work and contribute to the spirit of national service needed for the mobilization of the host country's full human resources.

While it would not be generally practical for the Peace Corps to supply unskilled manual labor, in many places the shortage of any skills is so great that there is a real need for semiskilled Peace Corps volunteers, who can assist with the construction of schools, self-help housing, feeder roads, and other small-scale public projects.

(d) **Working on large-scale construction and industrial projects.** Here the need for generally skilled workers is obvious. On most of the large dams, valley developments, construction of new cities, or establishment of modern factories, the employment of skilled operating personnel from outside has been necessary to do a great range of skilled and semiskilled jobs. If proper terms of service can be arranged, Peace Corps volunteers from trade unions or U.S. businesses can provide some of the needed help, including on-the-job training of local personnel.

(e) **Working in Government administration.** Many Peace Corps volunteers will be needed in public administration on all levels, including urban development.

These are some of the clear and present needs. It will be important for the Peace Corps to establish procedures with the best countries for the appraisal of each project in terms of the particular country's priorities of development needs. When there is no pressing need or desire—where local per-

sons are trained and ready—no Peace Corps volunteers should be sent.

HOW WOULD IT OPERATE?

The Peace Corps staff must have great flexibility to experiment with different methods of operation. Its role, as we see it, will be to reinforce existing private and public programs of assistance and development, by filling some of the manpower gaps which obstruct these programs, and to initiate new programs requiring Peace Corps volunteers.

The resources, energy, and experience of our nongovernmental institutions, including colleges and universities, foundations, trade unions, businesses, civic groups, and religious bodies must be tapped.

This must be a cooperative venture of the whole American people.

To accomplish this, the Peace Corps should seek to provide skilled manpower to developing nations through at least five different channels.

(a) **Through grants to Peace Corps-type programs carried out by private agencies:** This would result in the expansion of the existing voluntary agency activities using dedicated Americans overseas, and in the encouragement of other private organizations to undertake such projects. Trade unions would be urged to participate in this program.

(b) **Through arrangements with colleges, universities, or other educational institutions:** Already some 57 universities are working under contract with ICA in 37 countries on development or educational projects. While few, if any, of these contracts presently meet the criteria of the Peace Corps, they demonstrate the possibilities. * * *

(c) **Through programs of other U.S. Government agencies:** There is a need for technician helpers to supplement many existing technical and economic assistance projects being carried out by existing U.S. Government agencies.

(d) **Through programs of the U.N. and other international agencies.**

(e) **Through directly administered Peace Corps programs with host countries:** There will be some projects of a size or complexity or novelty or urgency which cannot be carried out, or carried out well, through any of the above channels. If such projects are proposed by host countries and fit the developmental needs of those countries and the overall foreign aid purposes of the United States, they can be undertaken through Peace Corps recruitment, training and direct administration. For example, some large-scale teaching programs may best be administered directly, perhaps using university campuses and facilities on contract for training purposes. Construction projects using skilled workers who are not college graduates may also call for direct Peace Corps administration.

HOW WOULD THE PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS BE SELECTED?

For projects administered directly by the Peace Corps there will have to be a general nationwide recruitment program. Although private agencies and universities will be able to recruit directly and separately for their respective projects, they, too, may often wish to utilize the Central Recruitment Service. And the Central Service, in turn, will probably want to have in its files the results of the separate recruitment by private agencies and universities.

HOW WOULD THE VOLUNTEERS BE TRAINED?

Once the Peace Corps is a going concern, training for it should be integrated as far as possible within the 4-year college curriculum of students interested in going overseas after graduation.

Even with this prior preparation some final training and orientation for particular Peace

Corps projects will be necessary. It will also be necessary for volunteers who are not college students.

WHAT WOULD BE THE TERMS OF SERVICE?

The usual length of service should probably be 2 years, with perhaps 3-year terms in some cases. Great flexibility must be permitted to accommodate projects with differing difficulties and needs.

From the training period throughout his term of service, the Peace Corps volunteer would be subject to immediate separation from the service and return home. There must be adequate supervision by the Peace Corps staff so that those who do not adjust to the new challenges can be promptly separated before their failure unduly damages them and the program.

While there should be no general age limit or restriction to one sex, there will be particular projects requiring special maturity and some open only to men or to women. The Peace Corps should not pay the expenses of a wife or family, unless the wife is also accepted for full-time Peace Corps work on the same project.

There should be no draft exemption because of Peace Corps service. In most cases service in the corps will probably be considered a ground for temporary deferment.

Peace Corps volunteers should be given just enough to provide a minimum decent standard of living. They should live in modest circumstances, avoiding all conspicuous consumption. Wherever possible they should live with their host country counterparts. * * *

WHAT WOULD THE FIRST PROJECT BE?

What would the first project be? In the first year there should probably be considerable emphasis on teaching projects. The need here is most clearly felt and our capacity to recruit and train qualified volunteers in a short period of time is greatest. * * *

How will it be financed? The already appropriated funds within the discretion of the President and Secretary of State under the Mutual Security Act are the only immediately available source of financing this summer's pilot programs of the Peace Corps. * * *

Specifically, Congress should consider authorizing the Peace Corps to receive contributions from American businesses, unions, civic organizations, and the public at large. * * *

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1961]
COLLEGE PRESIDENTS GIVE APPROVAL IN A POLL
BY MARGIN OF 9 TO 1

Three weeks before President Kennedy issued his Executive order creating the Peace Corps, the American Council on Education sent letters to 950 college and university presidents asking their opinions on the proposed plan.

Arthur S. Adams, president of the council, said Friday that 325 questionnaires had been returned so far to his office in Washington. "A sample of the first 100 questionnaires indicated a 9-to-1 response in favor of a youth Corps for international service," Dr. Adams said.

Of the institutions represented in the sample, about one-fifth reported "considerable interest" among students, one-half reported "some interest" and less than one-fourth found "no interest."

The college presidents were divided evenly on the type of candidates to be included in the program. Half favored 4-year college graduates only and the other half favored students with at least 2 years of post-high-school training.

Fewer than one-tenth of the respondents thought that the Government should assume complete direction of the selection, training, and placement of the volunteers. Three-fifths said that the program should

be administered through contracts with and grants to institutions of higher education and voluntary agencies. These organizations would then select and train Youth Corps members and arrange for oversea placement with assistance from the United States and host governments.

About half the institutions said that, with their available staffs and facilities, they would be prepared now to accept such grants. A small fraction said that they would undertake such programs only if they were responsible for all phases.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE

Dr. Adams, while stressing the fragmentary nature of the findings, said that the initial sample was fairly representative of the different types of institutions, large and small, public and private. He added that the pattern of the questionnaires received since the first 100 had remained fairly consistent, although no formal tabulation had been completed.

A spot check of institutions in various parts of the country brought the following responses:

University of Notre Dame: Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, described himself as "very hot" on the Peace Corps proposal. He suggested that the most appropriate arrangement would be for a national office to establish the areas and priorities for projects, make arrangements with the host countries, pass on proposals from the universities and provide the support for the program.

University of Michigan: President Harlan H. Hatcher said that Mr. Kennedy had struck a responsive note when he first mentioned the Peace Corps proposal. "The genuine enthusiasm of students on this campus has been extraordinary," he said. "Active planning for participation in the program has been proceeding," he said, adding that the university might expand its present international programs to southeast Asia, Mexico, South America, and Japan.

Georgetown University: Rev. Edward B. Bunn, president, said that the Peace Corps, to be successful, must operate in close cooperation with native institutions and populations. He added that candidates must be carefully selected, with emphasis on maturity and proper motivation.

Swarthmore College: President Courtney Smith said that: "Given the size of the college, which has 930 students, we would have to find out where we have strength and might be able to make a contribution to such a program. The Quaker tradition of the nonsectarian college carries with it a strong feeling for involvement in international affairs."

Carnegie Institute of Technology: President J. C. Warner said that there was strong sentiment at his institution for being helpful in a point 4 way. However, a canvass of opinion among the academic deans and faculty found them pretty neutral on the Peace Corps. "There is great interest in helping the underdeveloped countries," President Warner said, "but the Youth Corps doesn't seem to us to be the most effective way."

University of Minnesota: Dr. Willard L. Thompson, assistant to the president, said that the administration of the university was interested in the plan but had adopted a wait-and-see attitude until it was more fully developed. "The consensus is that any attempt at a crash program would be a serious mistake," he said. "Sending a lot of enthusiastic young people who are unprepared would be poor judgment."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1961]
PEACE CORPS WINS SUPPORT OF STUDENTS
AND EDUCATORS—PROJECT GAINS BACKING
OF MOST UNDERGRADUATES—WOMEN EAGER
A coast-to-coast sampling of campus sentiment toward President Kennedy's Peace

Corps discloses reactions ranging from "It's fabulous," to "It's a public relations gimmick."

The majority of students questioned at universities and colleges from New York to the Pacific coast reported themselves enthusiastic about the idea. Often women students were more eager to join the corps than were men.

"This is a fabulous idea," said Mary Tamarre, of Detroit, a 19-year-old junior at Wayne State University, Detroit. "Too many intelligent men after graduating from college get nothing better than a private first class title and sore feet."

But to John F. Lyons, of the Bronx, a senior in communication arts at Fordham College, New York, the Corps appeared to be "a public relations gimmick to boost the program of the new frontier."

"I strongly deplore it," Mr. Lyons said. "I'm for the idea of serving one's country, but this is a youth-oriented intellectual WPA, voluntary peacetime conscription of youth."

George Link, president of the student body at the University of California at Berkeley, Calif., said:

"The general reaction on the campus is that the President's plan is great. It has been widely and favorably discussed here."

Two principal questions were raised by students: the failure of the plan to provide draft exemption for participants in the Peace Corps and the proviso that Peace Corps members serve without pay.

At the University of California at Los Angeles, where student reaction was largely favorable, a 21-year-old sociology major summed up the chief reservations in these words:

"I'd be willing to go if the pay were on a par with Army salaries and draft exemption went with it."

FRIGHTENING OFFER

Martin Wall, a student in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Pennsylvania State University, said that he would volunteer at the end of his schooling "for any amount of time to be the same as my draft time in the Army."

"The Army is a waste of time for most people," he said. "The Peace Corps could channel America's resources in an intelligent way."

Thomas Frayne, of Philadelphia, a senior at the University of Pennsylvania, thought it "quite frightening to be offered an extremely difficult career with low wages, poor living conditions, and no recognition."

"It is quite foolish to expect young ambitious persons to sacrifice their lives for the good of society," he said.

Of about 40 students interviewed at three universities and three colleges in the Philadelphia area, all but two were positively interested in the Peace Corps. But only half a dozen felt that they were in a position to join and, of these, three said that they could do so only if draft deferment was incorporated into the project.

FAVORS DRAFT EXEMPTION

At Columbia University, Bruce Benson, 20, a government major from California, said of the Peace Corps: "It is harder, but we'd prefer it to military service. This way we would be doing something worth while, benefiting others and ourselves, too."

However, he said that he was not eager to volunteer unless he could count on draft exemption.

"It would louse me all up," he said, "to squeeze in college, law school, Peace Corps, and the Army."

Barbara Clarke, a Barnard senior and president of the Spanish Club, said that she wanted to join the corps. She thought the corps would be well received by Latin Americans, adding, "It's very important because

Latinos and people in other underdeveloped countries have such a poor opinion of us."

Tonia Leon, 19, a Barnard junior majoring in Spanish, said she thought more women than men were eager to join. "You see," she said, "it would give us a chance to do something rather than go straight into a minor office job."

CHANGES HER MIND

Judith Feit, a Barnard junior, said, "It's just the sort of thing I'd like to spend a couple of years at after college and before I went to graduate school."

Carol Van Buskirk, senior class president at Barnard, said she had first opposed the program, thinking that it would "just attract the idealistic college student who just goes off on a romantic crusade." But opening the program to others than college students won her support. College students do not have all the skills in the world, she said.

At the University of California at Los Angeles, there was strong sentiment for choosing farmers and those with mechanical skills as well as students. Girls at U.C.L.A. appeared to be as interested as men in joining.

"These Peace Corps people are pioneers of a sort," one girl said. "They should be chosen with particular care. We must have our best people if we are going to live and work successfully in those countries."

Among men, most felt that Peace Corps pay should equal Army pay. "Then most collegians," one said, "would select the Peace Corps over the Army."

A 22-year-old U.C.L.A. political science major took issue with the whole plan, saying:

"It's just a gesture. You won't win friends. My fear is you'll just send over 1,000 'ugly Americans.'"

He thought it would be better to subsidize 1,000 foreign students to come to the United States.

However, John T. Zubal, a history senior at Fordham, from Cleveland, took the opposite view.

"Perhaps," he said, "this may stamp out the impression of the 'ugly American.' We have to make sure we are not merely sending over people who are anti-Communist for the sake of preserving capitalism but who have a knowledge of the basic nature of the imperialism of Russian communism."

Peter Ward, a freshman at Fordham, from Fair Lawn, N.J., said:

"I think the idea is good on the whole and should have been introduced 10 years ago. The State Department has gotten wise to the fact that we're not going to win friends and influence people by driving through Laotian villages in big Cadillacs."

ENTHUSIASM OF THE YOUNG

William C. Wolff, a Fordham English senior, from the Bronx, said:

"It's a good proposal if you get qualified people for it. Sending the wrong people to Africa or Asia might misrepresent us. The idea is essentially very good. Young people have more energy and are more enthusiastic and have less prejudice and are more adaptable."

The reaction of women students was almost entirely favorable—enthusiastically so.

Dorothy Sattes of Charleston, W. Va., a senior at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., and editor of the Daily Northwestern, said:

"It's an absolutely wonderful plan. A premedical student, for example, would be trained in the language of the country to which he was assigned and then could use his medical knowledge to help people who need it. Under the draft much specialized knowledge is wasted. Even a girl who has just a liberal arts education could be helpful by going abroad to teach."

SOPHOMORE BACKS PLAN

Lynne Friedman, 19, a sophomore at Washington University, St. Louis, said, "Students are enthusiastic enough to want to take part if any kind of real campaign is waged to interest them. The plan appeals to people who want to do something more constructive than traipsing through the mud in boot camp."

Barbara Klearman, 21, a senior at Washington University, said:

"I would be interested if I knew what would be required of me and if my training would make me useful."

Gail Hochman, 18, a Barnard sophomore, said that she might want to go as a teacher and that a majority of her classmates were definitely interested, but added:

"On a college campus, intellectual interest is one thing and participation may be another."

Sheila Charls, a Barnard senior who plans to teach English, said that she and her husband, an electrical engineer, had been talking seriously about joining the Corps but wanted to know more about specific assignments.

At Mills College for Women, Oakland, Calif., Anita Lavine, junior from Los Angeles and editor of the college weekly, said that her paper would support the Corps but felt that participants should be exempt from the draft.

Two Mills students have already applied for admission—Lynn Knight, sophomore, from Perrysburg, Ohio, who spent some months in Africa last year with Operation Crossroads, and Gwen Patterson, a senior, from Westport, Conn., who was in France last year with the Experiment in International Living.

VOLUNTEERS AT BRYN MAWR

At Bryn Mawr, five seniors and one junior have already told the dean's office that they wish to volunteer. In an editorial, the editor of the campus newspaper, Suzanne Spain, of Elkins Park, Pa., wrote:

"If all its ambiguities can be resolved, the program will be an excellent opportunity for college graduates to serve as junior ambassadors."

On the negative side was Don Bone, of Lafayette, Calif., coordinator for the National Student Association at the University of California at Berkeley. He called the plan "a political maneuver put forward with little real thought."

A Columbia University senior commented:

"The Peace Corps? It's like existentialism. Everybody's for it but nobody quite knows what it's all about."

"I'm leery of uncontrolled enthusiasm," said Stephen Thomas, a graduate student of history at Columbia.

FEARFUL OF RIGHTISTS

James Blaine, a Columbia graduate student in sociology, commented:

"The right wing won't like it and probably will make it tough—through security clearances and all that—for many of the idealists and left-leaning people who will be naturally attracted by the idea."

Curt Swenson, of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., said:

"I think it's going to be ineffective. It is not nearly a positive enough project to do the job. It is entirely the wrong approach. Mr. Kennedy is delegating an awful lot of things when he ought to do more himself."

A check of 30 students at the College of the City of New York produced generally positive reactions to the Corps but little sentiment for joining up.

Bruce Solomon, 20, editor of The Campus, the C.C.N.Y. semiweekly, said:

"If the Peace Corps were a substitute for the draft I would join. It's certainly better than the Army. But I do not intend to spend 3 years of my life in foreign service and another 2 in the Army."

Negro students at Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn., were intensely interested in the Peace Corps.

Theopolis Fair, 20, of Pine Bluff, Ark., a sophomore majoring in history, recently handed out 375 questionnaires asking students about their interest in the Peace Corps. All were returned. These questionnaires were sent out by the National Student Association of Philadelphia, which is making a survey of student interest.

A half-dozen Negro students who were interviewed had not yet decided to file applications and were eager for more details.

Mr. Fair saw the Corps as a chance for a grassroots operation to give the people of other countries an opportunity to meet the average American instead of the party-going type in our Embassies.

Dianne Hemphill, 19, of Nashville, a junior majoring in psychology, said that she had not considered too seriously joining the Corps but was interested in its development.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 1961]

DEDICATED TO PEACE—ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER

The train of events that led Robert Sargent Shriver to Washington and a high place in the Kennedy administration started one night when he met a girl. Mr. Shriver, who announced his plans yesterday as head of the Peace Corps, might have arrived in Washington, anyway, or to almost any other place on which he had set his sights. As an indication of his versatility, he was president of the Chicago Board of Education for several years; was mentioned as a possible Democratic candidate for Governor of Illinois; headed the Yale alumni 1 year and has been prominent in lay Roman Catholic affairs.

In 1945, at a dinner party here, Mr. Shriver met Eunice M. Kennedy, sister of President Kennedy. He was then an assistant to the editor of Newsweek magazine. He had obtained the job on his return from Navy service in World War II, during which he had risen to lieutenant commander.

Before the war, Mr. Shriver studied law at Yale and served a brief apprenticeship in a New York law firm. He had been active on the Yale Daily News, and could not seem to wash off the printer's ink.

Joseph P. Kennedy, Eunice's father, was looking for someone to edit the letters of his son, Joseph, Jr., who had been killed on a wartime air mission over the English Channel.

He was impressed with Mr. Shriver and eventually took him into his business organization.

Mr. Shriver was sent to Chicago to do a survey of the Merchandise Mart, the world's largest commercial building, which Mr. Kennedy had just purchased. He became assistant manager of the mart and has made Chicago his home since 1946.

He married the girl, too. But it took 8 years of courting and commuting between Chicago, New York, Palm Beach, and Hyannis Port, Mass. They were wed in St. Patrick's Cathedral here in 1953.

Mr. Shriver, 45 years old, stands 5 feet 11 inches and carries his 175 pounds like an athlete. An easygoing man, his customary approach to a newcomer is an outstretched hand and this greeting: "Hi, I'm Sarge Shriver, Jack Kennedy's brother-in-law."

Informality marks most of his contacts, his friends say. But behind it is a cool, analytical mind, a dedication to public service, and intellectualism.

Mr. Shriver is a defender of intellectuals. America needs business and professional men, he has said, but it also needs "sages, saints, scholars, and statesmen—masterminds and master spirits."

Unlike other Kennedys, Mr. Shriver is not a touch-football enthusiast. "He plays tennis while the rest of us run around on the field," his wife explains.

He also shoots a good game of golf and is an expert skindiver. He is a modest collector of modern paintings.

He was born in Westminster, Md., a suburb of Baltimore. His late father, who bore the same name, was a vice president of the Baltimore Trust Co. and a director of two New York investment houses, J. C. Wilson & Co., and Young & Ottley. His mother lives in New York.

Mr. Shriner is descended from colonial families. One ancestor was David Shriner, signer of the Stamp Act and the Bill of Rights. Another, Robert Owings, held an original land grant from Cecil Calvert, Lord Baltimore.

Mr. Shriner attended Canterbury School at New Milford, Conn., and was graduated cum laude from Yale in 1938. He was a campus politician, a colleague recalls, and a founder of the America First organization there.

The Shrivers have two sons, Robert Sargent, 6, and Bern, 2, and a daughter, Maria Owings, 5. They live in an 11-room duplex apartment overlooking Lincoln Park and Lake Michigan in Chicago. They entertain a great deal.

MAN IN THE ECONOMY OF THE SIXTIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine address made by Dean Charles C. Abbott, of the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Virginia, before a group of the Virginia Manufacturers Association in May 1960.

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

MAN IN THE ECONOMY OF THE SIXTIES

(By Charles C. Abbott)

As you know, our theme today is "How the Fifties Make the Sixties." We are fortunate in having with us a distinguished series of speakers who will explore this theme with you.

My role this morning is simply to set the stage, to supply a springboard, to provide a preamble—not for a paity pocketful of perfunctory and pedestrian prophecies and predictions, but a flamboyant foreword for a fascinating, fabulous flood of factual, forthright, and felicitously phrased forecasts of the future. At the outset let me say that I have not discussed with your speakers what they are going to talk about. Like you, I look forward very eagerly to hearing them. Considering our topic, however, it seems to me inevitable that in the domestic field they must touch on two subjects that will be of great significance in the sixties: those changes that have been and are occurring in the size and makeup of our population, and those changes that have been and are occurring in the size and makeup of the sums spent—by government, business concerns, and universities—for research and development.

We are all aware of the startling growth in the population of the United States during the last 20 years. Less familiar are the changes in its age distribution. When the fifties started half the labor force was less than 35 years old. During the last 10 years the labor force aged, and currently only 39 percent is under 35. By 1970, however, the part of the labor force under 35 will have risen again, to an estimated 45 percent. Accompanying this will be two other striking developments—a rapid rise in the demand for technically and professionally trained people, and a rapid increase in the number of women in the work force. Ten

years from now the Labor Department expects 30 million women to be working, as compared with 23.5 million now.

Such changes will have a great impact in particular markets—in the demand for baby foods, schoolbooks, precooked meals, sports cars, and services of all types. Even more important will be the increasing need for savings that the growing population will create, for a rising amount of savings and investment will be required to house, accommodate, and especially provide jobs for the larger number of people.

Let me place beside this consequence of population change some of the effects of the large and growing expenditures for research development.

Since 1945 moneys spent for this purpose by government, industry, and educational institutions have been advancing rapidly from year to year. McGraw-Hill estimates that during the last 15 years they have aggregated approximately \$90 billion—an amount, it seems safe to say, much greater than that spent for research during the entire preceding history of the Republic. In 1969, McGraw-Hill estimates, the annual figure will be \$22 billion, compared with \$12 billion in 1959.

In addition to the fascinating new products and procedures, and the greater productivity that will follow from this expenditure, one other result is surely predictable: a much larger capital investment per job. And this effect will still further enhance the demand for savings and investment during the coming decade.

Should our speakers go outside the domestic field and glance at the international situation I suspect they will mention the extraordinary increase in productive capacity all over the world during the last 10 years, the disappearance of the so-called dollar shortage that so greatly influenced American foreign policy in the early fifties and the revival of competition in international trade. One consequence of this new level of production and of competition may be that our makers of monetary and fiscal policy will find it impractical to disregard—at least to the degree that has been possible during the last 15 years—policies carried on in other parts of the world. The world is getting smaller, and our money managers may not have as much latitude as they have had to create deficits, restrict credit availability, or pursue cheap or dear money policies.

In looking at the foreign scene conceivably our speakers may even note the striking sequence of political successes scored in most Western countries and in some others toward the end of the decade by political groups commonly termed conservative, at least in comparison with their opponents. These successes have occurred in Canada, Great Britain, France, and Germany, to name but four countries. And this development in turn raises the question: What is the strength of a viewpoint that, as Russell Kirk points out, did not surrender to the attacks of the Jacobins and the doctrines of the French Revolution, to the criticism of early 19th century Utilitarians, to sentimental socialism, to positivism, to the blandishments of Marxism and the planned economy, and now seems to have revived once more? Clearly a doctrine that did not succumb to all this, that neither the New Deal nor the Fair Deal was able to extirpate, that the largest government deficits in history have not been able to buy has some claim—not only to the *summum bonum* of evolutionary theory: survival value—but to its own characteristic form of integrity.

Conservatives are and have been of many creeds and faiths, but they tend to share a common attitude toward moral law. They tend not to believe that man is the measure of all things or that force and appetite are

the ultimate realities. Nor do they believe in the unlimited perfectibility of man—even when man's perfectibility is one of the goals of a planned economy constructed—statistically—immaculately. For they are aware that man, like the Almighty, must also achieve his ends through imperfect human beings; and sometimes they question whether mankind has the same skill, or even the same ends.

This means that conservatives are prone to believe that principles of right and wrong do exist, exterior to the mind and desires of men. Furthermore, they are likely to be explicit that these principles are not subject to change by popular vote, no matter how large the majority, nor by the Supreme Court, nor by the advance of scientific knowledge, nor even by the ADA. Like many anthropologists, and even some psychiatrists, they believe that society disintegrates when all taboos are removed, when veneration disappears, and when there is no longer any sense of sin.

In the conservative view, the test of the good society is not how much the economy produces, nor how its fruits are distributed. Neither the materialism of the Marxists and the neo-Marxists, nor the distributive justice of the egalitarians is the touchstone. No, the crux is, as it has always been, the relation of the individual to the state. And this question is fully as cogent when the issue is collectivism versus individualism as it was when the issue was the divine right of kings versus democracy. Perhaps it is even more cogent.

How shall the sovereign power do justice? What restrictions on the sovereign does the concept of justice imply? How much independence and liberty must or should the individual person sacrifice to achieve security? These questions remain with us.

The question of wealth, of enough production, is no longer, as it once was, a crucial problem. The present and prospective levels of GNP show that technology has largely solved this and the emphasis in much current thinking, as in the Eckstein report, has shifted to stability and growth.

Of course, the ability to produce enough—an adequate minimum for everyone—has stimulated the feeling that everyone by virtue of being alive is entitled to the minimum, irrespective of whether a free market says he's worth it. And this, naturally enough, instead of blunting has in fact sharpened a number of questions in political science and economics that for centuries have underlain the social structure and which—when people were hungry—were difficult to examine on their merits without regard to the humanities.

Nor, in the 19th century phrase, is "the social problem," the inequality of income, of much consequence. Progressive taxation combined with social security has remedied, or will presently remedy, that.

As we have been told repeatedly during the last 25 years, this is the century of the common man. So far the century has produced both the affluent society and the longest casualty lists in history, striking vindication of Irving Babbitt's criticism of the 19th century's assumption, that moral progress would issue almost automatically from material progress. And the old question still remains: How shall the individual protect himself (or be protected) against the aggrandizing, agglomerative, all-absorbing power of the State? And this question may become increasingly acute if, as has been recently suggested in semi-official documents, the Government makes greater use of so-called selective credit controls designed to regulate particular types of economic activity—such as the purchase of durable goods by consumers, the accumulation of inventories by business concerns or domestic residential construction—that are particu-

larly disruptive of centralized economic planning.

"We know," said Edmund Burke, "that we (he and his contemporaries) have made no discoveries; and we think that no discoveries are to be made, in morality; nor many in the great principles of government, nor in the idea of liberty, which were understood long before we were born, altogether as well as they will be after the grave has heaped its mould upon our presumption, and the silent tomb shall have imposed its laws on our pert loquacity."

You may demur that this was said nearly 200 years ago, that times have changed, that we have made great discoveries in morals and that it is not pertinent in a society with the greatest material prosperity and the largest tail fins of which we have record. So let me quote from a distinguished contemporary, Bertrand de Jouvenel, a man now living, who among his other attainments edits virtually the only newsletter on the European Continent that comments on American business conditions:

"The traditional view of the king was in effect that of a will at the service of justice * * *

"How is justice done? By rendering to each his due: *sum cuique*. The idea of justice implies the idea of rights which are preexistent and fixed so that justice is the more just the more respectfully it treats them.

"Today it is hard to understand the proud resistance of the ancient magistrature, for it is accepted now that the only function of judges is to apply the variable prescriptions of the sovereign. But this was a condition to which the magistrates of former days did not so tamely submit.

"Man is no great inventor of ideas. The doctrines of today are but the silhouette of yesterday's, in a new dress. Thus, the theory of the sovereignty of the people, as generally advanced in our own time, is but a new version of the theories of despotism advanced in the 17th and 18th centuries to the profit of the Stuarts and Bourbons—theories which did not then win the same approval as they receive today. The claim advanced three centuries ago (and admitted today) is that the will of the sovereign makes the law for the subject, whatever the will may be and subject only to the condition that it issues from the legitimate sovereign. The king (or the people) has only to formulate a command, whether general (a law) or particular (an order), for the subject to be bound in conscience to obey, whether by doing or by refraining from doing. And the sovereign, whether king or people, is completely free as regards its wishes. It may command whatever pleases it: *Quidquid principi (or populo) placuit legis habet vigorem*.

"The least reflection makes it clear that, once the principle of unchecked and unbounded sovereignty of a human will is admitted, the resulting regime is in substance the same to whatever person, real or fictive, this sovereign will is attributed.

"The surprising thing is that so vulnerable an idea should have so great a vogue in our own time. The men of the 17th century were not so simple, and the despotic idea had not at that date won for itself general acceptance. It was, on the contrary, everywhere denied that it lay with the sovereign will to lay down rules as it pleased; it was not believed that its wishes, whatever they happened to be, had power to bind. Everyone knew that the ordinance of temporal power was not morally binding in virtue of its form, if its substance did not satisfy certain conditions."

So says de Jouvenel.

At this point I cannot resist quoting from two men, one a Vice President, one a President of the United States, each numbered among the most acute political thinkers

produced by this country: John C. Calhoun and John Adams.

"The truth is," said Calhoun, "the Government of the uncontrolled numerical majority, is but the absolute and despotic form of popular governments; just as that of the uncontrolled will of man, or a few, is of monarchy or aristocracy; and, to say the least, it has as strong a tendency to oppression and the abuse of its powers, as either of the others."

Similarly John Adams: "The fundamental article of my political creed is that despotism or unlimited sovereignty or absolute power is the same in a majority of a popular assembly, an aristocratical council, an oligarchical junto, and a single emperor—equally arbitrary, cruel, bloody, and in every respect diabolical."

In his effort to escape from the overwhelming power of the sovereign, to find liberty in something better than the state of nature of the hermit, man through the centuries has made use of a host of concepts and institutions—religious law and the piety of the prince, natural law, privileges extorted or brought from the sovereign, constitutions, bills of rights and, in this country, doctrines such as the balance of powers and States rights. Whether or not designed with this end in view, these arrangements have served to keep the individual from being a mere grain of sand in the monolithic column of the state. Generally speaking, the history of each of these institutions has been its slow erosion and disintegration, until the old protection ceased to serve its purpose and was replaced by a new.

In the economic sphere far and away, the most important of such institutions is the concept of the free market and the free-market process. By free market I mean a situation in which politically created or politically protected monopoly is held to a minimum, in which the consumer has a freedom of choice in spending, or saving, his income, limited only by his own intelligence and the state of the arts and in which the allocation of resources and the form and timing of capital investment are directed by the owner in accordance with his wishes and not according to some centrally developed and bureaucratically administered plan.

I do not mean to suggest that this situation has prevailed on a grand scale in the recent or even the remote past. But I do mean that this condition can prevail—and within limited spans of time and place has prevailed—in all three of the basic markets, those for land, labor, and capital, as well as in the markets for consumer goods. The circumstances necessary for its creation or preservation are simply the maintenance of competition and, with some few exceptions, the confinement of Government activity to the two ancient and ineluctable responsibilities of the sovereign—preservation of domestic tranquillity and protection from foreign invasion.

At the present time agricultural support prices, tariffs, subsidies for raw materials, legalized featherbedding and work rules, manipulated interest rates, subsidies in a hundred forms reveal how far the national ethos has departed from the competitive creed, measure how great our reluctance to face the realities of competition, suggest the root cause of the recent concern with the rate of economic growth. So many are the interests that have taken the position that the public welfare is improved by their acceptance, directly or indirectly, of the public bounty and who, contrary to the psalmist's admonitions have placed their trust in princes, or rather in the modern counterpart, what sometimes passes for public policy.

Quite aside from its economic advantages, the free market should be defended as a political institution. So long as it is free it is by definition an area of social life into

which the individual citizen may retreat and take refuge from political interference, in which initiative and enterprise may be exercised free from rules, regulations, whims, wishes, or commands of governmental authority. So long as the freedom of the marketplace is preserved the market process serves as a shield protecting the citizen from the overpowering weight of the state.

"I would define liberty," said John Adams, "as a power as we would be done by." Would he agree, I wonder, that this definition was compatible with the governmental use of selective credit controls designed to regulate the construction of residential housing, the purchase of consumer durables goods, and the accumulation of inventories by business firms?

In a free market, both buyers and sellers do have the power advocated by John Adams. When the freedom of choice inherent in the free price system is superseded by a system of regulated prices and wages, of priorities and allocations of materials and assignment of the labor force, the individual indeed becomes another digit in the economic plan—in Orwell's terrifying phrase, one of "the streamlined men who think in slogans and talk with bullets."

In "A Positive Program of *Laissez Faire*" Henry Simonds believed that he was laying down a line of attack for militant liberalism. In fact, he was assailing what in his view was the improper accumulation or improper use of economic power, wherever found, whether in private or in public hands. Few conservatives could improve upon his justification of the free market or his statement of the desirability of its consequences:

"Efficient utilization of resources implies an allocation such that units of every kind of productive service make equally important (valuable) contributions to the social product in all the different uses among which they are transferable. Such allocation will be approximated if, by virtue of highly competitive conditions, resources move freely from less productive (remunerative) to more productive employments. It is an essential object of monopoly * * * to maintain an abnormally high yield (productivity), and to prevent such influx of resources as would bring the monopolized industry down to the common level.

"If the State undertakes, under popular government (or perhaps under any other form) to substitute its control for competition in the determination of relative prices and relative wages, the situation must soon become chaotic.

"The existence (and preservation) of a competitive situation in private industry makes possible a minimizing of responsibilities of the sovereign State. It frees that State from the obligation of adjudicating endless bitter disputes among persons as participants in different industries, and among owners of different kinds of productive services. In a word, it makes possible a political policy of *laissez faire*."

I would only add that not only does the free-market process free the States from the obligation of adjudicating such disputes, it also protects the taxpayer, the producer, and the consumer from the consequences of these adjudications.

In the famous simile of the invisible hand Adam Smith made, more colorfully, virtually the same point as Simonds:

"Every individual endeavors as much as he can * * * to employ his capital * * * and so to direct * * * industry that its produce may be of the greatest value * * * he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention. Nor is it always the worse for society that it was no part of it. By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that

of society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it. I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good."

Adam Smith and Simonds were in agreement in preferring the invisible hand of competition to the hand—visible or invisible—of the bureaucrat and economic planner, whether at the tiller of the ship of state or in the taxpayer's pocket.

The chief economic justification of political despotism of course is that the despot, using—in addition to strictly political measures—the two great economic instruments, the power to tax and the power to interfere with the free-price system, can accumulate larger aggregations of capital than can be accumulated in the hands of private individuals. When I was a graduate student of economics the then currently favorite example of the economic achievements possible under despotism were the pyramids of Egypt. I suppose the current counterpart are the pyramids of wheat this country has accumulated.

The conservative agrees with John Marshall that the power to tax is the power to destroy. He continues to question whether the converse is equally true—that the power to tax is also the power to create, as is sometimes implied in programs advanced by other groups—in Mr. Truman's phrase, the "kneek-jerk liberals." He feels intestinely as well as intellectually that the Government in its sovereign as distinct from its proprietary capacity produces nothing and that what it has it acquires by three ancient rights of the sovereign: eminent domain, taxation, and the coinage of money, or its modern equivalent, the creation of credit. And even then the production thus accomplished he senses, suffers the dilution of Parkinson's law. In short he inclines to the view that a dollar spent—or saved—by a private individual has at least as great procreative power as a dollar spent by the Government and that the so-called "multiplier" is as much a myth as the golden touch, unless the listener is equally as generous in granting the fairytale premises of the one as he is the statistical assumptions of the other. In his more pessimistic moments he even wonders whether it may not be true after all—looking at Cuba, and other countries—that security of person is dependent upon security of property since he has heard often enough the last 15 years that security is indivisible.

By way of summary, let me say that I think the economic argument in favor of the free market is unanswerable, however unpalatable. The free price system is democratic, in the proper sense. Within the limits of his income each purchaser is able to choose which goods he wants, and in what quantity. No one compels him to buy. No seller is compelled to sell against his will or at an unacceptable price. And note that this cannot be true in a planned economy.

Each dollar spent is a vote. This spending, or lack of it, produces the free movement of prices, profits for this firm, losses for that. The spur of competition leads to a constant search for product improvement, better service and lower price, or a better product at the same price. More important—much more important—it leads to a constant reallocation of available resources among the infinite uses to which they can be put. This reallocation is accomplished in accordance with the desires of the consuming public—which is, after all, the whole object of the economic process—and not according to a statistical formula, not in response to the allegation of some public interest greater than the public acknowledges through its direction of purchasing power, not under the task of a pressure group seeking to avoid the objective test of the marketplace.

Morals, politics and economics are inextricably woven together and this will con-

tinue to be true in the sixties as has been the case in the past. Public policy cannot be safely founded solely on the very human desire to reform someone else, nor on the naive presumption that universal suffrage signifies that majorities are always morally right nor on the delightfully mechanistic concept that the individual is essentially a spending-saving automation, that the household is most usefully regarded as a consumption unit and that these characteristics provide a predictive basis for controls toward some predetermined social end.

The governmental process, even by its most enthusiastic supporters, is admitted to be a blunt—albeit budgeoning—instrument. Indeed its crudeness, its acknowledged inability to do everything is their chief complaint regarding its efficacy. Of course, in the last analysis, this very crudeness may be the chief protection of the citizen against the concentrated majesty of government, the flaw in the best laid 5-year plan.

As we go into the sixties one of the great questions will be whether this blunt instrument can achieve such collaborative, collective goals as full employment of resources, economic stability, a maximum rate of growth, and at the same time maintain order, justice, freedom for the individual, a sense of the continuing common interests of the community, and protection of the inherited rights and liberties of the local community—qualities on which a good society also depends.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS PASSAGE OF COLD WAR VETERANS GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee and principal sponsor of S. 349, a bill to extend educational and on-the-job training to veterans of the cold war, I was particularly interested in the legislative program recommended to the 87th Congress by the American Veterans Committee.

Over the years the American Veterans Committee has consistently taken strong, responsible action for programs that are not only in the best interest of veterans but in the best interest of all Americans.

National AVC Chairman Mickey Levine and Executive Director J. Arnold Feldman have sent me the AVC's recommended legislative program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that portion of the program pertaining to educational assistance for veterans of the cold war.

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

1. The past World War II and Korean conflict GI bills strengthened our Nation immeasurably. They contributed in large measure toward educating our generation, provided an important avenue toward decent housing, and strengthened our system of higher education. Enactment of a peacetime GI bill of rights with liberal educational provisions will give greater strength to the Nation and promote these desirable social goals.

THE COMMUNICATIONS CRISIS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, there is an editorial in the current

March 1961 issue of the NEA Journal which I think is worthy of the attention of Members of Congress. It deals with a problem with which each of us individually is faced—and a problem with which millions of concerned citizens are faced.

It is the communications crisis. Each of us can fully appreciate this, because our offices are flooded daily with a heavy volume of material, to which we cannot possibly give detailed, personal attention and study—not even read.

Because of the timeliness and pithy pertinence of this editorial, written by Sidney Hertzberg, editor of the magazine Current, to our own daily operations, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I invite Senator's attention to it.

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

THE COMMUNICATIONS CRISIS (By Sidney Hertzberg)

I ask you to contemplate the plight of the concerned citizen. Unlike the apathetic or cynical citizen, the concerned citizen cares about what happens to our democratic society and believes that his caring can have some effect. He is busy living his life and he has, at most, only a few hours a week to inform himself about the frontier social problems of the day, to formulate opinions about them, and to make his opinions felt in their solution.

His problem is how to keep informed in the face of an overwhelming avalanche of material—newspapers, magazines, books, analyses by columnists and commentators, radio, television, and film presentations, research reports, findings of various official committees.

Our concerned citizen knows that not all this output is new or significant. Yet he worries about missing things. And the more conscientious—the more valuable—a citizen he is, the less likely he is to act unless he is satisfied that his action is based on the fullest knowledge.

The communications glut is no problem for those with closed minds who blindly follow leaders or those with blank minds who support the last thing they hear. It is the intelligent, concerned citizen who is frustrated, immobilized, reduced to a sense of hopelessness.

The communications crisis is part of the larger crisis of understanding growing out of the intricate and headlong advances in the physical and behavioral sciences. These advances—or at least changes—have infinitely complicated the social problems we face and will keep on complicating them at an ever-accelerating pace.

The concerned citizen may achieve the feeling that he is on top of yesterday's problems, but he has made little progress with today's. In fact he is not even sure what the problems are, and he senses that, whatever they are, they will be superseded in an early tomorrow. Nor does he get much help from the groups and individuals he once looked to for guidance. They haven't caught up either, or if they have, their answers cannot be a simple extension of an old stand, easily followed.

Crisis is the editorial writer's stock in trade, and I don't want to argue that my crisis is better (that is, worse) than the next writer's. But I do think it underlies the others.

Democracy gets along with a frightening number of wrong solutions to specific crises. But democracy ceases to exist when its con-

cerned citizens give up the search for the answers—indeed, for the questions.

Democracy is based on the assumption that a substantial number of citizens can be tolerably well informed, at least about the crucial problems of the day. This assumption was made supportable by a technical device (the printing press) and by a social device (free public education). Today the printing press, along with radio and television, could drown democracy in a sea of words.

The plight of the concerned citizen is a broad educational challenge. To find his way out of the communications morass, he must train his mind to adhere to rigorous, even ruthless, standards. He must isolate the problems worth his time—the frontier problems that are relevant to tomorrow's world and to democratic values. He must learn to bypass the superficial and pretentious, and to seek out the significant new ideas dealing with these problems.

The concerned citizen can be helped by responsible journalists and public leaders but most of all, I suspect, by educators. Teachers have long dealt with the problems created by the fact that new knowledge outstrips current curriculums. More than this, the teacher is better equipped by training and temperament to employ objectivity and ethical responsibility in identifying the questions and erecting the frameworks by which new answers (and the importance of new questions) can be judged.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER AS GENERAL OF THE ARMY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 55, S. 1173, a bill reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1173) to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is particularly fitting that I should speak in support of the bill. I have not always agreed with ex-President Eisenhower in connection with his program as President of the United States, but I wish to join with every other patriotic American in paying tribute to the military history which he has written for the United States and to the distinguished service he rendered as the head of our Armed Forces in World War II.

I think the action contemplated by the bill is more than a symbolism. I believe it is paying a deserved tribute to the ex-President to restore to him his five-star designation as a general.

I heartily approve of the bill, and shall vote for it with great pleasure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services reported the bill unanimously and enthusiastically. I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of the report printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would authorize the President to appoint former President Dwight David Eisenhower to the grade of General of the Army. Since former President Eisenhower is entitled to a monetary allowance of \$25,000 a year as a former President, the bill provides that when reappointed he will not be entitled to the pay and allowances of a General of the Army.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

After his election as President of the United States in 1952, then General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower resigned his military commission. He had originally been appointed to the temporary grade of General of the Army on December 20, 1944, under the authority of the act of December 14, 1944. He was permanently appointed to the grade of General of the Army under the authority of the act of March 23, 1946.

The 1944 act that established the grade of General of the Army limited eligibility for this grade to not more than four officers.

The 1946 act that authorized appointments to the permanent grade of General of the Army restricted eligibility for such appointments to those persons who served in that grade after December 14, 1944, and before August 14, 1945. Thus, it is apparent that only those officers who had held positions of exceptional importance and responsibility during the successful prosecution of World War II were eligible for this grade.

Officers serving in the grade of General of the Army are exempt from the mandatory retirement provisions applicable to other officers and even if they elect to be retired instead of remaining on the active list, they are entitled to the same pay and allowances as if they were on active duty.

Since former President Eisenhower's resignation as a General of the Army, legislation conferring compensation and other benefits on former Presidents of the United States has been approved. The act of August 25, 1958, provides an annual monetary allowance of \$25,000 to former Presidents, suitable office space appropriately furnished and equipped, and a total of not more than \$50,000 a year of compensation for an office staff. In addition, the 1958 act authorizes an annual pension of \$10,000 for the widow of any former President of the United States if such widow waives the right to any annuity or pension under any other act of Congress.

The monetary allowance of \$25,000 per year for former Presidents provided in the 1958 act makes, in this unique case, the receipt of the pay and allowances of a General of the Army inappropriate. Accordingly, the bill specifically provides that former President Eisenhower shall not be entitled to the pay or allowances of a General of the Army after his appointment. Moreover, the pay and allowances of any military assistants assigned for former President Eisenhower after his appointment as General of the Army under this bill would be deducted from the maximum office staff allowance of \$50,000 annually authorized by the act of August 25, 1958.

Section 3 of the bill is intended as a savings provision to make it abundantly clear that appointment of former President Eisenhower as General of the Army is not intended to restrict the benefits provided the widow of a former President under the 1958 act. Since that act conditions eligibility to receive a \$10,000 annual pension as widow of a former President upon a waiver of the right to any other annuity or pension provided by the Federal Government, it is clear that dual benefits could not accrue because of this bill.

COMPARISON OF COMPENSATION AND PRIVILEGES

The following tabulation compares the compensation, privileges, and benefits of a former President with those of a five-star general. It should be emphasized that the compensation of a five-star general is shown here only for purposes of comparison and is not authorized by this bill.

As former President	As 5-star general	Comment
1. \$25,000 per annum for life.	<i>Per annum</i> Pay \$12,916.80 Personal money allowance (tax free) 5,000.00 Subsistence allowance (tax free) 574.56 Quarters allowance (tax free) 2,052.00	The proposed bill limits monetary compensation to \$25,000 per annum as a former President. (The pay and allowances of a 5-star general, although lesser in amount, would be more advantageous because nearly \$8,000 thereof would be tax free.)
2. Up to \$50,000 per annum for an office staff.	Total (\$7,626.56 tax free) 20,543.36 Entitled by custom to an aide, secretary, and chauffeur orderly.	The proposed bill requires that the pay and allowances of any military assistant or assistants, officer or enlisted, be deducted from the \$50,000 that may be expended to provide an office staff for a former President. An election as to office space is not deemed necessary nor does the proposed bill require same.
3. Suitable office space, furnished and equipped, wherever in United States former President shall specify.	Entitled by custom to office space (usually at the Pentagon).	The proposed bill leaves the franking privilege as a former President intact.
4. Franking privilege.	No franking privilege.	This entitlement as a 5-star general would obtain under the proposed bill.
5.	Medical and surgical care at military hospitals.	These entitlements as a 5-star general would obtain under the proposed bill.
6.	Right to purchase at post exchanges and commissaries, space-available travel on MSTS and MATS, and other such minor entitlements.	

As widow of former President	As widow of 5-star general	Comment
1. \$10,000 per annum upon waiver of any annuity or pension under any other act of Congress.	\$242 per month (\$2,904 per annum), VA dependency and indemnity compensation. \$100 per month (\$1,200 per annum), estimated maximum social security benefits. Husband's burial expenses borne by Government and \$3,000 lump-sum death gratuity. Medical and surgical outpatient care and military hospitalization on a space-available basis. Right to purchase at post exchanges and commissaries and some of the other such lesser benefits to which husband when alive was entitled.	The proposed bill preserves entitlement to pension of \$10,000 per annum as widow of former President—but the act providing for that pension requires an election between these 2 alternatives. Undisturbed by proposed bill.
2.	Do.	
3.	Do.	
4.	Do.	

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee views the Office of the Presidency of the United States as having prestige and status superior to that of any public office or position. Approval of this bill should not be construed as any detraction from what the committee regards as the singular elevation of the Presidency.

Before his election and reelection as President, former President Eisenhower had spent all of his adult life in exceptionally distinguished military service to his country. It is readily understandable that for sentimental and other reasons, he might desire to be restored to his military grade. Restoration of his military grade seems an entirely fitting and deserved token of appreciation for his lifetime of public service.

VIEWS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Printed below and hereby made a part of this report is a letter from the President recommending the authority contained in this bill:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 1, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe it is most appropriate that former President Eisenhower be restored to his military rank of General of the Army. President Eisenhower's outstanding military record and the great affection and regard that the people of this country have for him are such that now that his service to the Nation as its President is ended, he should be reappointed to his military position.

I urge that legislation permitting President Eisenhower's reappointment as General of the Army be enacted. By a similar letter to the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee I am also asking the House to act on this matter. The details implementing this request can, I am certain, be worked out by the Congress and I want to assure you of my full cooperation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate has an easily understood purpose—to authorize the President to appoint former President Dwight David Eisenhower to the latter's former military grade of General of the Army.

Because this part of the proposal has been misunderstood in some quarters, let me hasten to add that the bill expressly provides that the pay and allowances otherwise accruing to a person holding the grade of General of the Army will not be paid in this instance because President Eisenhower is already entitled to annual compensation of \$25,000 as a former President.

A former President is entitled by law to an office staff allowance of not more than \$50,000 a year. By custom, a General of the Army is assigned as many as three military assistants. To avoid overlapping provisions in this area, the bill

requires that the pay and allowances of any military assistants assigned to President Eisenhower when he is reappointed as a General of the Army shall be deducted from the \$50,000 office staff allowance to which he is otherwise entitled as a former President.

The committee report contains a comparative tabulation of the compensation, privileges, and benefits of a former President and a General of the Army. I cannot believe the renewed eligibility for medical care at military hospitals and renewed eligibility for purchasing at post exchanges and commissaries can weigh very heavily in a decision on this measure. I should like to elaborate that the provision in the bill eliminating entitlement to pay and allowances operates to eliminate entitlement to the lump sum death gratuity that would otherwise be payable. Ordinarily, a widow of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty is entitled to a death gratuity equal to 6 months' pay at the rate to which the decedent was entitled on the date of his death. Since under the bill former President Eisenhower will not be entitled to military pay or allowances, this eliminates possible entitlement of a surviving widow to a death gratuity. Thus, the issue of dual compensation and duplicate benefits can be dismissed.

In its report on the bill, the committee has been careful to state that its recommendation on this measure should not be considered as any detraction from the preeminent prestige and status it associates with the Office of the Presidency of the United States. At this point, I shall quote from a pertinent part of the committee report:

The committee views the Office of the Presidency of the United States as having prestige and status superior to that of any public office or position. Approval of this bill should not be construed as any detraction from what the committee regards as the singular elevation of the Presidency.

Before his election and reelection as President, former President Eisenhower had spent all of his adult life in exceptionally distinguished military service to his country. It is readily understandable that for sentimental and other reasons, he might desire to be restored to his military grade. Restoration of his military grade seems an entirely fitting and deserved token of appreciation for his lifetime of public service.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is naturally enthusiastic about President Eisenhower's conduct of the Office of the Presidency and his accomplishments in that office. Yet the bill is as devoid of selfish political backing as any measure could be. The bill was introduced in the Senate by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr.

RUSSELL]. The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, Representative VINSON, has referred to the affection and admiration in which President Eisenhower is held by the American people. President Kennedy in urging the enactment of the bill has mentioned the great affection and regard that the people of this country have for President Eisenhower. I earnestly hope that the bill may be unanimously approved.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I have not agreed with all the actions taken by President Eisenhower while he was President, but I believe it is only just and right that the proposed legislation should be enacted. The rank of a five-star general simply would be the honor that General Eisenhower would have retained had he never been elected President of the United States. Therefore, I do not believe his having become President of the United States should be a reason for his not having the rank which he held at that particular time.

I am in accord with the bill, and believe it is only right and just for us to pass it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the action of Congress in passing the bill will restore to President Eisenhower his five-star rank as General of the Army on active service.

Congress is acting for the people of the Nation in paying this further tribute and recognition to the general who led our forces in Germany and other parts of Europe, who is a hero in the eyes of the American people, and who will, I am sure, receive this further honor from Congress and the people with great appreciation, because we understand that this is the title by which he wishes to be addressed in the future.

We who knew him as General Eisenhower and who served in some part of the world, either directly under his command, or as a part of the forces directed toward the defeat of the Axis Powers, are very much pleased that an opportunity presents itself in this way to express our affection, our continuing wish for his long life and happiness, and our recognition of the place which he holds in the hearts of the American people.

I wholeheartedly and very gladly support the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I willingly support the bill under the special circumstances which surround the case. I understand the measure represents the personal desires of President Kennedy and, as well, of former President Eisenhower. However, this fact alone is not a sufficient reason, in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, for the passage of such a measure. Let it be con-

sidered an expression of friendly feeling toward a former President who has served well both in the civilian and in the military branches of our Government, and has heretofore earned and been awarded the five stars of a General of the Army strictly on the basis of meritorious achievement.

Mr. President, I read briefly from the report of the committee which considered the bill:

The committee views the Office of the Presidency of the United States as having prestige and status superior to that of any public office or position. Approval of this bill should not be construed as any detraction from what the committee regards as the singular elevation of the Presidency.

Mr. President, the people of the Nation have twice honored former President Eisenhower by electing him, through constitutional channels, to the most exalted office within our Government. It is the most exalted office in the world. As President of the United States, the Constitution conferred upon him the title, the power, and the authority of Commander in Chief. That provision of our Constitution is not an idle one. After twice being elected to that office by the people—not by the Congress—and after twice serving in and twice holding the office of Commander in Chief, how can President Kennedy now confer upon him any additional military honor or any civilian honor, or how can the Congress confer upon him any additional honor, either civilian or military?

My point is that the record should show clearly that the action now proposed is not to be regarded as a precedent for having any President of the United States receive or be given by the Congress or by anyone else an honor in the form of an office, whether military or nonmilitary, because the Presidency of the United States, from a civilian standpoint, and the constitutional office of Commander in Chief, which the President also occupies, are supreme; and after serving in those capacities, nothing else can equal them in power, dignity, or honor.

I make these remarks solely for the purpose of keeping the record clear as regards that one point. I trust and I believe that those sentiments are in keeping with the views of a great many of us who are entirely willing to have the bill passed; with that understanding and with that record, we are willing gladly and cheerfully to support the bill as a fine gesture of appreciation from the Congress, from the present President, and from the people of the United States for faithful performance and service in the highest position of honor and responsibility that lies within the gift of the people of this great Nation.

But let this action not be used in any way to detract from or attempt to add to the dignity and the honor of that great office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can well understand the views which have been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Some may regard the action now proposed as a derogation, in the sense that after hav-

ing been the constitutional Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of our country, to restore to Dwight D. Eisenhower the rank of five-star general might be regarded as an act in derogation of that higher and more exalted honor. But I know the sentimental value that the former beloved President of the United States attaches to this rank; and the Congress has to serve as an instrumentality to convey the gratitude of the people to the former President, by taking the proposed action to restore to him that rank.

I believe that if I had served most of my adult life in the U.S. Army and if I had developed the peculiarly intimate fellowships and relationships that are a part of that service, I would also be inclined to request restoration of this rank, because it will be official in every sense.

In addition, it will give reality to the affectionate term we have always employed in referring to President Eisenhower. The people of the country referred to him informally as "Ike"; but from the days when I had lunch with him when he was Chief of Staff, I fell into the habit of referring to him as "General"; and on most occasions, particularly at the weekly meetings, I used that term.

So there are literally thousands and thousands of people who like to think of him not only as "President Eisenhower," but also as "General Eisenhower."

Therefore, because of the sentimental value which attaches to it, I think the action now proposed is an appropriate one for the Congress to take in conveying to him our gratitude. So I am happy to support the bill which will restore this rank to him.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it seems to me that this measure is an extremely appropriate token of the esteem with which President Eisenhower is held by the country and by the Congress—to grant this great patriot his wish to have this rank officially restored to him, and to do it, also, in compliance with the request of the present President of the United States.

By the enactment of this measure, there will be conveyed to him the Nation's gratitude to a soldier who brought peace with victory to our land, and to a statesman who restored peace and prevented a major war throughout the world.

Former President Eisenhower's 8 years in office saw our country pass through a period of increasing peril and danger, both at home and abroad. The fact that we have faced this danger with courage and determination and have met Soviet aggression indicates the debt owed by the entire Nation to former President Eisenhower.

By supporting this measure, all of us show our gratitude, our respect, and our good will for a man who always will hold a place of honor in the hearts of all Americans—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word, too, in regard to the pending measure, which I believe is a most appropriate one.

I have noted with interest the views expressed by our colleague, the Senator from Mississippi [MR. STENNIS].

I believe there are two things which animate President Kennedy in his recommendation that President Eisenhower be given his heart's desire. One is his personal feeling; President Eisenhower's adult life was devoted to that service.

I may say that I first met him when he was a one-star general and I was a major in the Chemical Corps, at a time when he was on duty in G-5 in the War Department. That dates back to 1941.

I know what Army life has meant to him, both when he served abroad and when he served in the Pentagon and during his great career as President of the United States. But, more than that, it seems to me that throughout his service as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he always had in his heart a wonderfully soft spot for the soldier. It may be remembered that one of the most sentimental journeys he ever took—one which he, himself, tells about—was to the various staging areas in preparation for Operation Overlord—the assault upon the Continent. It seems to me that demonstrated some of the profundity of his affection and admiration for those who served in the Armed Forces and some of the greatness of his character.

Therefore, it seems to me that he wishes to be restored to the rank of five-star general as a sort of tangible link—one which the Commander in Chief does not have—between himself and the men who bore such great burdens and made such great sacrifices, for which all of us are grateful.

I believe that by this means President Eisenhower will be identifying himself with the brave Americans who gave their all, in order that we might enjoy freedom; and I believe he has a feeling that that link will not be as tangible and as real if he is not restored to the rank he held during the war, prior to his service as President of the United States and Commander in Chief.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope very much that the bill will be enacted into law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am very proud that I was privileged to have the opportunity to meet with President Eisenhower from time to time.

I think I can properly sum up this matter by saying that he is proud to be known as President of the United States, but he hopes to be called General Eisenhower.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. 1173) 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 the President of the United States is authorized to appoint former President Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army in his former grade of General of the Army with his former date of rank in such

grade. Dwight David Eisenhower, as a former President entitled to a monetary allowance and other benefits by the Act of August 25, 1958 (Public Law 85-745), shall not be entitled to the pay or allowances of a General of the Army.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to assign military assistants to Dwight David Eisenhower as General of the Army. The amount authorized to be expended per annum by the Administrator of General Services under section (b) of the Act of August 25, 1958 (Public Law 85-745) to provide an office staff for a former President of the United States shall be reduced by the sum of the pay and allowances of any such military assistants so assigned.

Sec. 3. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as in any way affecting or limiting the benefits provided the widow of any former President under the Act of August 25, 1958 (Public Law 85-745).

THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, having been connected with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for approximately 15 years, and having been chairman of the committee for some 10 years, I bring to the Senate this morning a message with reference to postal affairs.

Mr. President, it is a matter of common knowledge that our American Air Force made great use of tinfoil in World War II, to foul the enemy radar screens and thus cause his antiaircraft guns to fire at empty targets. I am convinced that a device similar to this was used by the former Postmaster General to throw the Congress and the American public off target. I am afraid that the past 8 years of "management improvement" by means of press releases, motion pictures, and the age-old tactic of constant repetition, served to throw a great deal of tinsel in the eyes of the Congress and the American public on just what was going on in the U.S. Post Office Department.

Let us stop for a minute and consider what the well publicized objectives of the prior administration were. As early as February 2, 1953, President Eisenhower laid down the following simple directive to his newly appointed Postmaster General:

The Postmaster General will institute a program directed at improving service while at the same time reducing costs and decreasing deficits.

Also, that year the House Appropriations Committee told the Post Office to "seek its balance in long range economies."

As we contemplate these very laudable objectives, our minds turn back over the past 8 years and these objectives seem to be clouded in a flood of contradictory press releases, speeches, and vivid motion pictures constantly informing the American people what great improvements were being achieved. I have often wondered if it were really possible to achieve such a "snow job" in this fashion, and now I am of the definite opinion that this was achieved with notable success.

Let us take each one of these objectives and subject them to a little critical analysis. The first objective was to improve the service. I am sure that many Members of Congress will agree

with me and others that over the past 8 years our postal service has not improved. To the contrary, many think it has deteriorated.

A short time ago, I observed a letter to the editor of one of our local newspapers pleading that, perhaps, if we reinstated the pony express, the service might improve. My committee has made surveys of current service and is familiar with surveys made by other groups, and is of the definite opinion that the postal service is worse today than it was when the prior administration took over.

Recently, President Kennedy referred to the fact that a letter of his took 8 days to reach the city of Boston, Mass. Frankly, I do not consider this an exception, because I feel many people today are experiencing this same kind of poor service. One would think, with all the gadgetry, all the proclamations, and all the radio and press interviews, that the voices of a vocal few Members of Congress might have been muted on the subject of service; but when complaints continue to grow by leaps and bounds, no amount of glossing over can erase the fact that, in many respects, our postal service today is little better than the pony express.

I do not blame the postal employees for this. If the cause for any failure in our service is to be pinpointed, then I say it should be placed squarely on the shoulders of the recent postal management. The rank and file of postal employees are devoted, loyal, hard working people, but no large and highly complex activity can succeed without proper leadership and direction. Without further belaboring the point, I feel quite safe in saying that the announced objective of improved service was never achieved.

Now let us consider the second objective in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message of February 2, 1953. This directive dealt with reducing costs.

I recently reviewed the Annual Report of the Postmaster General for 1960. It does not take much squinting of the eyes to ascertain that the total expenses of the Department in 1953 were \$2,750 million. The expenses for 1960 were \$3,900 million.

The administration asked for \$4.4 billion for next year. Is this increase of \$1,150 million a reduction? Other Senators know the answer to that question as well as I do.

I am quite mindful that Postmaster General Summerfield told the Congress as late as April 1960, that for the period 1953-59 mail volume had increased 10 billion pieces, or more than 20 percent, but the Post Office Department was able to handle this larger workload with an overall increase in manpower of less than 8 percent. For this same period, however, it should be pointed out that the overall expenditures increased by 35 percent. Is this the economy we were promised by the previous administration?

I cannot reconcile the increase in expenditures with the increase in mail volume. Neither can I remain quiet while certain critics say the postal budg-

et would be in balance except for pay increases granted our postal employees during recent years. The Congress provided enough money in the 1958 rate bill to cover these much-deserved pay raises. Furthermore, even if this were not the case, pay increases alone would not fully account for the tremendous growth in our Postal Department's deficit. Everything has gone up, and this includes prices that postal patrons pay, too.

Since 1951, rates on first-class mail have been increased 33 1/3 percent; on second-class mail about 90 percent; on third-class mail 150 percent; and on fourth-class mail in excess of 100 percent. These figures would indicate that the Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission—which is responsible for fourth-class mail rates—have been quite generous in assisting the prior administration in obtaining additional postal revenues.

Another item might be pointed out which may not be widely known and generally understood. The previous administration entered into many so-called "management" contracts with private firms for the performance of a variety of postal services. Recently Postmaster General Day stated that these contracts totaled in excess of \$3 million. This is equal to some 500 employees, who of course do not appear on the employment rolls of the Department. However, the cost is there nonetheless. How many thousands have been engaged in work resulting from the many contracts for research and development, which were heralded as the real key to modernization and automation?

Mr. President, we are a long way from modernization despite the vast expenditures of funds. Our new Postmaster General only recently told a press conference that the big Project Turnkey in Providence, R.I., is not working and he is having to send top level people there every week in order to get the system straightened out so we can get some value for the money invested. Within recent days further payment on the project has been suspended by the House Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee pending further investigation of this huge Summerfield "boondoggle." It now seems clear that this \$48 million publicity stunt by the previous administration achieved neither modernization nor automation.

Project Turnkey became Project "Turkey" during the Christmas holidays, and the only way the great influx of mail was handled was by hiring additional employees to get the mail out.

Apart from ill-advised research, misdirected modernization contracts, and high-sounding publicity, all of which cost money, there is another factor which has contributed to the greatly increased costs of our postal system. I refer to the regional organization established by the prior administration.

I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the fact—some of whom already realize it—that during the Truman administration, before the last administration, we held many hearings to determine whether we should set up the

regional offices. The committee voted against setting up any regional offices because it was thought to be unnecessary, and it was thought it would cost a great deal of money.

We were told in the hearings it would cost \$5 million or \$6 million, but now that we have gone into it we find it is costing about \$37 million a year.

I know that complaints are rife among postmasters in the country that the regional organization is interfering so much with their operation that it is difficult for our loyal postmasters to run their establishments. Let us take a look at what occurred with the creating of the regional operation.

At the time it was conceived, we were told that it would substantially reduce the headquarters operation at the departmental level in Washington, D.C. In 1953 the total obligations for the overall administration of the Post Office Department amounted to a little over \$16 million. The 1962 budget estimate calls for \$19½ million for operations at the departmental level and an additional \$37 million for regional operations, for a total of \$56½ million for both activities. In other words, administration costs jumped from some \$16 million to over \$56 million.

It seems to me Summerfield created quite a collection of choice patronage plums for loyal party members in this glorified operation which has contributed substantially to postal costs and, I am afraid, to the confusion and delays which have occurred in recent years.

I should like to dwell for a moment on the third objective in our former President's message on the Post Office Department. This laudable goal was the reduction of postal deficits. After giving account to certain bookkeeping adjustments and rate increases, the postal deficit was under \$400 million when the prior administration took over in 1953. Despite subsequent rate increases provided by the Congress and by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the previous administration estimated that the 1962 postal deficit would exceed \$900 million. I sometimes wonder, if we had given the Postmaster General every rate increase he requested—and, believe me, there were several—if he would have accomplished any more on this objective of reducing the deficit. It seems to me he probably would have priced a good deal of the mail out of the market and ruined many small businesses as his deficits grew larger and larger.

It pains me somewhat to recount this history of mismanagement and maladministration, but I feel it is my responsibility as chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to do so.

Oh, we were told that mail could be flown from submarines to heaven daily, and that talking gadgets would make the painful task of paying higher postal rates more enjoyable; and all the while, while heaping itself in self-glory, that administration was quietly scrutinizing the mail to enforce purity of thought and purpose. All of this apparently did not allow the past administration time to read and abide by the

law which the Congress itself established for its guidance.

I briefly refer here to the Postal Policy Act of 1958, which provided that out of postal costs, approximately \$300 million should be set aside as a public service and charged to the general funds of the Treasury. The past administration held this law in utter contempt and bombarded the American people and the Congress with statements of tremendous deficits for the purpose of forcing the Congress to enact further postal rate increases. The Department, likewise, paid no attention to President Eisenhower's statement in his message to Congress on January 11, 1955, which read as follows:

Certain services which are performed by the Post Office, such as those for the blind, are a part of general welfare services. The cost of such services should not be borne by users of the mails. Expenditures for them, and for services performed for the Government, should be identified and met by direct appropriation.

Despite the vast flood of publicity—press releases, movies, and books—we stand on one simple conclusion: The service has deteriorated, costs have increased, and deficits keep on soaring.

I recently addressed a letter to Postmaster General Day setting forth certain approaches to these problems which I trust he will follow. In the meantime, I plan to introduce in the near future legislation requiring that all appointments in the Post Office Department to positions the pay of which is \$10,000 or more be submitted to the U.S. Senate for confirmation. We require many postmasters whose salaries are less than this to have Senate confirmation, but allow men who receive salaries as high as \$17,500 to be placed in the regional offices.

I think it is about time we took a firmer hand in passing on the qualifications of the persons who will be in charge of this gigantic operation, and perhaps in an orderly way obtain the management talent so badly needed to bring the American postal service out of chaos and make it the efficient operation we all have a right to expect here in America, one of the richest nations in the world.

I hope that in this effort I will be joined by the principal legislative and appropriation committees of the Congress, in order that we can get to the basis of our staggering postal problems in as short a time as possible.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States transmitting drafts of two bills relating to institutions of higher learning.

One, however, amends the Housing Act and the other relates to college academic facilities.

Without objection, the communication will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to

consider the matters following under their respective jurisdictions, and be printed in the RECORD.

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

The communication from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1961.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith drafts of two bills designed to carry out recommendations set forth in my message of February 20 to the Congress for assistance to institutions of higher education. One bill provides for the construction of academic facilities and for undergraduate scholarships. The other bill provides for housing facilities for the students. I consider enactment of this legislation vital. In the years ahead there will be great increases in the number of students seeking matriculation at our colleges and universities. If our youth are to have an opportunity to develop their intellectual capacities to the fullest, steps must be taken immediately to increase the available facilities for higher education and to relieve both the students and the universities from impossible financial burdens. This program is designed to do this.

Enclosed are letters from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and from the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator describing the two proposals in more detail. I consider the need critical and the program urgent.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination under the Export-Import Bank.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

[Ex. No. 1]

Allott	Cannon	Dodd
Anderson	Capehart	Douglas
Bartlett	Carlson	Dworschak
Beall	Carroll	Eastland
Bennett	Case, N.J.	Ellender
Bible	Case, S. Dak.	Engle
Boggs	Chavez	Ervin
Bridges	Church	Fong
Burdick	Clark	Fulbright
Bush	Cooper	Gore
Butler	Cotton	Gruening
Byrd, Va.	Curtis	Hart
Byrd, W. Va.	Dirksen	Hartke

Hayden	Mansfield	Russell
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Saltonstall
Hickey	McGee	Schoeppel
Hill	McNamara	Scott
Holland	Metcalf	Smith, Mass.
Hruska	Miller	Smith, Maine
Humphrey	Morse	Sparkman
Jackson	Morton	Stennis
Javits	Moss	Symington
Johnston	Mundt	Talmadge
Jordan	Muskie	Thurmond
Keating	Neuberger	Wiley
Kefauver	Pastore	Williams, N.J.
Kerr	Pell	Williams, Del.
Lausche	Proxmire	Yarborough
Long, Hawaii	Randolph	Young, N. Dak.
Long, La.	Robertson	Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on this nomination, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency, after extensive hearings, has reported the nomination of Mr. Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The nomination is now before the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. Meriwether was nominated for this position by President Kennedy. The nomination was approved and supported by both Senators from Alabama.

Before the opening of the hearings, no letters critical of Mr. Meriwether had been received; on the contrary three letters recommending him were received from Alabama. One telegram asking that a careful investigation be made—in substance opposing the nomination—was received during the course of the hearing. No one asked to testify either for or against the nomination.

The nomination by President Kennedy and the support by the Senators from Alabama are warranted by Mr. Meriwether's qualifications. He has for 2 years been director of finance of the State of Alabama, carrying on very extensive procurement and financial activities.

This has involved floating loans, procurement, auditing and budget work, and the like. In addition, Mr. Meriwether has had experience for many years in private business. He has also had much experience in politics and political activity.

His experience in the art of politics, as much as his direct experience in Government, will be helpful to Mr. Meriwether in his work as director of the Export-Import Bank. It is perhaps ap-

propriate to point out that experience in State and local politics may perhaps be even better experience for the job than would experience as a bureaucrat in Washington.

The nomination seems to be one which could have been approved in fairly routine fashion. But this was not the case. Charges which were made against Mr. Meriwether gave rise to extensive questioning. In my judgment, the questioning disclosed that the charges were entirely unwarranted and unsupported.

The first charge against Mr. Meriwether related to his associations with Admiral Crommelin, a perennial candidate for election to office in Alabama. Admiral Crommelin, I understand, in his recent campaigns has expressed violent racist views—anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. It is charged that because Mr. Meriwether was associated with Admiral Crommelin, Mr. Meriwether must hold the same views. Later, I shall discuss Mr. Meriwether's own views on this general subject. At this point I wish to discuss the question of Mr. Meriwether's associations with Admiral Crommelin.

The testimony presented showed that Admiral Crommelin ran for election to the U.S. Senate, against Senator HILL, in 1950. At that time Admiral Crommelin had just come out of the Navy with a fine war record. His campaign was not based upon anti-Semitic or any other extreme racial views. It was in that 1950 campaign that Mr. Meriwether supported Admiral Crommelin and was his campaign manager.

Later, Admiral Crommelin considered running against Senator SPARKMAN, in 1954. Mr. Meriwether testified that he then urged Admiral Crommelin not to run against Senator SPARKMAN, and that Admiral Crommelin broke with Mr. Meriwether over this matter, and has since opposed Mr. Meriwether. The only evidence to the contrary is a report from an unidentified confidential informant, which refers to a meeting between Admiral Crommelin and Mr. Meriwether in 1954. Mr. Meriwether flatly denied this meeting. The confidential informant did not appear, nor did any witness appear in support of the charge.

Admiral Crommelin ran against Governor Patterson in 1958, and many of his most extreme racist views were expressed in that campaign, in which Mr. Meriwether assisted Governor Patterson.

The charge that Mr. Meriwether must share Admiral Crommelin's racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-Negro views, which the Admiral expressed in the 1954 and later campaigns, simply because Mr. Meriwether had assisted Admiral Crommelin in his 1950 campaign, even though they broke up in 1954, and were on opposite sides in the 1958 campaign, is in my judgment the wildest and most irresponsible type of attempt to prove guilt by association. On its face, this charge is ridiculous.

The next charge is that Mr. Meriwether is linked to the Ku Klux Klan, and, therefore, shares the racist, and possibly the subversive, views of the Klan.

At the outset it is well to make it entirely clear that there was no charge that Mr. Meriwether was, or ever had been,

a member of the Klan. Mr. Meriwether denied flatly that he was, or ever had been, a member; and I have no reason whatever to doubt him. This was clearly brought out at the hearing, on page 2 of the printed volume:

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Meriwether, let me ask you this, since the chairman has mentioned some of the questions that have been raised as possible objections to you: I will ask you right off, have you ever been a member of the Ku Klux Klan, or in any way connected with the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, Senator, I have not.

Mr. Meriwether's position on the Klan's beliefs was clearly expressed at the hearing, on page 22:

Mr. MERIWETHER. Well, I have never stood for the principles that I hear the Klan stands for. I have never seen any literature on what they stand for. I hear these things, as do you and other people, and I have never felt that their stands on general public matters were sound, and I do not adhere to them, not at all.

The testimony also showed that on occasions the Klan attacked Meriwether:

Senator SPARKMAN. Let me ask you, is that typical of the attacks that have been made upon you by the Klan?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes, sir; it is.

Senator SPARKMAN. And the Klan leaders?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes, sir. We have had them from all facets of organizations of that type down there. They have been made directly on me at many different times and many different places in the State during the last 3 or 4 years, that is true, sir.

The only basis for the charge that Mr. Meriwether was "linked" to the Klan was that he knew a Mr. R. M. Shelton, who was said to be a leader in the Ku Klux Klan; that he did not repudiate Mr. Shelton's support in the 1958 campaign; and that he did not then, or at any other time, repudiate the support of the Klan, for either himself or for the candidate he was supporting.

Much of the evidence of close association between Mr. Meriwether and Mr. Shelton appeared in the columns of the Montgomery Advertiser. Before I conclude my remarks I shall quote from a favorable editorial published in that newspaper. The Montgomery Advertiser was an opponent of Mr. Patterson during the 1958 campaign. It seems entirely possible that these vitriolic attacks on Mr. Patterson and Mr. Meriwether during the 1958 campaign were, like many political statements, somewhat exaggerated, to say the least. This appears quite probable, indeed, from the same paper's recent editorial in support of Mr. Meriwether's nomination. This editorial ended with the following paragraph:

Probably the President's investigators reported the Patterson connection with the Klan in the 1958 campaign.

I digress to say that not only was the President's report to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that the FBI report was entirely satisfactory, but he also publicly made the same statement at a news conference.

I continue.

It was the Advertiser that yanked that hood off Patterson's head, but never did we suggest more than campaign expediency on his part. Patterson doesn't care a hoot

about the dumb Kluxers, he just used them in the campaign as most other politicians would have, then turned his back on them.

Mr. Meriwether was frank to say that he accepted support for his candidate from any voter—though he later said he would refuse support from the Communist Party—as long as no commitments and attachments were involved. There is no evidence whatever of any commitments to the Ku Klux Klan, either by Mr. Patterson or by Mr. Meriwether.

I think most Senators will agree that the problem when one must reject offers of support, tendered without asking for commitments and attachments, during a heated campaign, is not an easy one to solve.

The next charge against Mr. Meriwether was that he was somehow involved in doubtful transactions involving the purchase of tires and the Alabama highway program.

Mr. Meriwether's explanations of these were entirely reasonable, and no question was made as to their correctness. I see no reason to continue to press these exploded allegations, except that I did want to make the statement that here was a public charge of misconduct against a man, notwithstanding the fact that it was of public record that a member of the Legislature of Alabama introduced a resolution of censure against the member who had first made the charge, and every member of the house voted for it except the man who made the charge and one of his close friends.

That was a matter of public record. Yet there was published all over the Nation a charge of misconduct applying to him in connection with the purchase of tires and in connection with the highway program. That was typical of the allegations which were waged against this man.

Finally, I regret to come to what I believe is the real objection to Mr. Meriwether. As I have said, the other charges were window dressing, and they were proved to be window dressing. I regret to have to say that I think the real objection to Mr. Meriwether is that he believes that segregation in Alabama is best for Alabama, and the conclusion is that because he has this belief he cannot be an impartial, fair, and unprejudiced official in Washington, and that he cannot be fair and impartial and just in fulfilling his responsibilities in the Export-Import Bank with all of its worldwide activities.

The assumption that Mr. Meriwether cannot fulfill his duties in Washington, or, where necessary, around the world, because of his views on segregation in Alabama, is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. Meriwether did testify that he thought segregation in Alabama was best for Alabama. He made it clear, however, that in Washington he would follow the laws, policies, customs, and practices established for the Government. He made it clear that this intention applied to employment practices in the Export-Import Bank, so far as he, a director, might have any responsibility for them. He made it clear that this intention applied to the consideration of

applications from foreign countries and from American exporters. He made it clear that he would not be prejudiced in his consideration of an application by the fact that the foreign country involved might have integrated schools, for example.

I might add that he said he thought every foreign country should have the privilege of running its schools as it saw fit. That is how the junior Senator from Virginia feels. He feels every sovereign State in this Nation should have that privilege; but, of course, by amending the Constitution, the Supreme Court has said the States do not have the right to run their schools as they see fit.

In this connection, I think Mr. Meriwether's attitude is entirely praiseworthy, and his background is more of a help than a hindrance. Mr. Meriwether recognizes that there are different races, and that different races may and frequently do have different customs, practices, and traditions. He also recognizes that laws, customs, and practices may differ even within the same race from place to place. Because of his recognition of these facts, Mr. Meriwether, in my judgment, may well be far better equipped to deal with representatives of other countries and other races, and to consider objectively proposals from foreign countries, than would a person who takes the doctrinaire position that there are no differences between races and that all differences in laws, practices, customs, and traditions between races should be abolished forthwith, regardless of the views of the persons involved.

I should like to read a few quotations from Mr. Meriwether's testimony in order to make entirely clear his intention to carry out his duties in an entirely impartial and unprejudiced manner:

Mr. MERIWETHER. I have never had any problem of any kind either of an anti-Semitic nature or of a racist nature myself. I am not anti-Semitic. I am friendly toward the colored race.

I digress here to say that when the distinguished Senator from Alabama speaks he will refer to the fact that Mr. Meriwether has been for a number of years in partnership with two Jews in his home State of Alabama, for whom he has a very high regard.

I continue:

Senator JAVITS. Are you in favor of giving Negroes the same preferment in respect of jobs in the highest echelons of government which you would give to those who were white?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I believe that if a Negro is qualified, qualifies for a job under the same set of qualifications that we do, that he is qualified to hold it and he can have it.

Senator JAVITS. In other words, are you telling us now that as a Director of the Export-Import Bank you will feel perfectly free to make a loan notwithstanding the fact that to your knowledge that loan will directly or indirectly enable a particular integrated school to continue to function?

Mark that now—an integrated school. He is to be Director of the Export-Import Bank, but the questions were related to the employment practices of Alabama, separate eating places in Alabama, the school laws of Alabama, and integrated schools.

Well, here is the answer:

Mr. MERIWETHER. That is absolutely true, sir. I do not know what schools they are operating now, but I am told they are integrated now in many of the countries in Africa.

According to Mr. Meriwether, they can run any kind of school they please, so far as he is concerned.

I continue the quotation:

That being the case, I certainly would not let a loan application be influenced by the fact that I would want to segregate them. That is their business.

Senator JAVITS. And do you feel, too, that in respect of the employee situation here in Washington in the offices of the Export-Import Bank, where you have Federal executive orders with respect to hiring and with respect to practices which are completely nonsegregated, that you could administer and live with that fairly and honestly?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes.

The chairman then interrupted. The chairman happens to be the junior Senator from Virginia. I participated in the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair just wants to see if we understand the point which we have reached.

It seems that although you were reared in the South and you believe that segregation is best for the South, in accepting a Federal job you will accept the Federal laws on desegregation and in passing on loans to foreign countries you will not try to inject any personal views you may have had on what is good for Alabama?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Right, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Do you say that in your administration of your office, if you should be confirmed, that you will not allow any racial prejudice, any color prejudice, any religious prejudice to influence your decisions?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I do, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. And do you make this pledge without any mental reservations whatsoever?

The Senator could have added "or secret evasion of mind, or purpose of evasion," to make it as strong as possible, but he said "without any mental reservations whatsoever."

Mr. MERIWETHER. I do.

Mr. President, since I consider Mr. Meriwether entirely qualified for the position to which he has been nominated by the President, and since I consider that charges against him have been clearly shown to be unfounded, I urge that his nomination be approved.

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. President, there has fallen to me a responsibility which I did not invite. I have served a long time in Congress. This is my fifth year in the Senate. I can hardly recall an instance in which I have taken the position I am taking today, in opposing the confirmation of the nomination of a man for high office, whatever administration has been in power.

This is not easy for me. I attended the hearings with a completely open mind—and I think I shall demonstrate that fact as I go along—anxious to have the witness prove whatever could be proven as to his own qualifications for this very high post. The witness, Mr. Meriwether, has been commended to me by people who know him well and who think well of him. Others do not think

so well of him. This is quite in the essence of our country. As I have said, I went to the hearing prepared to ask a good many questions, and hoping that Mr. Meriwether would, on the basis of his answers, make it unnecessary to oppose his confirmation. I found from the hearings that this could not be, and I would like to state to the Senate the four major headings which led me to the conclusion that this particular nominee is not qualified for the position to which he has been named at this time.

Let me make those three points clear. Mr. Meriwether is not qualified for the job to which he has been named at this time. So in good conscience, as I happened to carry the burden of the inquiry at the hearing, it is my duty to lay all the facts before the Senate without heat and, I hope, in as objective a way of which any man is capable when he is opposed to the nomination.

The four grounds on which I believe this nomination must be rejected are as follows:

First, a lack of qualification for the job based upon business experience. After all, this is elementary; this is essentially a business job.

Second, the real possibility that the nominee will be unacceptable to those with whom he must deal. I intend to give the Senate a detailed description of the work of the Export and Import Bank. After all this is a job, and it has very clearly ascertainable responsibilities.

Third, that the nominee at this time lacks the sensitivity to the public policy of the United States which he would need as a high Government official. Let us remember that the minute a nominee's appointment is confirmed by the Senate, he is in a policymaking position. He is a high Government official. He is quotable—and properly so—by all of our dear friends who are sitting in the gallery. When he says something, it is news, because he has what we define as a high post in the Government. Otherwise we would not be talking about it today. So I think he showed by his testimony that he lacks the sensitivity to the public policy of the United States requisite to a Senate-confirmed job.

Fourth, I think in all fairness, whatever may have been his motivations, he lacked frankness with the committee upon a number of subjects which I have mentioned.

I have no desire to intrude in the life of any man, so I have been very careful to render no moral judgments and to confine myself to the thesis that at this time the nominee is not qualified. Therefore I wish to state to my colleagues that when I am through speaking I shall move to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Banking and Currency, having been advised by the Parliamentarian that, notwithstanding an order for the yeas and nays on the nomination, such a motion is in order. I do not so move now, but when I am through speaking I shall move to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I have the honor to be a member.

I come to the fundamental thesis which is involved here. Last October—President Kennedy—the then Senator Kennedy made this pledge to the American people:

Should I be elected President, it would be my intention to ask the ablest men in the country to make whatever sacrifice is required to bring to the Government a ministry of the best available talent—men with a single-minded loyalty to the national interest—men who would regard public office as a public trust. For no Government is better than the men who compose it—and I want the best.

President Kennedy is our President, and it is our duty, whatever may be our party affiliation, to try to help him succeed in his job. So the question today is, Does the nominee represent the best available talent, to use the words of the President, to be a Director of the Export-Import Bank? I have already given to Senators the main headings that make me feel he is not. I would now like to implement from his testimony the evidence to support those main arguments.

No effort was made to dredge up evidence. For example, I did not ask the committee chairman to issue subpoenas to bring in witnesses in order to make some full-scale inquiry into this question. It seemed to me that here was a question of the presentation of the individual himself. I do not agree that because a man has held one set of views one time he cannot change those and perhaps be a better man for it. We have seen some great examples of that in the highest places in our Government, of men who may have started with a set of ideas very much like what Mr. Meriwether has, and yet who have, by virtue of living life and experiencing other activities, come to a totally different philosophy more consistent with the basic policy of our country.

So I believe, though other Senators may not agree with me, that in a sense it was right to try this case, as it were, with him as the only witness, because he was the man who is to occupy the office. What did he think? What was his disposition? How did he look at all the things that happened in his life in contemplation of this particular job?

So I think if that evidence shows he is not qualified—and I deeply feel that it does—that is the best evidence of any, far better than calling in people who might have had something against him, whether it was political or personal, in order to build up testimony as one would in some court case.

The question is, What are his convictions? What are his beliefs now? What is his sensitivity now to the public policy of the United States? It is within that framework that I should like to lay the facts before Senators.

First, I said, "What is the nature of this job? With whom will he be doing business?"

The Export-Import Bank over the past 26 years during which it has been in existence has authorized more than \$10.7 billion in credits to U.S. exporters and to foreign importers of U.S. products. I emphasize the latter—to foreign importers of U.S. products.

Although the Bank's primary purpose has been and still is the expansion of foreign markets for U.S. goods, increasing emphasis has been placed during the past decade on having this purpose also aid in the stimulation of exports from developing nations of the free world to enable them to accelerate their economic development. The governments of these developing nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are themselves eligible for and do negotiate borrowings from the Export-Import Bank, as do their nationals, to finance U.S. exports to them.

I hope my colleagues will pay serious attention to this point. These newly developing nations themselves and their nationals actually negotiate with the Export-Import Bank.

So the nominee, as a director, would have to either engage in these negotiations personally or, at the very least, pass on them in a considerate way as a director of the Bank.

During the last 2 fiscal years, the Bank authorized credits for U.S. exports of capital goods and other products to the developing nations at the rate of \$500 million a year. The increasing importance of the Bank's activities among developing nations is evident from the fact that during the last 2 fiscal years, the share of credits allocated for exports to Africa, Asia, and Latin America was 76 percent of all credits authorized by the Bank, as compared to 57 percent for the 24 years up to June 30, 1958.

Africa and Asia alone during these last 2 fiscal years received \$432 million—or 31 percent—of \$1.397 billion in authorized credits. In addition, the Bank was actively participating in other programs, such as extension of foreign currency loans and serving as fiscal agent for the International Cooperation Administration—ICA—in aid to the developing areas.

An examination of the last fiscal year's operations alone emphasizes this trend also. Exports to Asia and Africa accounted for 42 percent of authorized loans—double what they received prior to July 1, 1958. New countries appear in the operations of the Bank—such as Kenya and Lebanon. Exports to countries such as Indonesia, Liberia, the Philippines, and Thailand are taking an increasing share of the Bank's credits.

And the trend toward more credits for exports to African nations must move upward in the future. None of the 16 African nations which achieved independence last year has yet to appear in the operations of the Export-Import Bank—and they will have to in the future if the United States is to share in their markets and in their economic development.

Thus, the financing of U.S. capital goods exports to the African Continent is becoming one of the primary functions of the Bank, alongside of the financing of exports to Asia and Latin America.

The place which is to be taken by the nominee is that of George Blowers. George Blowers is an expert on Africa. He has been governor of the State banks of Libya and Ethiopia. He is widely

known and respected in Latin America and in the Far East. As a matter of fact, I asked the nominee whether he would feel perfectly competent to undertake George Blowers' work if it were assigned to him. He said he would. We shall see about that in a little while. However, this is the ambit of authority of his predecessor.

In the light of these facts, the Senate is asked to confirm the appointment of a man with little more experience in business than as a part owner of a modest drug firm; with no more experience in government than as finance director of the State of Alabama for 2 years; with no real experience in the field of banking; with no experience in foreign affairs, export trade, or anything related to the functions of the Bank.

In all candor, I believe it is very clear from the record that Mr. Meriwether's major experience has been in politics. He did political work for "Boss" Crump of Tennessee while he worked in the insurance business in Tennessee, and then he admitted he made radio speeches in support of "Boss" Crump's candidates. In 1950 he was campaign manager for Admiral Crommelin.

I will deal with Admiral Crommelin's case. It is well known that he is a notorious racist. However I am not trying to attach that fact to Mr. Meriwether. Then he was campaign manager for Governor Patterson. At that time, as I will show—and I believe the record clearly shows this—he was clearly identified with the Ku Klux Klan. The record before the Committee on Banking and Currency shows that Mr. Meriwether is unqualified at this time to take on the sensitive position in the international field which I have described.

He told the committee, for example, under examination last week that he had no idea what the Ku Klux Klan stood for when he accepted the support of a man widely mentioned as a high official of the Klan in Alabama in Governor Patterson's 1958 campaign—and it would seem only because of the patience of Senator Douglas, who explained it to him, does he know what the Ku Klux Klan stands for now. He said he accepted this support in the campaign of 1958 because "I ask for votes where I can find them"; and he said that he was not aware that the Ku Klux Klan was on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

And as for his associations with Robert Shelton, whom Alabama papers in the 1958 campaign identified as the Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama, we got little from Mr. Meriwether at last week's hearing more than inconsistencies.

All of us agreed from hearing Mr. Meriwether in last week's hearing, that here indeed was a record of inconsistencies. Indeed, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] pointed out how replete was his testimony on specific questions with the words "I do not recall," "I do not know," "I could not say."

He even left us with the idea that, even though he is a politician, he did not read the newspapers. That is what he would have us believe. He would have

us believe that he only read newspapers from time to time, or occasionally. The evidence showed that he was constantly being interviewed by the press itself. It seems to me that he made one thing clear, and I shall go into details to prove it, and that is, that he accepted help and support during the campaign without any public sign of rebellion of conscience.

That is the point I wish to emphasize—without any sign of rebellion in his conscience. That is what we are talking about. I am not one of those who believe in eternal sin. I believe it is possible for one to be a Ku Klux Klansman and then become a saint in terms of freedom. The question is, "Do you understand it? Do you have any feeling of rebellion? Do you want to make any change in your philosophy?"

We got nothing of that kind from this witness. The witness knew that this was to his self-interest, and he knew what he was being asked, and what conclusion would be drawn from it. There was no sign of any such thing here, or that it had anything to do with the policy of our country which he would supposedly be expressing as a director of the Export-Import Bank.

I believe that such a man is unqualified to occupy that kind of position. It is not possible to wish consciousness into a man. Either he has it, or he does not have it. A man is unqualified to hold that kind of position until he does get it.

We understand, of course, that Mr. Meriwether comes from an area of our country in which racial segregation is widely accepted as being right, as he put it. He said it is all right in Alabama, but he assured us that he would not let his personal views influence his work at the Export-Import Bank. However, that was an easy statement for him to make. The Export-Import Bank employs about 280 people, many of them, no doubt, Negroes, in various positions. He may have to pass on their promotion, and so forth. He said that he would not let his personal views influence him in that regard, but he was not conscious at all of what his views meant.

This is what makes him unqualified, as I see the matter. It may not make him any less a good father. It may not make the people of Alabama or his friends elsewhere think any the less of him. It simply makes him unqualified, because he does not understand what we are doing here, and what this proceeding is all about. It does not make him qualified, therefore, to exercise a policymaking position, notwithstanding the statement he made off the top of his head that he would not let his views stand in the way. If he does not understand what his views really mean, then we have a right to believe that they will stand in the way whenever he really does understand what they mean.

So in this administration's often publicized, intensive search for the very best talent to man the New Frontier, I think we have a right to ask ourselves the question, in the case of Mr. Meriwether: "Is he the best available man for the position?" I think the answer is distinctly "No."

I should like to go into some of the detail of the hearings, because I do not want Senators to take these statements on faith from me—and they would not, anyhow. I should like to show in detail, from the record, why I have drawn these conclusions.

I said Mr. Meriwether's experience was primarily a political experience. He did, as a matter of fact, shortly after going to Alabama, engage in a whole series of campaigns. That was essentially his prime occupation. He was the campaign manager for Admiral Crommelin in 1950; for a Mr. Seldon, who ran for the House of Representatives in 1952; for a man named Bradley, who ran for municipal counsel in Birmingham in 1953; for the father of the present Governor in 1954, when he ran for attorney general; and then, successively, for the present Governor, both when he ran for attorney general and in his race for Governor in 1958.

I should like to deal now with the Crommelin case which has been mentioned. I in no way make any charge of association by the nominee with Admiral Crommelin's extreme racist views. I shall refer to what was actually shown to the witness in the evidence; as a matter of fact, he testified to his own knowledge, in response to questions asked by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. As everyone knows, Admiral Crommelin has most extreme views on anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic subjects. He had no hesitancy about publishing those views very widely. However, it is a fact that in 1950, from everything I have been able to ascertain, and again in the campaign of 1954, Admiral Crommelin was active. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], during his questioning of the witness, referred to a particular anti-Semitic speech made over the radio in 1954. The activity of Admiral Crommelin bears on the insensitivity of the nominee.

In 1950, as Admiral Crommelin's campaign manager, he knew that Crommelin was voicing these extreme views. He voiced them in 1954 and in successive campaigns thereafter, bringing us to the campaign of 1960.

The witness was asked:

When did you break with Crommelin? When did you ever take a position against him?

He said he took a position against Admiral Crommelin only when Crommelin threatened to file against Senator SPARKMAN. Then he felt he had to break with him.

The witness was asked:

Did you protest in any public way? After all, you had been intimately acquainted with him, as the record shows.

I said:

Did you ever denounce what he was publicly defending? Did you ever comment adversely?

"No," he said, "but his views were well known to his friends"—that is, to Meriwether's friends.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that in all fairness the Senator from New York should make it clear that it was the campaign of 1954 to which Mr. Meriwether was referring, when Admiral Crommelin filed against me, and not the campaign of 1960. Remember, the admiral has made several races. The Senator from New York said a few minutes ago that, as a matter of fact, Admiral Crommelin did not come out with his expression of these views until during the 1954 campaign. I think that is correct. Meriwether broke with Crommelin prior to the beginning of the campaign, probably in January or February 1954. The campaign did not get under way until the middle of March. I simply call the attention of the Senator from New York to that date, because I think it is important, even in the line of argument which the Senator is making.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I should like, therefore, to specify precisely where in the record this testimony appears. At the top of page 32 of the hearings, my question was:

Did you ever have any actual break with Crommelin in any formal way where you told him you could not support him any more?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes, sir.

Senator JAVITS. When was that?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I believe it was the day before he filed against Senator SPARKMAN. I thought it was unwise and told him so, and he became very angry with me.

Now I pass on to page 33, near the bottom of the page, where the following question appears:

Senator JAVITS. And have you at any time in the course of your explanations, of which I assume you have made quite a few, of your relationship to Crommelin in 1950 denounced his views or differed with them?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes; I have.

Senator JAVITS. When and under what circumstances?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Well, I have made public statements as these violent statements of his have come out about extreme anti-Semitic statements and racist statements. I have made them to people within my personal circle of friends, and I believe that perhaps it would be very easy to establish.

Those were the specific questions and answers to which I was referring. I should like to have them stand in lieu of my characterizations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Right at that particular point, the time is indicated as 1954. I believe the Senator from New York will find elsewhere in the hearings that it was 1954. The Senator will recall also that the witness made it clear that it was in 1954. I believe such a reference appears on page 31 of the hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. My reason for drawing the conclusion down to 1960 was not the references at pages 31 and 32, but the reference to my question in which I asked:

And have you at any time in the course of your explanations, of which I assume you have made quite a few, of your relationship to Crommelin in 1950 denounced his views or differed with them?

The Senator from Alabama will recall that there were newspaper articles relating to interviews with Mr. Meriwether

in 1958 and 1959, in which he was questioned about that release. It was to that that I was referring.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The only thing I wish to have made clear—and I think it is important—is that in 1954 there was a definite, open, and final break between Meriwether and Crommelin, and that there is nothing in the record to the effect that Crommelin expressed these extreme views of his until in the course of the 1954 campaign.

Mr. JAVITS. I have said that myself. I am not in any way trying to impute to Mr. Meriwether any of Crommelin's views. I have dealt only with the question of insensitivity, which I shall develop further. Proceeding further upon this ground, much of the testimony on the question of insensitivity related to the relationships between Mr. Meriwether and a man named Robert Shelton. According to the allegations of the Alabama newspapers in the middle of the 1958 campaign, in which Mr. Meriwether admittedly was the No. 2 campaign manager for Governor Patterson, Shelton was widely said by the Alabama newspapers, in May of 1958, to be a high official in and was described as a grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan. Apparently, the relationship of the Klan to the Patterson campaign was a very important issue. It was a very important issue in respect to the whole matter of the campaign. This affected primarily, of course, Governor Patterson; but it had a very active bearing and a very important relationship upon Mr. Meriwether's qualifications for the position to which he has been nominated now, in terms of the factor which I have described as sensitivity to the public policy of the United States.

Let us trace this back. The fundamental issue which is involved here is a letter which is set forth in the record at page 15 and to which I refer Senators, a letter signed by John Patterson, attorney general, on the letterhead of the attorney general of the State of Alabama. In the letter, Mr. Patterson said to a number of addresses—and Meriwether testified to this—

A mutual friend, Mr. H. M. (Bob) Shelton, of ours in Tuscaloosa has suggested that I write you and ask for your support in the coming Governor's race.

I hope you will see fit to support my candidacy and I would like to meet you when I am next in * * *.

At that point the name of the place is blacked out.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely your friend,
JOHN PATTERSON,
Attorney General.

Notwithstanding the fact that this letter was published in Alabama newspapers and was considered a key element in the Patterson campaign, the witness disclaimed any real knowledge of it and of any real belief that it was a vital question. He contradicted himself, in my view, on a number of occasions, upon the question whether that was or was not an important issue in the campaign.

All of it went to the key point of whether he was accepting such support as the campaign manager, with knowl-

edge of what it meant, with knowledge of the Ku Klux Klan as a riding, hooded outfit associated with terror—whether he accepted it as that, or whether he did not. Again, I make no moral judgments; but it seems to me that the least that can be said is that he did not think about that at all or that it did not disturb him at all, but that he was thinking only of whether it would be politically useful.

I read now from page 10 of the hearing:

Senator JAVITS. You have just heard rumors. When Shelton came, what did he come for? Did he tell you?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes. He wanted to support Governor Patterson. He worked for B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co., and thought he could influence a lot of votes that way, and he did.

I read now from pages 21 and 22 of the hearing:

Senator JAVITS. Was Shelton active in that campaign as political activity is generally defined?

Mr. MERIWETHER. My answer to that would have to be: moderately so.

Senator JAVITS. Did he make speeches?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I never heard that, no, sir.

Senator JAVITS. Did he make speeches on the radio or television?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir; I never heard that. I don't think so.

Senator JAVITS. What did he do? What did this campaign activity consist of?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Well, he, in my opinion, worked with his friends in the area of his home and solicited their support for the Governor. I was told that that was true, and I think it was.

In view of that depreciation of the importance of the participation by this man—a man widely advertised as a high official of the Klan—I invite attention to the fact that the inherent evidence itself showed that thereafter Mr. Meriwether himself said on four or five occasions, one of them as recently as the week before the committee hearing, that he saw Shelton. One of the newspaper articles set forth the statement that the reporter said he found Mr. Meriwether, in 1959, at the State capitol with his arm around Shelton. There were stories about Shelton's ducking in and out of Meriwether's office when newspaper reporters tried to track down Shelton for an interview.

On the point that a man who was sensitive to that situation would certainly have done something about it, we have the testimony of Mr. Meriwether as to how important it was in the campaign.

On page 12 we find that he said it was a very controversial thing. On page 11 we find that he said it "was not an important question."

The whole record is replete with testimony which shows that kind of insensitivity. For example, on page 30, the record shows that on the fundamental question of insensitivity, he was asked the following question:

Senator JAVITS. Did you have any knowledge whatever of Shelton's views as expressed in his letter to the paper?

Let me explain that an editorial entitled "Our No. 1 Troublemaker" had been published in the Tuscaloosa News,

the hometown newspaper of Mr. Shelton; and Mr. Shelton had written a letter to the editor of that newspaper. That was on May 17, 1951, when Mr. Meriwether was in office. Mr. Shelton, in his letter to the editor of the newspaper, apparently protested about the editorial, and expressed the most extreme racist views, views of the kind generally associated with the Ku Klux Klan.

Let me read what Mr. Meriwether said, when we questioned him last week, about that sort of exchange:

Mr. MERIWETHER. I had never heard Mr. Shelton express to me any views of any kind about his political philosophy other than that he was supporting the Governor, as I have said. I did not know he was for or against anything, Senator. I did not know the man that well. I do not know his personal life.

Senator JAVITS. Well, now, this is not very personal, is it? It was published in the paper.

Mr. MERIWETHER. It is a personal observation that if I had known him well I might have known that, but he never made statements like that at the times that I have seen him.

Senator JAVITS. Did you ever discuss with him in this interval between the election and now—you have seen him from time to time—his connection with the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir; I have not, but I can say that he discusses it with everybody that will listen to him.

Senator JAVITS. Did he discuss it with you?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir; I would not listen to him.

Senator JAVITS. You would not listen?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I just would not listen to him.

Senator JAVITS. Did you know in this interval that he had organized a new entity of the Klan in Alabama?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I have read it in the paper; yes, sir.

Senator JAVITS. You did not ask him about it?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir.

Senator JAVITS. And did you ever discuss with him his views, as disclosed by his letter, as to his feelings about Jews or Negroes?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that such testimony is simply incredible. Meriwether was the campaign manager for Governor Patterson, and the Klan was a big issue in the campaign. The letter was published in that newspaper. The witness himself characterized this as a very controversial thing. Yet we are asked to believe that he made no inquiry, and would not even listen at all to that man express his views or state whether he affirmed or denied his connection with the Klan, or anything else.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I shall yield when I have finished stating this point.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate would not wish to confirm the nomination of Mr. Meriwether to be a Director of the Export-Import Bank when Senators realize that in regard to so controversial a matter he said he did not even make inquiry and did not even wish to listen to what the man said, but that as long as the man was giving his

political support, that was all that interested him.

It seems to me that the very least one can say—even giving him the benefit of all possible doubt—is that he is not qualified, in view of the way he looks at these things and in view of the fact that he will not inquire about them.

Now I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator from New York always intends to be fair, but I believe we must be careful. For instance, the editorial and the letter about which the Senator from New York has been talking were published in May 1959, more than a year after the election. Yet in the presentation they are tied in with the political campaign.

Why should Mr. Meriwether have seen that letter in the Tuscaloosa News? The Tuscaloosa News is one of the fine daily newspapers published in our State, and the publisher is a good friend of mine. But I never saw the letter or the editorial to which the letter referred; and I do not understand why Mr. Meriwether should be charged with knowledge of the letter or the editorial. He had been in office for a year, as the finance officer of the State of Alabama, and he was going about the State's business. He was not hunting up someone to talk to, just because the letter had been written to the editor a year after the campaign was over.

Mr. JAVITS. I think my colleague would be absolutely correct if a foundation had not been laid for this piece of evidence, which came in 1959, by the evidence which admittedly was before the nominee in 1958, in the midst of that campaign. Senators will find on page 14 an article which was published in the Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser; and the witness admitted he saw it. He did not deny that. The article is headed: "Klan Aids Patterson—Grand Dragon Called Mutual Friend."

The first few lines of the article read as follows:

TUSCALOOSA, ALA.—Attorney General John Patterson, candidate for Governor, is actively supported by the leadership of the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama. Patterson knows this.

Patterson, in addition to being supported by the KKK, has made use of the name in his campaign of R. M. (Bobby) Shelton, grand dragon of the Alabama Klan.

And I call attention to another article, published in the Montgomery Advertiser on May 18, 1953. The article was entitled "Patterson's Manager Is No Amateur."

In the article it was set forth that he was specifically asked about this situation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that when we connect these two pieces of evidence, we have a right to ask why it is—in view of the fact that, in my opinion, that was obviously a large issue in the Patterson campaign in 1959—that those extreme views, which finally were actually put into print by Mr. Shelton in 1959, and I assume they represented the Klan views, were nothing that Mr. Meriwether felt he even had to inquire into, and why he felt that they did not even need to trouble him at all.

Mr. President, my colleagues can read the record just as well as I can. I have tried to point up some of its highlights.

I should like now, if I may, go to one other point on the question of insensitivity which, in my opinion, is absolutely conclusive in this regard.

If my colleagues will turn to page 53 of the record of hearings, when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had Mr. Meriwether under examination—not I, but the Senator from Illinois—and will be just good enough to read that colloquy, they can then come to their own conclusion as to whether this witness understood, or at least was willing to admit to us he understood, what he was saying, and therefore was qualified intellectually, in terms of experience and sensitivity, to hold this particular position. I read from the hearings:

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Meriwether, you have said that you have not previously publicly repudiated the doctrines of the Ku Klux Klan. I would now like to ask whether you are now prepared to repudiate them.

Mr. MERIWETHER. I am prepared, sir, to repudiate anything that is not for our welfare. I do not really know what they are.

This was in 1961, after this had been a hot issue in the campaign, after the Tuscaloosa exchange to which my colleague, the Senator from Alabama, has referred. His answer, not to any Senator who was cross-examining him, but to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who was making a perfectly reasonable inquiry, was:

I do not really know what they are.

Mr. President, a man does not really know what the Ku Klux Klan stands for in March of 1961 does not, to use a curbstone phrase, know enough to come in out of the rain; and certainly is not entitled to hold public office. If there was not any other answer in this document than that one, it would be enough to defeat the nomination.

Then the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] "explained"—and I use quotation marks around the word "explained"—what the Klan was all about, so the nominee could say, well, he certainly would not stand for that.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have been listening to the Senator from New York for some time, and, very frankly, I have not made up my mind how I am going to vote on the nomination. The Senator has raised the question which appears on this particular page, and I happened to hear this particular remark on television the night after it was made.

I think I know what the Ku Klux Klan stands for, as the Senator from New York thinks he knows what it stands for. However, it is my understanding the Ku Klux Klan is a secret organization. Is that true?

Mr. JAVITS. It is true.

Mr. ALLOTT. Therefore, would the Senator from New York, to be honest and fair about this, since I think the Senator is pinning his main argument on this matter, be willing to swear what

the beliefs and precepts of the Klan are? I presume, as I have known of it for all my life, that the Klan is anti-Negro. I have known of instances when it has been referred to as being anti-Jewish. I have heard, in more remote connections, that it is anti-Catholic.

I should like to ask my colleague from New York, being honest about it, whether he would be willing to take the witness stand and swear that he knows what the Klan stands for. If Mr. Meriwether is not a member of the Klan, he may be in no better position to take the stand and swear what the Klan stands for than I would be or the Senator from New York would be.

Mr. JAVITS. Well, I think we do not have to improvise or extrapolate, as we said in the Army, on the part of either the Senator from Colorado or the Senator from New York. The Senator can read the letter of Robert Shelton of the Tuscaloosa News, which appears on pages 28 and 29 of the hearings. I will not demean the Senate by reading it into the RECORD. The letter is directed to the editor of the News. It starts off with the words:

Quizling—An editor in the South who betrays the white man by promising appeasement for mongrelization.

Then follows the text of the letter. It seems to me that is a pretty good characterization of what most people understand to be the general views of the Klan.

Mr. Shelton ends up the letter by saying: "I'm proud of the U.S. Klans."

The last paragraph reads:

Regardless of what you write or your ill talk, I'm proud of the U.S. Klans. No, our sign will not come down.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have not read this particular letter, because I have not had an opportunity to review the record completely; but I wondered, at the time I heard it reproduced on television, and I wonder now, why someone at the hearing did not pin down this particular question. I think I know, and the Senator from New York thinks he knows, and the Senator from New York knows I have no more tolerance for these things than he does. What I wonder about is whether the question was answered. I do not know; I have not examined the constitution or bylaws of the organization; but I wondered why the question was not pinned down so we could have an answer as to whether he was talking in generalization or specifically. If he was talking specifically, I would say the answer was honest. If he was talking in generalization, I would say his answer was dishonest.

Mr. JAVITS. The answer has to be taken in the context in which it was given, the Tuscaloosa News editorial having gone in the RECORD, as well as the Shelton letter, and the fact that it was a hot issue in the campaign. I am not basing my question on any specificity as to what the Klan stands for; but the question of the Klan was in issue. It was an important issue. He was in considerable difficulty in association with a man who was a high official of the Klan. When he is finally faced with confirma-

tion in 1961 for a high position, the best he can do is say he does not know. Apparently he made no inquiry. He would not listen. It seems to me that question goes to his qualifications for an important job. Perhaps he is fit to be an official of a company, or anything else he might do to make a living; but if he did not make inquiry as a result of that kind of letter, I think he is not qualified for this sensitive job. That is the basis of my argument.

So I think, with the limitation which I apply to the utilization of these facts in terms of proof, it is unnecessary for me to go further than that, on the basis that he was known to be so insensitive to this type of consideration as to be unaware; and I say he is unqualified for this particular job on that one question of insensitivity.

Mr. ALLOTT. Perhaps we in the western part of the United States speak more frankly than do those in the East. To be rather blunt about it, what the Senator is really saying is that the nominee is so insensitive or so lacking in general knowledge that he is not qualified, or that he is purposely misrepresenting his real position and his real thoughts on the matter. Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I would say the nominee is a very competent lawyer. No lawyer would make the latter assertion if he did not have to, and therefore I am perfectly willing to rest my case on it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I, myself, am a lawyer, as the Senator knows—

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, I know.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think one would have to draw one of two conclusions in this instance, and it depends on his interpretation of the particular answer which has bothered me. If one puts one interpretation on it in the strict sense, the nominee could have answered with perfect honesty. If one takes it in the broader sense, I do not think one could help arriving at another conclusion.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to give the Senator a little parallel. Interestingly enough, when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] was examining the witness, he examined him on precisely this subject. I refer my colleague to that, because I think it may be interesting to him.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator please state the page?

Mr. JAVITS. It appears beginning at the bottom of page 45, and is as follows:

Senator PROXMIRE. Have you ever publicly disowned or denounced the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. Publicly?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. Have you ever made a statement which has been published in the Alabama paper or any other paper critical of the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I do not know. I do not believe so.

Senator PROXMIRE. The Senator from Alabama circulated at the beginning of your appearance here an editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser when it was supporting your position. The last paragraph is very brief and I would like to read it and ask if this reflects your views:

"Probably the President's investigators reported the Patterson connection with the Klan in the 1958 campaign. It was the Ad-

vertiser that yanked that hood off Patterson's head, but never did we suggest more than campaign expediency on his part. Patterson doesn't care a hoot about the dumb Kluxers, he just used them in the campaign as most other politicians would have, then turned his back on them."

Is that correct?

Mr. MERIWETHER. That was a little rough. I read that; yes, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is this your view?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir. I never brought anybody close to us. I never discarded anybody. I asked for votes where I could find them.

Senator PROXMIRE. You asked for votes where you could find them and you would accept the votes of anybody regardless of their views?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. Supposing they were members of the Communist Party. Would you accept their support?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I never thought of it. That is the first time I ever thought of that. I would prefer not to have a Communist support me.

Senator PROXMIRE. I know you prefer, but would you repudiate it, publicly repudiate it?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I have.

Senator PROXMIRE. You have?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. You have never repudiated the support of the Ku Klux Klan or any of their supporters?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, nor have I of the colored people, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. You would repudiate the support of a Communist?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I feel that I would; yes, sir.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that is what I am talking about. This is an evaluation in terms of what is Mr. Meriwether's outlook as he now comes to us to take this job. His outlook is that he cannot equate the support of the Ku Klux Klan with support of a Communist. He is very clear on the latter, but certainly, to say the least and to be the most charitable, he is extremely fuzzy as to the former.

It seems to me, Mr. President, such a man is not ready to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank, to serve in a high policy job confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude upon the question of the lack of qualification for the job based on business experience. I think this will not require too much argument.

I ask Senators to turn to page 49 of the record of hearings, where they will find a reference to the job which this witness now occupies, his position in the State as finance director, which he has held since 1959. As the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] brought out, the job pays \$10,000 a year.

I ask Senators to read the excellent cross-examination by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] on the question of what the nominee knew about the Bank and what it did. The Senators can see for themselves.

I hope very much the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] may think it proper to speak on the subject herself, to show precisely what the nominee knew about the Bank, about the implications of its work, about its activities and about its position in the world.

I respectfully submit what has happened is that we have been asked to confirm the nomination to a high and important Government post, which is subject to Senate confirmation, of a man who was catapulted from an atmosphere completely different from the one in which he would be engaged in almost every way, a man who does not begin to comprehend the orientation of the public policy of the United States in the sensitive area which deals with one and a quarter billion people of the world whose skins are yellow, black, or brown.

We are asked to run a risk when that man speaks. If his words do not get the headlines in America they will certainly get the headlines in Africa, or in Asia, or in Latin America; and, if there are not headlines for what he says now, surely there will be a thorough going over of what he has said and done before, I can assure the Senate.

The question we face is, Shall we do this with our eyes wide open?

I think this illustrates the grave danger of simply leaping to confirm any nomination which the President sends to the Senate for confirmation, because this is a sort of honeymoon period after the presidential election when we feel inclined to say, "We want to go along with what you would like to do, so that you will have a good chance, or the best chance, to go a good job."

I think this particular request by the President is an unfortunate one. I think he was badly advised to make it. I wish he had not sent us the name of this nominee. I deeply feel we have to give the nomination the careful and thoughtful consideration which we are giving it. I deeply feel that the public will bear with us, as indeed it should, notwithstanding the honeymoon period, as we examine the qualifications of this nominee.

Mr. President, a man may be a fine family man, a good father, considered to be a good man in his State, with a lot of friends; and yet, when it comes to a consideration of policy on the part of the United States, a question of a man sitting in a job critically important to the public interest, which requires Senate confirmation, he may not be the right man.

As I have said before, I say again, I wish the President had brought Mr. Meriwether to Washington, D.C., and had put him to work in some agency to learn a few things about the public policy of the United States—the policy with respect to the less developed areas of the world and with respect to people who have colored pigmentation in their skins. Then we could consider what the man says, what he does, what were his antecedents, what was his philosophy as to the carrying out of his job and the position of the United States in the world.

Then, 2 or 3 years after that, when the man had gone through the orientation in Washington, D.C., or somewhere else in our country, or somewhere else in the world, perhaps he would be ready and perhaps he would be qualified.

I am not given to saying that a man is forever marked. Not at all. He might be ready and he might be quali-

fied for this or for some other job in such circumstances.

I respectfully submit that upon the record we have, based upon the job, this particular nominee is not qualified, and therefore, Mr. President, I move to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I voted in the committee to report the nomination of Mr. Meriwether in order that the Senate could examine into the hearings, appraise the testimony, judge the qualifications of this nominee, and then work its will. I felt a nomination of this importance should be considered by the Senate and should not be bottled up in the committee.

I have made my own review of the testimony and of the experience and qualifications of Mr. Meriwether. I conclude that the nomination lacks merit, and I must vote against confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I plan to vote against the nomination of Charles M. Meriwether to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Patronage is recognized as one legitimate means of building and keeping together such a political organization. But, Mr. President, the party and the person controlling the patronage must be careful in its use. The individuals who are to be honored by the system must be qualified and their appointment must be considered not only in a domestic political light but also as to what effect appointment will have on our relations with other countries as well. Thus, Mr. President, the qualifications of the individual must be weighed carefully and the effect of the appointment elsewhere must be scrutinized with care.

BANK AND BOARD FUNCTIONS

The Export-Import Bank was authorized in 1934 as a banking corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia. It was made an independent agency of the Government in 1945. The Bank is authorized to have a capital stock of \$1 billion and may borrow from the U.S. Treasury on its own obligations up to not more than \$6 million outstanding at any one time. The purpose of the Bank is to aid in financing and to facilitate exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States or any of its territories or insular possessions and any foreign country or the agencies or nationals thereof. The Bank supplements and does not compete with private capital and its loans should generally be for specific purposes and offer reasonable assurance of repayment.

Mr. President, as Senators know, I have long shown an interest in the foreign commerce of the United States. Only last year as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I made a trip in connection with the committee's study on foreign commerce. I visited countries both in Asia and in Africa and found that there were formidable obstacles to any large-scale expansion of American exports. There is a lack of hard currency reserves or

purchasing power in many of these nations and the competition in the field of machinery and manufactured goods from other countries such as Japan and Germany are great.

Mr. President, the Export-Import Bank, its Board of Directors, and the way the Bank is run can do much to meet this increased competition and the problems of development as related to trade.

It is my understanding that the Board of Directors of the Bank from time to time have to pass on the granting of credit to foreign businesses so that they might purchase American goods. It would seem that in some cases the Board members would have to personally negotiate with foreign nationals on particular guarantee or credit requests. If my assumptions are correct, then the Board member, in this day and age when foreign commerce is so vital a part of our whole economy, should have the qualifications and the background to enable him carefully to weigh the applications in the light of economic and financial considerations and the effect it will have on our fiscal soundness.

Mr. President, under the Constitution the President of the United States has the power to appoint certain officers with the advice and consent of the Senate. I have always felt that the President, in order to develop his program, should be able to name to particular positions those in whom he has faith. But this courtesy which I would extend to the President is not a substitute for my obligation to protect the best interests of the United States in accordance with the duty of the Senate to advise and consent.

It was a Senator from the great State of Louisiana—Edward Livingston—who in 1831 was one of the first to question an appointment submitted by a President—Andrew Jackson.

And, so, through the years the Senate has performed its function granted by this section of the Constitution.

Mr. President, over the past weekend, I have studied carefully the hearings on the nomination of Mr. Meriwether. I cannot help but feel that, with all respect to him, he does not have the qualifications necessary for appointment to such an important office. His biographical sketch reveals only 2 years of experience in the field of finance. The hearings reveal only a very general understanding of the functions of the Export-Import Bank.

This is no time in the foreign commerce area of our economic development for on-the-job training. The Board needs men versed in banking, credit, and finance fields. If this country is to move ahead, if this is the time of opportunity, if this is the beginning of a new era, if this is a time for greatness, we must certainly need a steady qualified hand in each office.

Mr. President, I have never subscribed to the theory of "guilt by association." In my study of the hearings I found no legal proof of Mr. Meriwether being responsible for the charges which have been leveled against him, but I was disturbed by his answers to some of the

questions. In one case Mr. Meriwether said, "If a klansman wanted to vote for a candidate whom I was working for, I would welcome his vote." In another case Mr. Meriwether said, "I asked for votes where I could find them." In answer to a question by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] whether he would accept the votes of any people regardless of their views, he answered, "Yes, sir."

It is true, Mr. President, that as elective officers we do not have control over the voting habits of the people; but, Mr. President, I would hardly venture to say that any Member of this body would "welcome" a klansman vote or ask for a vote where we could find it—simply for the sake of a vote. This is a rather cynical attitude, as expressed by this nominee. And in answer to a question as to whether he would accept the support of members of the Communist Party, he answered, "I never thought of it. That is the first time I ever thought of it." Mr. President, for one who is looked upon as a political "pro" in his adopted State, that, to me, is a very naive answer.

Mr. President, the exchange and communication with foreign representatives must be one of friendliness and understanding, if we are to meet the challenge to our way of life and well-being. The appointment to an office such as this is a privilege and not a right. We must set and maintain standards of public conduct. Political considerations in and of themselves are not the only criteria for public appointment, but qualifications and ability to do the job should be all controlling.

Mr. President, it is for those reasons that I shall vote against confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in my view, the President should have the widest discretion in the choice of nominees for posts in the executive branch of Government. I have said many times that unless the nominee is manifestly lacking in character, or incompetent, or is lacking in loyalty to his country, or is involved in a conflict of interest, I would vote to confirm his nomination even though I did not regard the candidate as the best man for the job. I do not believe that the Senate's privilege to "advise and consent" justifies the exercise of veto power over the President's power of appointment.

It is by these standards that I judged all of President Eisenhower's nominees—some of whom I felt were rather unfairly treated in the Senate—and it is by these same standards that I intend to judge President Kennedy's nominees.

I have examined the hearings involving Mr. Meriwether very carefully, and I have weighed his testimony against the standards which I believe must be controlling. In this evaluation I have tried to give the nominee the benefit of every doubt and to find some way in which I could justify to myself a vote in favor of President Kennedy's selection. Reluctantly, but firmly, I am convinced that it would be a great mistake to approve Charles Meriwether's ap-

pointment—a mistake which President Kennedy, himself, would regret as much as anyone.

In my opinion, the conflict of interest between Mr. Meriwether's past record and philosophy and his duties on the Export-Import Board, would be even more basic than any conflict which could arise out of financial involvements such as usually concern us. Mr. Meriwether is a segregationist who in his political campaigns has accepted the support of the Ku Klux Klan. In his position as a director of the Export-Import Bank, he would be called upon to approve loans for projects in Africa, in the Far East, and in South America in places where Negroes and other non-whites are in the overwhelming majority. Mr. Meriwether professes no hostility toward Negroes—but he has a philosophical attachment to views which would make it impossible for the representatives in these areas of the world to approach him with confidence or faith, or on any basis of mutual and sympathetic understanding.

The conclusion is inescapable that he would put the whole Bank on the spot and jeopardize its vital work in the underdeveloped areas of the world which need its assistance most. He might respond to this awkward situation by leaning over so far backward as to make unwise and improvident decisions. Or, he might create such an atmosphere of tension and hostility that no good could come of any loan negotiations. In either case, it is simply impossible for a man of his background and beliefs to approach this assignment with the kind of objectivity which is necessary to protect the best interests of America and promote the objectives of the Bank.

We cannot overlook the impact either on the people of this country or on the world which would arise from the appointment of a man holding the views of Mr. Meriwether to a post of this nature. There is a struggle in our land between those who are fighting for adherence to the law and those who are defying the mandate of our Highest Court. Will we be advancing the cause of law and order by appointing an avowed segregationist to this high position—or will we simply be giving ammunition to the Communists and other subversives who will use this incident to embarrass us throughout the globe? I believe that we would be doing a great disservice to our country and to its position in the world by allowing this appointment to be confirmed.

Perhaps some of the dangers could be risked if Mr. Meriwether offered other unique qualifications for this post. The truth is, as the hearings make clear, that he knows little or nothing about problems of international finance or trade. Under these circumstances, his endorsement would be utterly inexplicable.

Mr. President, I shall vote against confirmation of Mr. Meriwether's nomination.

I trust that some other place may be found for Mr. Meriwether.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]

to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, due to the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wished to speak, I think I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I yield. I see the Senator from Oregon is present in the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wondered about the time arrangement. The motion to recommit is pending, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recommit is the pending question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Oregon how long he expects to take to discuss the motion to recommit?

Mr. MORSE. Not very long.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then it is possible that within the next 30 minutes there could be a vote on the motion to recommit?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know if other Senators will wish to talk after I finish, but I should think we might have a vote within the next hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, I am not advised as to who wishes to talk.

Mr. MORSE. I am not, either.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was assuming, with respect to the pending motion, that after the Senator from New York finished probably the Senator from Oregon would discuss the motion. Then I presume there will be other discussion afterwards.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the only Senator who intends to speak on the motion to recommit is the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct, I believe.

Mr. MORSE. I am not sure that is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. I know of no other Senator who wishes to speak at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. A couple of other Senators mentioned it to me. They may decide not to speak.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This inquiry was made only for the purpose of notifying and alerting Senators, some of whom are away from the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with no pleasure that I proceed to discuss this nomination. I would give almost everything, to use a colloquialism, if this discussion could have been avoided on the floor of the Senate. I still hope that much of it can be avoided on the floor of the Senate until after the committee gives further consideration to the nomination.

I am going on my 17th year in the Senate. Many confirmation debates

have occurred in that time. I do not know of a single debate in those 17 years in which I felt it was more important that a committee give further consideration to a nomination than this one. The nomination comes to us without a majority vote of the committee, in that not a majority voted for the nomination. It comes to us with five voting for the nomination, four voting against it, and the others apparently not voting. In my judgment, that raises a rather important procedural question for the Senate to consider this afternoon. When we have a nomination as important as this one, we ought to have the benefit of a much more detailed record than this one, and we ought to have the benefit of the judgment of a majority of the members of the committee.

It is also true that opposition to this nomination is of rather late date. At the beginning of a new administration there are many, many nominations. There is not a Senator on this floor who has not spent a great deal of time since the Kennedy administration came into office dealing with problems of appointments of people from his own State or her own State. We have been literally bombarded with requests for recommendations for this job or that job. We have been so taken up with appointment questions, as well as our other Senate duties, that in my judgment Senators have not had the time to give the study and attention to a good many nominations that have reached the floor of the Senate.

I suggest that if the truth were known, only a small minority of Senators have read the hearings on Meriwether. The nomination has not been before us very long. Senators have had many, many other things to do. Those of us who have developed a great concern about this nomination have studied the record. I am satisfied that if the nomination were sent back to committee, and Senators took the time to consider the contents of the record the committee has already made, which has been so ably discussed this afternoon by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and took the time to present to the committee, as I think many of us should, information which we have gathered since the committee hearings, the result of the vote on the nomination would probably be very much different from what it would be if we went to a vote this afternoon.

It is in fairness to the President that this nomination should go back to the committee for further consideration. In view of the objections that will be raised to this nominee, I feel that the committee owes it to the President to call witnesses before it to testify on those objections and criticisms. I am not criticizing the committee. I seek to cast no reflection on the committee. I simply say that in my judgment the new conditions which have arisen since the committee hearing justify sending it back to the committee; and sending it back to the committee is no reflection upon the committee.

We really have no committee report; we do not actually get written reports

on most nominations, but only an indication of the action taken by the committee from the vote on the nomination, from who is for and who is against it or, in this instance, who had not voted.

I should like at this point to associate myself with the argument of the Senator from New York in that if one should consider the transcript of the committee hearings and read it from its four corners, most people would come to the conclusion that this nominee does not have the competency, the background, the experience, and the special qualifications a nominee ought to have in order to represent the interests of this country on the Export-Import Bank.

That is the burden of the argument of the Senator from New York. I think he presented it in a masterful fashion, and I commend him for it. He is quite right. President Kennedy throughout his campaign promised—pledged—to the American people that he was going to fill the responsible positions of Government with highly qualified and competent people. He has not kept his pledge in this instance.

It does not make me happy to say that, because he is my President, and I intend, as I told him in a letter yesterday, to give him every support that I can in making his administration a success. I expect to be able to support him 99.9 percent of the time, but I cannot support him when he makes a mistake like this.

The President of the United States used to be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. The President of the United States knows of the vital importance of the Export-Import Bank to America's foreign relations. Yet he nominates a man for a position in the Export-Import Bank who, in my judgment, from the standpoint of background and experience and professional knowledge, simply does not qualify for the job. This is a nomination of gross incompetency.

Senators will recall that in past controversies in the Senate, starting back in 1945, I have held consistently and firmly to the four historical criteria that legal scholars agree should be applied under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution. They are very simple.

First, the character of the nominee. Not that he is a perfect man, because such a man has never lived, but that a Senator, in keeping with his oath, may vote to confirm him. A Senator takes an oath to uphold the Constitution. Incidentally, that is the same oath the President takes. A Senator is obligated under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution to uphold the Constitution. A Senator must satisfy himself that the nominee does not possess such defects of character as to raise a serious question as to whether he can perform the duties of his office in keeping with the best interests of the country.

If necessary, at a later time I shall discuss that criterion in relation to the nomination. I only wish to say at this time that in my judgment the nominee does not possess the qualifications which qualify him under the character test, and that he should be turned down on that criterion.

Second, a Senator must be satisfied that the nominee is loyal to our form of government. I know of nothing in the record which raises any question as to the patriotic loyalty of the nominee. So he qualifies on that ground.

Third, conflict of interest. I am satisfied that, from the standpoint of his economic background and his connections and his associations, he does not suffer from a conflict of interest. That does not mean only financial interest, of course. In my present judgment, he does not suffer from such a conflict of interest as would disqualify him from holding the position, though, on that criterion, I believe the committee should make further investigation.

Fourth, competence. Each Senator must satisfy himself, after a study of the record, that the nominee possesses such qualifications of competence and ability as to make it possible for him to serve his country in this particular position in a satisfactory manner. In my judgment, the nominee fails to meet this test, and he should not be confirmed, because of an obvious lack of competence.

The Export-Import Bank, by the very nature of its functions, in my judgment, calls for the appointment so far as basic qualifications are concerned, of a person who has knowledge of banking, knowledge of international trade, knowledge of the foreign affairs problems of our country, knowledge of the underdeveloped areas of the world, and professional knowledge of the underdeveloped countries of the world in which the Export-Import Bank will consider investing millions and millions of American dollars. The nominee does not have those qualifications.

There may be some other place where the President might have assigned him. I do not know what it would be. There might be some place. I would pass judgment upon that in connection with such an assignment. However, for the work performed by the Export-Import Bank the nominee does not have the professional background and knowledge and experience and competency the American people are entitled to have of any nominee from President John F. Kennedy, in view of President John F. Kennedy's pledge to the American people in campaign speech after campaign speech that he would select highly competent people as his nominees to responsible posts.

The fact that he made a mistake on this nomination is not a serious mark against him. Who among us does not make mistakes? This is a mistake, however, that he can correct. This is a mistake which it is not too late for him to remedy.

I believe I know President Kennedy. I have sat with him on the floor of the Senate, as my fellow Senators have, in confirmation controversies. I know the high standard of competency that he has insisted upon in casting his vote on confirmations. So far as I am concerned, I am completely satisfied in my mind that if President John F. Kennedy were back as a Senator, and a President sent up this nomination for this position, he, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, would share my

view that confirmation of this nomination would be a serious mistake and would not vote for it.

That is the confidence I have in President Kennedy. We need to keep in mind the pace that he has had to keep since he has become President. We need to keep in mind all the recommendations that have flooded upon him. We need to keep in mind all the appointments he has had to consider. A President cannot possibly give the detailed study and investigation and consideration to each one of the nominations that we have a constitutional duty to do in the Senate when a nomination is submitted to us.

We all know that in making appointments very often a President must place a great deal of reliance upon advisers. In my opinion, the staff work in this instance was very poorly done. I believe that the President of the United States was not given a thorough analysis of the record of the nominee before the nomination was made.

I would not be a bit surprised to learn that representations of various forms which were presented to the President caused him, in all honesty, to think that this would be a good nomination. He has a duty as President, we all know, to make a fair and reasonable distribution of appointments among the various areas of the United States.

We know what a howl would go up if a President made too many appointments from any given area of the country. We also know—and let us be practical about it and talk about these things calmly and objectively—that after a successful campaign it is to be expected that appointments should go in part, at least, to those who were very helpful in obtaining the victory, provided, of course, that those people are selected who are highly qualified and competent to do the work for which they are being nominated.

I do not believe it is a reflection upon this administration to point out that at an early date there was a strong indication that Alabama would go for Kennedy. Alabama was a great asset in that historic campaign. I do not think there is any doubt, if we are to be frank about it, that the early support of the Democratic candidate by the Governor of Alabama was of considerable political influence in many places throughout the Nation, North as well as South.

I hope it is tactful to say that no one was surprised to see an appointment or two go to Alabama. Such appointments should go to Alabama, but I think they ought to go to qualified persons from Alabama, persons competent to perform the jobs for which they were nominated. In this appointment the President made a bad slip, because he did not appoint, in my judgment, a qualified, competent person.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I have listened to the debate with much attention. Considerable evidence has been presented

to the effect that this is an unfortunate nomination at this time for this post. It involves foreign relations, which are so important. It involves the new nations on the turbulent continent of Africa, and the nations of Latin-America for which loans will be requested.

I am wondering whether the Senator from Oregon would think that a motion to recommit should necessarily be to the Committee on Banking and Currency, or whether it could not be to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to get the opinion of that group of the appropriateness of this nomination at this time. I do not know whether that is appropriate or possible, but I raise the point as a question.

Mr. MORSE. I suppose the Senate could always, by motion, refer a nomination to any committee it wished, but I would be the first to insist that this nomination go back to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have complete confidence in the Committee on Banking and Currency, once I am satisfied that they have all the facts which can be made available to them in regard to the nomination.

If the nomination goes back to the Committee on Banking and Currency, I should like very much to have some of us who are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations testify before the Committee on Banking and Currency in regard to the importance of a position on the Export-Import Bank, and the qualifications we have a right to expect of the nominee.

It would be most desirable to emphasize the foreign policy importance of this particular assignment, in regard to which I think this nominee is unqualified.

Mr. GRUENING. Particularly in view of the importance of Latin America to our foreign relations with which the administration is so greatly concerned.

Mr. MORSE. I shall have considerable to say about that phase if we get into the substance of the debate on this nomination.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Alaska expressed great concern with respect to the ability of the nominee to discharge the duties of a member of the Export-Import Bank; but when the President nominated a distinguished Jew from New York to run the whole show, to be President of the Bank, we did not hear the Senator from Alaska say that that nomination ought to be sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations for advice before the Committee on Banking and Currency acted on it.

Mr. GRUENING. I merely asked the question because the distinguished Senator from Oregon had mentioned the importance of this appointment in the field of foreign relations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think I understand the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the qualifications we ought

to look for before a nomination to the Export-Import Bank is confirmed, I should like to call attention to the qualifications of the present members of the Export-Import Bank, simply set them alongside the alleged qualifications of this nominee, and then ask the Senate the simple question: Is Meriwether even in their class? Does he even approach them in qualifications?

Mr. President, it has been suggested—and I am happy to conform to the suggestion—that because of the large attendance of Senators on the floor at this moment, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington is Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, a great banker, a great financial expert, a man whom I have watched in international conferences. Every American has a right to be proud of this man's outstanding qualifications. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Waugh's biography, as printed in "Who's Who," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Waugh, Samuel Clark, banker, Government official; born Plattsburgh, Nebr., April 28, 1890; son of Sam and Flora (Rawlins) W.; student, University of Nebraska, 1911-12; married Ruby Barns, May 1, 1913 (deceased July 1934); married 2d, Della Ladd Romans, April 11, 1942. With First Trust Co., Lincoln, Nebr., 1913—, president, director, 1953—; on leave as Assistant Secretary of State, U.S. State Department, 1953-55; President and Chairman of Board, Export-Import Bank, 1955—; —; director Citizens State Bank, Lincoln, trustee University of Nebraska Foundation, Doane College, Cooper; Foundation. Member, American Bankers Association (past president, trust division), Lincoln Chamber of Commerce (past president), Delta Upsilon, Republican. Clubs: Lincoln Country, University (Lincoln, Nebr.); Chevy Chase (Washington). Home: 3419 Prospect Avenue NW, Washington. Office: Export-Import Bank, 811 Vermont Avenue, Washington.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows, I presume, that Mr. Waugh left the Bank on January 20.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but I want the Senate to know—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the Senator was referring to the present membership of the Bank.

Mr. MORSE. No; I want the Senate to know the kind of man who ought to be selected for the Export-Import Bank. The Senator from Alabama is correct: Mr. Waugh left the Bank on January 20.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly agree with the Senator from Oregon regarding the qualifications of Mr. Waugh.

Mr. MORSE. I have asked that his credentials be placed in the RECORD because they would be very helpful to the President to have called to his attention the kind of man we ought to appoint to the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD the biography of Mr. Lynn U. Stambaugh, First Vice President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank.

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

Stambaugh, Lynn Upshaw (stām'baw), lawyer; born Abilene, Kans., July 4, 1890; son of Winfield Scott and Lina (Upshaw) Stambaugh; student, Fargo (N. Dak.) College, 1909-10; LL.B., University of North 1913-15; practiced law at Hazen, N. Dak., 1915-17, at Fargo, N. Dak., since 1919; member of Cupler, Stambaugh & Tennesen; member of Board, Export-Import Bank, 1945—, now Vice President. Served with Food Administration during World War; national commander, American Legion, 1941-42. Member, Fargo Chamber of Commerce (past president); member of American Bar Association, North Dakota Bar Association, Cass County Bar Association (past president). Order of Coif, Sigma Chi, Phi Delta Phi, Republican, Episcopalian, Mason. Home: Wodley Park Towers. Office: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the biography of Mr. Hawthorne Arey, as published in "Who's Who."

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

Arey, Hawthorne, lawyer, banker; born, Omaha, Nebr., October 31, 1905; son of Irving Hubert and Blanche Howe (Widmeyer) Arey; student, Grinnell (Iowa) College, 1924-26; University of Nebraska, 1926-27; LL.B. cum laude, Creighton University, 1930; married Ruth Gordon, August 21, 1929; children, Jane, Gordon Hawthorne. Admitted to Nebraska bar, 1930; practiced in Omaha as member, law firm of Ritchie, Swenson & Arey, 1930-33; on legal staff, RFC, 1933-34; Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1934-38; secretary and counsel, Export-Import Bank of Washington, 1938-43; Vice President and Assistant General Counsel, 1943-45; Vice President and General Counsel, 1945-47; executive Vice President, 1947-49; Director, Vice Chairman, 1949-53; Assistant Director, 1953-54; Director, 1954—. Adviser, U.S. delegation, United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, Bretton Woods, 1944. Member, Board of Trustees, Export-Import Bank, 1943-46. Member, Nebraska State Bar Association, Delta Upsilon. Presbyterian Club; University (Washington). Home: 4224 Franklin Street, Kensington, Md. Office: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the biography of George A. Blowers, as published in "Who's Who."

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

Blowers, George Albert, banker; born, Pineville, Ky., March 5, 1906; son of Albert Cortelyou and Adelaide (Gardner) Blowers; student of Columbia Military Academy, 1922-24; B.S., Harvard University, 1928; Ph. D., Liberia College, 1941; married Nina Bogdanoff, December 21, 1934. With National City Banks since 1929; London, 1929; Singapore, 1930; Tientsin, 1931-32; Peiping, 1933; Shanghai, 1934-35; Hangkow, 1936-37; general manager, Bank of Monrovia, Liberia, 1938-43. Became governor, State Bank of Ethiopia, 1943; governor, Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency, 1952—. Member, Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank, 1955—. Attended International Food Conference, 1943;

United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, Bretton Woods, 1944; inaugural meetings, International Monetary Fund and Bank of Savannah, 1946; Paris Peace Conference, 1946; first annual meeting of International Monetary Fund and Bank, Washington, D.C., 1946; second annual meeting of International Monetary Fund and Bank, London, 1947. Deputy director, finance and trade, ECA, Paris, 1948-49; head, United Nations mission on currency, banking problems to Libya, 1950. Special adviser, International Monetary Fund. Methodist Club: Harvard (New York). Changed the Liberian currency from pound sterling to U.S. dollar; introduced new Ethiopian currency in place of East African shillings. Home: 2247 47th Street NW., Washington; Office: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the biography of Walter Sauer, executive vice president of the Export-Import Bank, as published in Who's Who.

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

Sauer, Walter Charles, lawyer; born Jersey City, N.J., March 5, 1905; son of William and Agnes (Dillon) Sauer; bachelor of arts, Princeton University, 1928; bachelor of laws, Yale University, 1931. Practicing attorney, New Jersey, 1931-34; counsel, RFC 1934-41; General Counsel, Export-Import Bank of Washington, since 1947, now Vice President, General Counsel. Served as lieutenant commander, USNR, 1942-45. Club: University (Washington). Home: University Club. Office: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington.

I have read to the Senate the names of the members of the Export-Import Bank as contained in the last Congressional Directory as of January 1, 1960, and I think it is well that their biographical sketches be printed in the RECORD, as the Senate has given me permission to have them printed. But immediately following those sketches I would like to have unanimous consent that the biographical sketches of the present sitting members be printed.

I ask unanimous consent that the biographical sketches of the present sitting members be printed in the RECORD. They are President and Chairman, Mr. Harold F. Linder; First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Tom Killefer; Directors: Mr. James S. Bush, Mr. George A. Blowers, and Gov. George Docking.

The nominee in this appointment would take Mr. Blowers' position.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief biographical sketch showing their qualifications, with the exception of Mr. Blowers, whose biography appears above, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Harold F. Linder: Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., September 13, 1900; attended Columbia University; 1925-33, helped organize and eventually became president of Cornell, Linder & Co., engaged in industrial reorganization and investment of funds; 1933-38, partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., investment banking and brokerage firm; 1938-40, voluntary work in connection with refugees from Germany and Austria; 1941-44, service in the Navy, lieutenant commander and commander; 1945-46, represented the Joint Distribution Committee in London as a

volunteer—relations with UNRRA and Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees; 1948-55, president, General American Investors Co., Inc.—a closed investment company listed on the New York Stock Exchange; 1951-53, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; 1955-56, Board on National Estimates, CIA; 1956 to present time, has been engaged in personal investments and active participation in nonprofit organizations; was director of seven or eight industrial companies before summoned to Government service.

Mr. Tom Killefer: Born in Los Angeles, Calif., January 7, 1917; 1938, A.B. in economics with honors from Stanford University; 1946, LL.B., Harvard Law School; 1947, B.C.L., Oxford University, Rhodes scholar; 1946, admitted to California bar; 1953, admitted to practice before Supreme Court of United States; 1954, admitted to District of Columbia bar; 1951-52, member of staff of U.S. High Commission of Germany; 1947-October 1959; partner in California and District of Columbia law firm of Lillick, Geary, Wheat, Adams & Charles; was an associate until 1956; 1958, was a representative of Maritime Law Association of United States at United Nations Conference on Law of the Seas in Geneva; 1959-August 1960, executive director of the Committee of American Shipping Lines.

Mr. James S. Bush: Born in Milwaukee, Wis., April 11, 1901; graduate, Yale University, B.A., 1922; 1922-25, associated with Washburn, Crosby Flour Co. in Minneapolis, Minn.; 1925-34, investment banking business in Cleveland, Ohio, firm of Hayden, Miller & Co.; 1934-46, managing partner of G. H. Walker & Co., St. Louis, Mo., investment bankers and members of the New York Stock Exchange; 1942-46, U.S. Air Force, discharged as lieutenant colonel; 1947-October 1958, became vice president and director of the Bank of St. Louis, the General Contract Corp., and the Washington Fire & Marine Insurance Co.

Gov. George Docking: Born in Clay Center, Kans., February 23, 1904; graduate of University of Kansas, A.B. in economics, 1925; 1925-26, bond trader, Fidelity National Bank & Trust Co., Kansas City, Mo., and C. F. Childs & Co.; 1926-28, member of the Brown-Crummer Co., Topeka, Kans.; 1928-31, cashier, Kansas Reserve State Bank in Topeka; 1931-37, cashier, First National Bank, Lawrence, Kans., 1937-42, vice president of First National Bank, Lawrence, Kans.; 1942-59, president of First National Bank, Lawrence, Kans.; 1939 to date, treasurer and director of Kansas Public Service Co.; 1957-61, Governor of the State of Kansas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there are many reasons why I believe this nomination should go back to the committee for further consideration. I think I indicated very clearly my main reasons in a letter I wrote to the President yesterday, March 6, which I shall now read to the Senate:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1961.
The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I regret to advise you that on the basis of the hearings to date on the nomination of Charles Meriwether for a post on the Export-Import Bank, I cannot support the nomination on the floor of the Senate.

Just this morning I have had information presented to me based on allegations that Meriwether has a police record. It is also alleged that he has other serious defects in character which make it impossible for him to meet the character test which is one of

the historic criteria that the Senate has the obligation to follow under the advice and consent clause.

For instance, it is charged that he at one time was an alcoholic although his friends now claim that he is now reformed.

I am far from satisfied that he has cleared himself of the charges concerning his anti-Semitism, his Ku Klux Klan connections, and his questionable business practices in his present Alabama State position.

I am sure I need not tell you that I deeply regret that I cannot support this nomination on the basis of my present knowledge of the case. But when we served together in the Senate you learned of my consistent record of scrutinizing very carefully Presidential nominations irrespective of any partisan consideration.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have sent to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover asking for information which the Federal Bureau of Investigation files may be able to disclose concerning this nomination. I would appreciate it very much if you would instruct Mr. Hoover to make available to me and others in the Senate any information contained in the Federal Bureau of Investigation files bearing upon the qualifications of the nominee.

In addition to the specific allegations which raise serious questions as to Meriwether's character qualifications, I am also very much concerned about the effect of this nomination on our African relations and, for that matter, on our relations in Latin America. My experience at the United Nations satisfies me that this nomination cannot possibly strengthen our relations with the African delegations at the United Nations.

You may be sure, Mr. President, that it is with deep regret that I shall oppose this nomination unless my objections can be answered in the course of the debate. However, my disagreeing with you on this issue will in no way lessen my support of you in what I am sure will be 99.9 percent of the time in connection with the rest of your program.

With best wishes,
Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, also on yesterday I sent to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
Washington D.C., March 6, 1961.
Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I am very much disturbed about the nomination of Mr. Charles Meriwether for a position on the Export-Import Bank. I am notifying the President that on the basis of the case which has been made to date in support of this nomination, I shall oppose the nomination on the floor of the Senate.

I am enclosing a copy of a telegram which I have sent to Mr. Meriwether this morning asking for specific answers to a series of allegations which have been presented to me concerning the nominee. You will note that some of the allegations refer to an alleged police record.

It is not clear to me from the record which has been made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on this nominee as to whether or not the Federal Bureau of Investigation has filed a report with the President which covers all of the items essential for an FBI clearance on the nominee. It is my opinion that, unless the Federal Bureau of Investigation was asked for some special report on Meriwether, the usual full FBI report would be filed in this case. If that was done, then I am sure it must contain information in regard to Meriwether's police record, if he has any. I think I have

been reliably informed that he does have a police record.

If my request does not violate what you consider to be an obligation of privilege in your relationship with the President, I would appreciate your advising me concerning Meriwether's police record, if he has one.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the President so that he will have full knowledge of my concern in the matter.

With best wishes,
Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Oregon has stated that he has been in the Senate for 17 years. Does he recall any instance during all that time when Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, made public a report on his investigation of a person who was being considered by the President for a Presidential appointment?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot say that I have. But I shall comment right now on that point.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Oregon has written the letter but he does not know of any reason to expect a reply to it, does he?

Mr. MORSE. Our committees have had access to FBI reports; on several occasions we have, with the approval of the President, sent to the White House some committee members who have been allowed to read the FBI reports. We do have precedent after precedent in regard to such handling of FBI reports.

I am glad the Senator from Virginia has introduced the subject matter for me, so well. I propose to call attention to some promises which Mr. Kennedy made during the campaign.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator moves away from his comment about the request for the FBI report, and so forth, I call his attention to pages 54 and 55 of the hearings, in which I read into the hearings a statement that President Kennedy made in his press conference. I call it to the attention of the Senator from Oregon. The question was put to the President:

Mr. President, on the nomination, sir, of Charles Meriwether, is there anything in this man's background that might embarrass your administration?

President Kennedy said:

No; I have sent Mr. Meriwether's name up there after reading the FBI report and other records.

Mr. MORSE. I did not know it was the President who was exercising his prerogative under the advise-and-consent clause of the Constitution. I thought it was the Senate that was exercising that prerogative. I am surprised the Senator from Alabama would imply that we ought to let the President make the nomination and then also have him testify, under the advise-and-consent clause, that he is qualified. That happens to be a question for the Senator from Ala-

bama, the Senator from Oregon, and 98 other Senators to decide.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish. For the Senator to quote me a statement that the President of the United States made at a press conference in answer to a newspaperman's question as to whether or not there was anything in the FBI report that would in any way embarrass him is quite irrelevant on the issue before the Senate.

That is for us to judge, not for the President of the United States. That is our job, not the President's. The President has only the right to appoint. We have a duty to confirm or not confirm.

I do not propose to relegate to the President of the United States the job of evaluating what may be in an FBI report in regard to the character of his own nominee. I want to see what is in the report.

I am going to make some suggestions in a very few minutes as to how I think we can proceed in an orderly way to get the needed information, without in any way throwing open to the world the FBI report. I think the comment the Senator from Alabama made is entirely irrelevant to the point I am making.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly never intended to suggest that the President had anything to do with the advise-and-consent requirement under the Constitution in reference to the Senate of the United States, but the Senator from Oregon knows, as does every other Senator in the Chamber, that in the past this is all we have ever required. We have required a statement from the President of the United States, or a representation, that the FBI report has been received and evaluated.

The Senator knows that is what we do in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am sure the Senator knows that in the case of Dr. Weaver, because the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency wrote to the President and asked if he had evaluated the FBI report, he was excoriated. The President wrote to the chairman saying he had evaluated the report, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency was fully satisfied and pursued the matter no further.

We ought to be consistent. If we demand these things in one case, let us demand them in all cases. If we do not demand them in all cases, let us not particularize or pick out a certain case.

The President has announced that he has seen the FBI report, that he has read it, and that there is nothing in it which causes him to withhold the nomination or to fear any subsequent embarrassment. I am willing to rest on that not only in this case, but also in every other case.

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator from Alabama may be willing to rest upon, I give him complete assurance, the Senator from Oregon is not.

I should like to refresh the memory of the Senator from Alabama by stating

that there have been cases in the Foreign Relations Committee, on which both of us serve, in respect to which we have even selected a Republican and a Democrat to confer with the President in regard to what the secret files show, and then to return to the committee to give us, as committee members, their evaluation of the files.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. We did not rely upon what the President said in regard to those matters. We worked out a voluntary, cooperative arrangement with the President in those instances, and we sent down our own committee members under an arrangement with the President.

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

Mr. MORSE. I am going to discuss that in a moment, and I say to the Senator from Alabama, in regard to his proposed uniform principle which should be applied in all cases, that there would be no sense in applying it uniformly unless there were a contest. When there is a contest, when there is a serious question raised, as is true in this case, as to the character of the nominee and as to what can be shown if one has a report concerning, for example, whether the nominee has or has not a police record, I think it is perfectly proper for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or a representative of the committee, to discuss it with the President, and to see to what extent the President wishes to cooperate in making the information in the files available. He has the power to do it. He has the power to do it; and I ask Senators not to tell me that J. Edgar Hoover would not allow it, for he is neither God nor the head of a Gestapo in this country. The President of the United States has the right to make the information available.

In my judgment, in this case—I was not going to cover this until a few minutes later, but I will cover it now and come back to the argument later—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before that, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator will allow me to finish my statement first.

In my judgment, one of the reasons why this nomination ought to go back to the Committee on Banking and Currency is so that the Committee on Banking and Currency can select a couple of members to talk to the President about this matter and to specifically request the President to make available to them either the report or a clear synopsis of the report, so that they can report to the committee.

The Senators who are selected can tell their colleagues whether they are satisfied, not whether the President is satisfied. The President has become a special pleader in this case. The President is a biased witness in this matter from now on. The President made the nomination. It is our job, under the Constitution, to judge the nomination, under the advise-and-consent clause of the Constitution.

The President cannot speak for me in regard to this nomination in regard to the point under discussion, and our duty

under the advise-and-consent clause is to get our own evidence.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that there was one case in the Committee on Foreign Relations in which representatives were appointed to go to see the President. I do not recall more than one case. Can the Senator from Oregon recall more?

Mr. MORSE. I shall have a survey made. I think I can recall at least two, and I do not know how many others there were.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have been on the committee as long as the Senator from Oregon. I can recall only one case, and that was one when the late Senator from Wisconsin made some charges against a person who was being considered for an appointment to be an Ambassador. I happened to be one of the Senators who was appointed, with the late Senator Taft. The late Senator Taft and I went to the Department of Justice or to the White House, wherever it was, and saw the FBI files. We saw them. So far as I know, that is the only case.

Let me say this: I hate to see the ugly head of McCarthyism raised again here in the Senate, in the reverse even though it may be.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a personal question? Is the implication of the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Oregon is raising McCarthyism in the Senate?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all.

Mr. MORSE. That is the implication I infer, and I do not yield to the Senator further.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do not intend that.

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield to the Senator from Alabama after that. I refuse to yield to the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Alabama must make it very clear that he did not mean to imply McCarthyism because I am exercising my rights under the advise-and-consent clause. I will never yield to the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. I refuse to yield to the Senator from Alabama. I will never yield to him again so long as we serve in the Senate until he erases what I consider to be an unfair and unkind remark.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am doing my best.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not yield to the Senator from Alabama, and I request that he take his seat.

Mr. President, this is not an easy task for the Senator from Oregon. If any Senator in this body thinks it is easy for me to stand up to raise objections to a nominee on the basis of what I think is a *prima facie* case made to date that the man does not have a character of the nature required for service on the Export-Import Bank, he is mistaken.

I should like to have the Senator from Alabama know that the criterion of character happens to be one of the constitutional criteria used throughout our history, as to which a Senator has a duty to check when he exercises his rights under the advise-and-consent clause.

I do not like to have to go into the character of a man, but if I am satisfied that the evidence is there which shows he does not have the character he should have, then I think his nomination should not be confirmed. I resent any implication that because I raise a question of character I am raising McCarthyism on the floor of the Senate. I will let the RECORD speak for itself as to whether I have raised this problem today with dignity and restraint, Mr. President.

I know how delicate is the road I am treading at the present time. I repeat that in my opinion, on the basis of what I know about this nominee to date, this man does not have a character which warrants confirmation of his nomination. On that basis, I raise one of my objections.

Mr. President, I now return to the body of my argument. Throughout the campaign on many occasions Mr. Kennedy made clear to the American people that he was going to bring to an end, commensurate with national security, the denial to the representatives of the people of information which they ought to have. I paraphrase him, but I think accurately, Mr. President, when I point out that in some of the speeches he shared the point of view which the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald has expressed time and time again, when, as chairman of that journalistic committee which has sought to bring an end to government by secrecy, he performed a great service in protesting the denial, not only to the legislative branch of the Government but also to the press and to the American people generally, of information which they ought to have which too often is marked "top secret."

I agree with that point of view. I hailed this position taken by the Democratic nominee. In many of the 54 speeches that I gave in support of the Democratic nominee in this country it was one of the points that I stressed, because, as I have been heard to say in the Senate, in my judgment, we need to be on guard against a growing trend in this democracy toward government by secrecy, with respect to the doctrine of executive privilege.

I have defended Presidents on the doctrine and the exercise of executive privilege, and I will defend this President, because under the Constitution he has the constitutional right to deny to the Congress of the United States executive information, and he has a right to do it in this case if he wants to do it. If he decides that he wants to do it, I will defend him in his right to do it.

As I have said in past speeches on this subject, this is not mandatory on the part of the President. A President, if he thinks national security is not involved, is free to make available to committees of the Congress or to individual Members of Congress, for that matter, information that he thinks will help them in reaching their legislative decisions. Presidents throughout our history have done so. In fact, this trend toward denying confidential information

or secret information or executive information or whatever label one wishes to use to describe it, is of rather recent origin.

We can go back to the very beginning of this Republic, when Presidents in some instances have denied Congress access to executive information. But in their administrations they have also granted access to information. There has been no fixed rule about it.

In recent years there has been a growing tendency in our country for Chief Executives automatically to deny such access. Because of this trend I enthusiastically praised the pronouncements made by candidate Kennedy during the campaign that he was going to cooperate to a greater extent with the Congress, and that he was going to make available, whenever he thought national security was not involved, information that involved the public's business. That is the test, after all. Should the public know? Should the public know what information is contained in the files of the executive branch?

I wish to say in this instance that when a question has been raised with regard to the character of the nominee and his background, the President ought to be willing—and I am not sure he would not be willing; at least I think we ought to find out—to sit down with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], or any Republican on the Committee on Banking and Currency. Those three would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

I may have my differences with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in our personal relations that have developed here, but not in his qualifications to serve as a Senator and to serve in the performance of the function I now outline. I would be perfectly willing to have him go down and review the file and report back to the committee, and through the committee to the Congress, as to whether or not there is anything in the record that sustains the allegations that are being made against the nominee.

So I think the nomination ought to go back to committee, and the committee ought to discuss the nomination with the President.

The advise-and-consent clause does not mean that a barrier of nonaccessibility is set up between a Senate committee and the President of the United States. There is nothing that should prevent the committee or a delegation of the committee from asking the President for a conference with respect to the nomination. That is within the spirit and intent—yes, the constitutional purpose—of the advise-and-consent clause. So I think the nomination ought to go back for that reason.

Yesterday I sent a wire to Mr. Meriwether, addressed to his office:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 6, 1961.

Mr. CHARLES MERIWETHER,
Director of Finance,
State of Alabama,
Montgomery, Ala.:

I am very disturbed in connection with your nomination for a post on the Export-Import Bank concerning disclosures about

your past record. Specifically, I would like to know if it is true that you were fired from the Utopia Dry Cleaning Co. in Birmingham, Ala., allegedly for drunkenness. I would like to know if you were ever fired from the Utopia Dry Cleaning Co., and, if so, for what reason or reasons. Next I would like to know if you were arrested on September 11, 1947, or any other time on a charge of issuing worthless checks and using a car without the owner's consent. Further, I would like to know if you have ever been arrested and, if so, at what times and on what charges. I would like to know your explanation as to why the low tire bid of U. S. Royal to the State of Alabama was turned down in favor of a higher bid by B. F. Goodrich at a time when it is alleged that Robert Shelton, Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan, was State sales representative of Goodrich. I shall appreciate an immediate reply.

WAYNE MORSE.

Today I received a wire from Mr. Meriwether's secretary, signed Julie Allen, executive secretary to Mr. Meriwether. The wire reads:

MONTGOMERY, ALA., March 6, 1961.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Mr. Meriwether out of city. Your telegram will be called to his attention immediately upon his return.

JULIE ALLEN,
Executive Secretary to Mr. Meriwether.

I think the answer speaks reams. I think it is perfectly clear that his secretary would have had no difficulty in apprising him of the contents of my wire. My own conclusion is that he obviously did not want to answer my wire, and I think the nomination should go back to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to enable the committee to pursue the matter concerning this man's police record, if any, because the hearings will not be helpful on the subject.

Whenever we deal with the criterion of character it is not pleasant, and yet we owe it to the American people—yes, to the President of the United States—to make perfectly certain that this man has the character as intended by the Constitutional Fathers when they wrote the advise-and-consent clause into the Constitution. We must fulfill this obligation if we are to keep faith with the oath that we took at that desk to uphold the Constitution, in confirming nominations. I wish to say I cannot report to the people of my State, on the basis of my fears concerning this man's alleged police record, that he has the requisite character.

It is no answer to me to say, as I understand some of his apologists will be heard to say, "But he was drunk when he did these things." I did not know that it was only necessary for him to get intoxicated in order to erase from the record concerning his confirmation any question as to whether he has the character to perform the work of the office to which he has been nominated.

I have grave doubts as to the character of this nominee. I believe it ought to be looked into by the Committee on Banking and Currency in great detail. I said we owe it to the American people, but we also owe it to the President of the United States. One of the purposes of the advise-and-consent clause is to make available a protective check for the President. When I sit in the Senate and

vote against a President's nomination I do not believe I am casting any reflection on the President. We should be impersonal about these things. That is why, when I raise a question as to this man's character, I am impersonal about it, and sad about it, but in conscience I have a duty to perform, and I intend to perform it, no matter how much I will be criticized for it by others.

There have come into the debate this afternoon on the floor of the Senate statements that we have not been able to read all of the record. Can we really justify in a case of a contested nomination—and it is an entirely different thing when there is no contest—moving the nomination until we first give the Banking and Currency Committee an opportunity to reconsider this matter in light of the developments since the committee's hearings?

If I were a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I would want to call Mr. Meriwether back before my committee. I would like to pursue further the brilliant cross-examination started by my colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. She went right to the heart of this matter as far as competency is concerned.

As I read Mr. Meriwether's answers to Senator NEUBERGER's questions on cross-examination before the committee, I said to myself, to use a popular expression, "This fellow just is not qualified. He does not know what the score is."

Certainly he is not competent for this job. I believe that Senator NEUBERGER brought that out, and it needs to be pressed further. He needs to be cross-examined at great length in regard to his knowledge concerning banking, and about the fiscal problems involved in the functions of the Export-Import Bank, and their relationship, in turn, to American foreign policy in Asia and Latin America and southeast Asia, and elsewhere.

In the debate this afternoon there was quite a bit of time spent in various colloquies concerning the connections, if any, of the nominee with the Ku Klux Klan. All I wish to say at this point is that I talked to two Alabama newspaper editors today. I paraphrase very accurately what one of them said to me. He said, "Senator, we understand that Kennedy needed to make a major Alabama appointment to fulfill an obligation, but he should not have filled it with a counterfeit."

Then he went on to express himself as a newspaper editor on what he considered to be the counterfeit characteristics of the nominee. He said, "Senator, he just is not qualified to do the job. There are many people in Alabama who are and who ought to have been recognized and appointed."

I am inclined to think that that editor is right.

In another conversation, my attention was called to an editorial which appeared in the Montgomery Advertiser last Sunday. I asked the Library of Congress to send it over to me. It is not pleasant reading, but this is not a pleasant task that we have to perform, nor a pleasant nomination we have to consider. This

is a situation that every one of us would like to walk out on, on which we would like to bury our heads in the sand for a while until the storm has passed.

However, that is not our job. We have a solemn duty to perform, and I believe it is necessary for us to perform it, not only for the people of the country, but also for the President.

We must take a look at what is going on at the grassroots of America with regard to this nomination. There are those who would like to get this nomination behind them as quickly as possible, before the storm gathers. However, I am satisfied that if we send this nomination back to committee for a few days, and if the committee holds further hearings on the nomination, the reaction across the country will be so overwhelmingly in opposition to the nomination, that it either will be withdrawn or, if brought to a vote on the floor of the Senate, within the next week or 10 days, it will be overwhelmingly rejected. I am satisfied that the American people will never "buy" this nomination if they have the time to consider it.

What is our duty? I believe that one of our duties as Senators is to bide time in the Senate in a matter of contest such as this until the public has had an opportunity to react to it. Ours is a republican form of government. When we get to a contest such as this, the people whom we represent have the right to be heard. If we send the nomination back to committee, and the committee holds further investigation, we will hear from the country, and we will hear from very serious, sober-minded people concerning the desirability of a nomination such as this.

I believe that some of the points the editor of the *Montgomery Advertiser* brings out in his editorial ought to be called to the attention of the Senate this afternoon. I will do that. The editor entitles his editorial "Badweather." That is quite an editorial in itself. The editorial reads:

"BADWEATHER"

President Kennedy is unhappy over Finance Director Charlie Meriwether, Governor Patterson is or should be unhappy over Meriwether and undoubtedly more unhappy than both of them together is Meriwether himself.

President Kennedy, like any other politician is stricken bilious at the thought of attaining his administration before the eyes of northern minority elements with the least dab of anti-Semitism or Kluxism.

And here he is with the chief figure in the administration of Governor Patterson, who to Harlem is the personification of the southern white devil. J.P. is a lameduck as far as the President is concerned since he won't be in office when the next presidential election occurs. But Kennedy owes both Patterson and Meriwether much and he decided to take the lumps necessary to make Meriwether a director of the Export-Import Bank.

It is plain from the testimony before the Senate committee that it disdained Meriwether. But in deference to the Democratic President the nomination got out of committee by a margin of one vote.

Meriwether's nomination presumably will be the most controversial matter before the U.S. Senate tomorrow when his nomination will ride on a full vote of the membership. The Democratic majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, declined to predict confirmation. The President will groan even though Meri-

wether is confirmed, for every such wrangle diminishes his endowment of honeymoon indulgence.

J.P. must have been displeased by Meriwether's testimony. In the first place, it was, as the Senators observed, faltering and evasive. It was absurd for Meriwether to say he didn't know for sure that Bobby Shelton was the Kluxer grand dragon since Shelton has signed himself that way publicly and the two know each other quite well.

I digress from a reading of the editorial to say that the editor was shocked by that testimony of Meriwether. He said, "We have established time and time again in the columns of our newspaper his connections with the Ku Klux Klan."

Returning to the editorial, I read as follows:

Meriwether's confirmation must be twice vital to him since, in view of his testimony that he would cheerfully do as the Romans do with respect to integration in Washington, it is not easy to see how he can return to the Patterson administration.

J.P. in a hundred statements has taken the line that it is necessary to the preservation of white welfare that the schools be closed before integrating a single Negro pupil. But in Washington, Meriwether said he would abide by the policy, which policy is integration.

In a limited sense Meriwether was doing what any white Army officer must and does do in obedience to policy. But in the larger sense this easy embrace of integration must be awkward for J.P. Conceivably, the Washington Meriwether might give a job to a Negro the Alabama Meriwether wouldn't permit to parade at J.P.'s inauguration 2 years ago.

Mr. President, in closing this part of my speech, I wish to make it very clear to all my colleagues that I strongly support the nomination and appointment of qualified southerners to high posts in the Kennedy administration—and there are as many, area by area, as elsewhere. There is not the slightest bias on my part in connection with the appointment of southerners to high posts. I lauded and praised the appointment of Governor Hodges as Secretary of Commerce. I predict again on the floor of the Senate, as I have said elsewhere, that I think he will make a brilliant record as Secretary of Commerce.

There is a need for these appointments to represent a cross section of our country, but they must always, to get my support in the Senate, be based upon ability. They must be based upon the four historic criteria which we have always applied under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution. In my judgment, Meriwether does not meet the test on at least two grounds—character and competency. At least, he does not meet the test on the basis of the showing which has been made to date.

Therefore, I think in fairness to all concerned the nomination ought to be referred to the committee for further study and consideration, and consultation with the President, if in the wisdom of the committee it wishes to do so, but it certainly should not be voted on this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit the nomination.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the roll being called for a yea-and-nay vote or to develop a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is to develop a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I was present when Mr. Meriwether was examined, and took a minor part in questioning him.

Let me start by making two preliminary statements. There is no Member of this body who has a more profound sense of correct legal procedure than the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. He has again and again demonstrated his desire to protect the rights of individuals and to give them the proper safeguards of approved Anglo-Saxon legal procedure.

Similarly, I think no one will question the fact that I have a complete abhorrence for the principles of the Ku Klux Klan. I am certain that this is also the feeling of virtually every Member of this body. I think we should narrow the issues to the evidence as much as we can.

I have seen no evidence to indicate that Mr. Meriwether is now or ever has been a member of the Ku Klux Klan. There is no evidence whatsoever to support such a belief. It is true that he supported Admiral Crommelin in the campaign of 1950; but the evidence is also clear that in the 1950 campaign Admiral Crommelin did not conduct anti-Semitic activities.

There has been some dispute about whether Mr. Meriwether supported Admiral Crommelin in the campaign of 1954, when Admiral Crommelin did conduct an anti-Semitic campaign. Mr. Meriwether denied this under direct examination. I think the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will confirm the fact that, in his judgment, Mr. Meriwether was not an open supporter of Admiral Crommelin at that time. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I remind the Senator that I was the candidate against whom Crommelin was running, and I am certain that Mr. Meriwether was not associated with Admiral Crommelin during that campaign.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the charge which has been made that Mr. Meriwether aided Admiral Crommelin in the anti-Semitic campaign in 1954 seems not to be proven. It is based upon the statement of an anonymous informer, whom I have been trying to locate for some days. I have been unsuccessful in either locating the man or getting him to make a

statement, although I have tried to relay messages to him through intermediaries who are supposed to have access, direct or indirect, to him.

On this score, I think one of the things to which we have always objected has been the testimony of so-called faceless informers, persons who make charges but who are not identified on dossiers and upon whose word, not subject to cross-examination, people are sometimes condemned. This, I think, has been one of the gravest defects in the loyalty proceedings. I have always believed a man should have the right to face his accuser and subject him to cross-examination. If conditions of national security prohibit this, at least the judges in the case should have the right to cross-examine the informer; and if this privilege is not given either to the accused or to the judges, the testimony should not be taken into account.

Therefore, until definitive evidence is produced, my only conclusion is that the contention that Meriwether assisted Crommelin in 1954 is not supported by evidence and seems to be untrue.

In reply to direct questioning which I conducted, Mr. Meriwether stated of the so-called three principles of the Klan—namely, anti-Semitism, anti-Negroism, and anti-Catholicism—that in each case he specifically repudiated any such belief. Then I asked him whether he made these repudiations without mental reservation; and he declared that he did so make them. Of course, it is possible that at the same time he did have mental reservations; but at least he testified publicly that he made those statements without mental reservation; and until evidence to the contrary is produced, I have to take his word.

The new alleged evidence that has been introduced this afternoon is that, in 1947, he was intoxicated and passed a bad check. I do not know whether that is true or not. I have not seen a photostatic copy of the arrest. It would seem to me to be more of a venial than a mortal sin.

When I had to vote on this matter in the committee, I found a number of considerations passing through my mind which prevented me from voting against the nomination. I shall be very frank in discussing them, even though they may cause pain to some.

My mind went back to 1938, when the then Senator from Alabama, Hugo Black, was nominated for membership on the U.S. Supreme Court. Later it developed that Senator Black had not only been elected with the assistance of the Ku Klux Klan, but that at one time he actually had been a member of the Klan. If we had applied such standards to Hugo Black in 1938 and if we had barred him from confirmation as a Justice of the Supreme Court, this Nation would have lost the services of a man whom I regard as one of the most noble Justices in the entire history of our Nation; and one who by his more than 20 years of conduct since then has demonstrated that he has not the slightest element of racial prejudice in him. In fact, he is a militant defender of human freedom for all. I honor and regard him and I am un-

utterably grateful that he has served us for so long.

My mind also went back to a former Member of Congress and one whom I knew in the 1940's. I think he was one of the finest Members of the other body. It developed in 1946, that years before when he was a very young man, he had joined the Klan. Largely as a result of this fact, becoming known he was defeated when he sought reelection; and thus the Nation lost the services of a man whom I regard as a truly fine person.

My mind also went back to 1930, when the name of Justice John J. Parker was before this body, for appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court. Members of the so-called liberal section of the Senate, Senators who then held much the same economic and political opinions, which I do now, prevented the confirmation of his nomination. But he went on to be one of the best circuit judges of the United States. He showed by his life and decisions that he was not anti-Negro nor was he antilabor.

In thinking of all those things, I found it impossible to pass harsh judgment upon this nominee and to vote against the confirmation of his nomination.

I also thought, and in increasing measure have continued during the past days, to think of other persons who at one time or another, either through ignorance or through not quite knowing what the basic issues were, had a tangential relationship with organizations on the so-called left. I have always urged that we treat such cases with mercy and compassion.

On the floor of this body I have defended men who many years prior to their nomination had made injudicious statements which later they repented, and for which, in my judgment, they had atoned by lives of virtue.

I felt that if we apply this standard of mercy and compassion to one set of people, it is not proper to deny it to those who, for one reason or another, become attached to organizations on the so-called right.

Let me say that I think it is undoubtedly true that in the 1958 campaign which Mr. Meriwether managed for the present Governor Patterson, he did accept the help of the grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama. I think it also true that he must have known who that grand dragon was. I think it probable that Mr. Meriwether continued to greet him after Governor Patterson was elected. I think it quite possible that Mr. Meriwether may have shaded the awarding of some contracts in his favor.

So far as the evidence goes, however, I think that is about the worst that can be said about the nominee.

Let me say that we serve here not only as judges, but also as men of the world, and that in the world of justice there is a place for mercy and compassion. I do not wish to brand with disgrace a man who, I think, did make a mistake, and who perhaps persisted a little in that mistake. But I would say that we should not be unduly censorious; and I like to think of the fact that we should

be charitable in the judgments we make, just as we hope the Lord will be charitable to us when we, with all our sins and inadequacies, face him for final judgment. When we ourselves are involved in difficulties, we ask for ourselves not only justice, but also compassion and mercy; and we believe that our friends should be accorded mercy and compassion. Why, then, should we deny mercy to men who have a differing point of view and who may err—and, I think, did err—but who did not err in a fashion so as to alter their fundamental loyalty to this Nation.

Let me say that I yield to no one in my opposition to the Ku Klux Klan and to all the principles for which it stands.

So, Mr. President, although I know that the motion made by the Senator from Oregon—a Senator whom I honor and respect—is addressed primarily to a simple motion to recommit, I do not personally see any reason why we should subject the nominee to further mental torment for an added period of time. I am willing to err—if it be erring—on the side of mercy.

After making this statement, I admit that I may be wrong. I remember that in 1953, when the name of Harold Talbot was before us, the Senator from Oregon exposed the fact that in 1917 and 1918, Mr. Talbot had indulged in very shady practices in connection with the contracts for the DeHaviland-4 airplanes, and that this resulted in the loss of millions of dollars to our Government and the death of many aviators.

The Senator from Oregon, in a very able speech, urged that we refuse to confirm the nomination of Mr. Talbot. I voted to confirm the nomination, because that occurrence had happened 30 years before. I thought men should be given the chance to reform, that 30 years had passed, and I was not going to keep books for as long as that.

It later turned out that the Senator from Oregon was right. Mr. Talbot persisted in some of these unethical cases of conduct, and ultimately had to be forced to resign because he did not distinguish between his private business and his work as Secretary for Air and used his post to feather his own nest.

The Senator from Oregon may again be right in this instance. I am not one to say he is wrong. I can simply say I believe that if we do err, we should err on the side of mercy and on the side of compassion; and because of that belief, I am going to vote against recommitting the nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no speech to make. I merely wish to say to the Senate that I have listened to the confession this afternoon. I wish an equal degree of grace and charity had been exercised when the name of Adm. Lewis Strauss had been before the Senate. I am not going to make that mistake in the first instance, and I shall vote not to recommit this nomination to committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make at this time a statement I had overlooked making previously.

Last night in my office, I was called by Mr. Mike Manatos, of the White House

staff, who said the President had asked him to call me to see if it was possible for Mr. Manatos to visit me in connection with the nomination. I told him I would be delighted to see him.

Mr. Manatos came to my office. He was there for 15 minutes. He had some penciled handwritten excerpts which he said he had taken from the FBI reports. He read those excerpts to me. When he got through reading them, I pointed out that they did not bear upon the issue I had raised, and said I would like to know whether or not the FBI reports contained any information on the questions I had raised in regard to the character of the nominee. He said he did not know. I then told him that our conference could not help in finding out the facts in regard to the nominee. I suggested that he make a report to the President that something be worked out whereby we could have some assurance as to what is contained in the FBI reports in regard to these allegations. I said we owed it to the nominee to try to clarify the situation if the facts warranted clarification.

I pause only to say to my dear friend from Illinois, whose judgment he knows always carries great weight with me, that in this instance I do not follow him. To do so, it seems to me, we would almost have to eliminate entirely the character criterion as one of the criteria we should apply under the advise-and-consent clause, and we might as well take the position that we will leave it up to the President, and not go into the character qualifications at all.

As I said before, it is unpleasant to raise this question, but I want to point out that the transcript of the Hugo Black hearings, when the Black appointment was before the Senate committee, is quite a different transcript of record from the one made by this nominee. It was a record of great accomplishment as a U.S. Senator. When personal charges were raised against Black, he bared his chest, so to speak. Without any reservation whatsoever, Hugo Black told his position to his everlasting credit.

That was one of the very early radio programs of that kind in our country, and how we sat glued to our chairs, close to our radios, listening to the moving statement by the great Hugo Black.

I only want to say to my dear friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that I do not think the two cases are even in the same category.

Furthermore, may I say the only question we have to determine is whether or not we think, with respect to this criteria, in a given instance, that there may be such a defect in character that the public interest would be endangered. It is a hard decision to make.

I do not yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] or anyone else in leaning over backward and giving the benefit of the doubt to an individual, but I think we should know what the facts are. All I am asking is that we know what the facts are.

I have not gone into the substantive matters, and I do not intend to address myself to them. I know what the contention is by his supporters and friends

as to what happened, but I think the facts ought to be presented to the committee, and not here on the floor of the Senate in open debate.

In fairness to everyone concerned, the question of character ought to be gone into in the committee room and be considered there, because it has been raised, as the hearings showed, in the committee. And that is why I have made the motion I have made.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I hesitate to impose upon the patience of my colleagues, and I suppose I could delay my remarks on the nomination until after this vote. However, as a member of the committee, I think I have an obligation to make my position known before the vote on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

As some of my colleagues may have noted, when the vote was taken in committee I withheld my vote. I did so because at the time the vote was taken I had not heard or read all of the testimony that had been taken, and I refused to take a position until I had the benefit of that testimony. I feel that at this point, before any vote is taken, I should make the decision which was made by my colleagues on the committee, by indicating publicly what my position is.

As the discussion this afternoon makes clear, a vote on a Presidential nomination is not a matter to be entered into lightly. All of us, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon has pointed out, have a very special obligation to examine with care any nomination presented to us for our advice and consent. The obligation to be absolutely fair and, insofar as possible, objective applies to those cases in which we may disagree with the nominee as well as to those cases in which the nominee has our enthusiastic support.

In the case of the President's nomination of Mr. Meriwether to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, I am confronted by a choice in respect to a man with whom I disagree on the crucial issue of civil rights. I am also confronted by a special responsibility as a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

On March 2, the date of the hearing on Mr. Meriwether's nomination, as I have said, I was unavoidably detained during the morning session of the committee. As a result, I was unable to benefit from the close and careful examination of the nominee conducted by the senior Senator from New York. Under the circumstances, and in view of the controversy surrounding the nomination, I did not consider it wise for me to take a position.

I have since had an opportunity to examine the record in detail, and on the basis of information contained therein I have reached my decision.

If I were to vote today in committee, on the basis of that testimony, I would vote to support the President's nomination of Mr. Meriwether. I take this position recognizing that I do not agree with Mr. Meriwether's position on seg-

regation, nor do I approve the program of his party organization in Alabama on the civil rights question.

I do not contend that this is an outstanding appointment. I say that the President has, after due deliberation and examination of the record, nominated Mr. Meriwether.

I point out at this moment that after the President indicated his intention to nominate Mr. Meriwether several weeks passed, weeks during which the President was given ample warning that it was a controversial nomination, and weeks during which, I assume, the President took extraordinary care to check upon the qualifications of this nominee.

On the record of the hearings, which is the record upon which as a committee member I have to indicate my position, I find no evidence to justify denying consent to the President's nomination.

Serious objections have been raised to Mr. Meriwether's nomination on at least two grounds. The first objection is that as an exponent of segregation in Alabama he would not vote to administer the Export-Import Bank, or the loans of the Export-Import Bank, in line with U.S. policy prohibiting segregation in Federal institutions and agencies and encouraging development of countries in the nonwhite areas of the world. The second objection is that his political associations with certain extremist, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic persons disqualify him from consideration for this important post.

On the first point, I think it must be said Mr. Meriwether acquitted himself with integrity in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. He did not deny or seek to gloss over his attitude on such questions as school integration in Alabama and in other Southern States. On this issue I must repeat that I disagree with him, and I am perfectly happy to refer the Senate to the record.

At the same time, under strong questioning by the senior Senator from New York he stated very emphatically that he would obey the laws and regulations of the Federal Government on nonsegregation in Federal agencies and that he would not allow his decisions to be influenced by integration questions in other countries which may seek assistance from the Export-Import Bank.

Indeed, his statement on noninterference in domestic questions in countries seeking loans from the Export-Import Bank is exemplary.

On the question of Mr. Meriwether's political associations, it must be said, regrettably, that the attempt to disqualify him on these grounds approaches accusations of guilt by association. I cannot agree with or condone such a position. I react against it when it is used against people who share my religious background or my political background, and I react against it when it is used against those who have a different background from my own.

On the issue of Admiral Crommelin, it has not been demonstrated in any way that Mr. Meriwether was associated with him during or after the admiral made anti-Semitic remarks.

It has not been demonstrated that Mr. Meriwether had a close association with Mr. Shelton, the alleged head of the Alabama Ku Klux Klan.

In addition, there is no evidence that Mr. Meriwether is or ever was a member of the Klan.

There have been other allegations relative to Mr. Meriwether's previous activities or experience. No proof was submitted to support these allegations, and consequently very little weight can be attached to them.

I was as aware as anyone else in the Senate, from the moment the President indicated his intention to nominate Mr. Meriwether, that this would be a controversial nomination. I was aware of and read very carefully every word which was written to substantiate the allegations. I expected that as a result of the days and weeks of this kind of open discussion, frank discussion, and blunt discussion, the members of the committee would be given a full case not only by those who supported the nomination, but also by those who opposed it.

I refer my colleagues of the Senate to the statement in the report of the hearings that nobody asked to be heard against the nomination of Mr. Meriwether. Oh, we received anonymous documents of one kind or another, calling our attention to accusations made in the public press, but not a scrap of evidence was adduced in the committee by anyone to support these accusations, in my judgment.

I can only make up my mind on the same basis on which I should like others to make up their minds about me. I wish to be fair. I wish to be factual. I wish to be objective. I am not going to make a decision on the basis of anything else but the facts and the evidence as presented to us.

I repeat, I do not regard this as a strong nomination or a strong appointment. I think there are other men who might have been selected. I am sure there are other men who could have been selected who would be able to fill the post more effectively and more adequately. But I find nothing in the record of the hearings to justify opposition to the appointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to recommit to the Committee on Banking and Currency the nomination of Mr. Charles M. Meriwether to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PELL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is also detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 66, as follows:

[Ex. No. 2]		
YEAS—18		
Carroll	Javits	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Keating	Scott
Clark	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Miller	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Neuberger	Young, Ohio
NAYS—66		
Allott	Eastland	Mansfield
Anderson	Ellender	McClellan
Bartlett	Engle	McGee
Beall	Ervin	McNamara
Bennett	Fong	Metcalf
Bible	Fulbright	Moss
Boggs	Gore	Mundt
Bridges	Hart	Muskie
Burdick	Hartke	Pastore
Butler	Hayden	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hickey	Russell
Cannon	Hill	Schoeppe
Carlson	Holland	Smith, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Sparkman
Chavez	Humphrey	Stennis
Church	Jackson	Symington
Cooper	Johnston	Talmadge
Curtis	Kefauver	Thurmond
Dirksen	Kerr	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Yarborough
Douglas	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
NOT VOTING—16		
Aiken	Kuchel	Pell
Blakley	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Bush	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Capehart	McCarthy	Smathers
Goldwater	Monroney	
Jordan	Morton	

So Mr. JAVITS' motion was rejected.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE AT 2 P.M. TOMORROW ON NOMINATION OF CHARLES M. MERIWETHER TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have consulted with the distinguished minority leader, and I have also discussed the matter with various members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and other Senators who are interested in the proposal. With their consent, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock tomorrow, March 8, the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination of Charles M. Meriwether to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather from the Senator's statement that there will be no other votes and no other business, aside from discussion, for the rest of the day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. Any Senator who wishes to go home may do so.

ADDITIONAL WASTE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week I submitted to the Senate evidence of waste in the Army and Navy under the present antique and disjointed organization of the Department of Defense.

Today, I present evidence of comparable waste in the Air Force.

I have here several reports; the first is a study of the cost of excess proficiency flying.

Proficiency flying is defined by the Defense Department as flying by rated personnel "primarily to maintain basic flying skills while serving in assignments where such skills would not normally be maintained in the performance of assigned duties."

Of the approximate 72,000 rated officers in the Air Force, 27,000 have been judged as being either excess to the requirement for flying officers, or in assignments which do not require current flying skills.

But the Air Force provides proficiency flying for these 27,000 officers, and in so doing will spend \$183 million in this fiscal year, alone. Unless this situation is corrected, obviously corresponding amounts will be wasted in subsequent years.

Of this \$183 million, \$112 million goes to pay for the maintenance and operation of the aircraft employed; the remaining \$71 million is for unnecessary flight pay.

There are additional costs, not so readily measurable. These include diversion of officers' time from primary duties, acquisition and maintenance of ground support equipment, and the countless administrative duties incident to maintaining aircraft individual flying records and arranging flight schedules.

Actually, if rated personnel acknowledged by the Air Force to be excess to requirements were not required to fly, hundreds of millions of dollars could be saved over a comparatively short period; and this saving could be more than doubled if flying requirements for rated personnel were established only when they were in positions where maintenance of current flying proficiency is a requisite for effective performance.

Rated officers who increase their incomes through proficiency flying function in budget, motion pictures, food service, fuel supply, and electronic data processing departments and as lawyers, dentists, mathematicians, physicists, chemists, auditors, and chaplains.

Most of the officers filling these positions are specialists, trained in nonflying fields, without any need for maintaining current flying proficiency in order to perform in their fields of specialization.

Many officers receiving flying pay have not actually flown planes themselves for years. In such cases, subordinates do the flying while the officer in question works or rests in the back of the plane.

At a time when an increasing percentage of the strategic and tactical missions of the Air Force calls for proficiency in jet aircraft, or in the new field of missiles, it is noted that over 40 percent of the total hours flown for proficiency flying last year was in C-47 World War II cargo-type aircraft.

The Air Force also maintains a practice of "familiarization" flying. This practice adds further unnecessary expense, enabling some 1,200 officers, who are pending retirement or separation, to qualify for flight pay by flying 4 hours per month.

Another report which I have here reviews Air Force practices and procedures in procuring ground communication electronic equipment.

This study shows a lack of effective program control, and little semblance of accurate determination of valid requirements for this type of equipment.

Procedures were found to be inadequate for controlling and terminating excess procurement.

Field reporting of inventory was found unreliable.

During the conduct of its review, the General Accounting Office reported a number of excesses on the contracts; and as a result the Air Force canceled large orders for unneeded equipment.

In a third study, substantial waste of funds was found because of inefficient award of defense contracts on a non-competitive basis.

All of us know there are conditions where procurement by advertised bidding is either impractical or inappropriate; and, therefore, the Congress has authorized the military departments to place

contracts through negotiation, under specified circumstances.

But it was found that insufficient care is frequently taken in such negotiations.

In one study it was found that reasonable prices were not negotiated; and as a result the taxpayer lost many millions of dollars—\$17 million on but 14 cases examined.

In other cases where prices were negotiated without proper consideration of available information, selling prices of \$58,700,000 exceeded costs by \$13,800,000—about 30 percent.

It is all too clear that uniform standards, plus centralized procurement policy control, would result in the saving of billions of dollars.

The three reports presented today are but samples or illustrations which reveal but a small part of the nonsubmerged portion of the iceberg of operating waste characteristic of the functioning of the Department of Defense.

Nevertheless, we have not yet looked at, or spoken of, the place where the greatest amount of waste is to be found; namely, in the duplication of weapons systems.

These examples are not presented as a reflection on any individual or service. They have simply translated into dollars and cents the inevitable waste and mismanagement which result when an organization is rooted in the traditions of the prenuclear space age.

Again I congratulate the Comptroller General and his staff for their constructive contribution to good government, through the exposure of all this unnecessary waste.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as the Senator from Missouri knows, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. That appropriation amounts, yearly, to \$41 billion, amounting to \$11 billion more than the cost of the rest of Government. When the Senator from Missouri enunciates his remarks, I know he is addressing himself to a subject about which he knows something. I am positive of that. I could tell him of many instances of waste. I call to his attention in particular the matter of retired generals and retired admirals working in civilian capacities in the Pentagon. I do not think that should be. If they are retired, why should they be employed in the same department as civilians?

I understand what the Senator is driving at, and I appreciate his statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first I congratulate the Senator from Missouri for his statement this afternoon on what is a continuing source of waste in the Air Force. We all know of the ability with which the Senator from Missouri served as Secretary of the Air Force. It so happens that about 10 years ago I criticized the widespread practice of ground officers being passengers in airplanes for a few hours a month and then being paid flight pay. At that time there was some promise of administrative reform.

I think the Senator from New Mexico has performed a great public service in making his statement. The wastes in this item alone, I am sure, run into the tens of millions of dollars each year in the form of pay to chaplains, dentists, doctors, and others. I believe doctors get a double bonus. They get a bonus as doctors, and then they get a bonus as aviators. Supply officers, who are really not aviators, have, nevertheless, been getting flight pay.

This is a matter which needs to be taken care of, and the Senator from Missouri has performed a great public service.

I am also delighted he has called attention to the abuses in the case of negotiated contracts and has called for a larger degree of competitive bidding. The facts are that during the year 1959, as I remember, 86 percent of the dollar volume of contracts in the Defense Department were let under negotiated bidding, not competitive bidding. The Comptroller General, who, I think, is one of the great public servants of all time, as was his predecessor, Lindsey Warren, has filed report after report pointing out the abuses.

I am happy to say that, in response to conversation, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, invited a group of us, including Representative McCORMACK, Representative CURRIS, and Representative HÉBERT, to meet last week, and showed a great degree of cooperation and said it was the intention of the Defense Department markedly to reduce the percentage of negotiated contracts and, therefore, to increase the percentage of competitively bid contracts; and he gave evidence of so intending. But, Mr. President, prodding from the legislative branch is always helpful in overcoming inertia on the part of the bureaucracy.

This testimony, coming from one known for his knowledge of Air Force matters, as well as a defender of that branch of the service, as some others of us are defenders of other branches of the service, is extremely helpful; and I want to congratulate the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure the Senator from Illinois knows there is no one from whom I would appreciate more receiving those observations about the few remarks I have made. The reports issued by the Comptroller General, to which the Senator has referred, have been very valuable, and I share with the Senator the high respect he has for the ability of this official. The reports show clearly that in the Air Force, Army, and Navy, we are wasting many hundreds of millions of dollars because of the current organization in the Pentagon. The greatest savings, I am convinced, are to be found through the elimination of duplication in weapons systems, because the duplication incident to letting each service try to put itself in a position to handle future trouble by itself has cost the taxpayer and is costing the taxpayer many billions of dollars. I thank the able Senator from Illinois for his comments.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR JOSEPH R. GRUNDY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am grieved to report to the Senate that over the last weekend there died, at the age of 98, the Honorable Joseph Richard Grundy, a former Member of the Senate and a very distinguished Pennsylvanian, a man full of years and honor. I say on behalf of myself and the members of the delegation in the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania that we mourn the passing of a most distinguished figure in Pennsylvania life, in its industry, and in its political affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an article on Mr. Grundy's death.

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

JOSEPH GRUNDY DIES IN NASSAU—50-YEAR POWER IN GOP WAS 98

Former U.S. Senator Joseph Ridgway Grundy, a leading power in the State and national Republican Party for more than five decades, died yesterday in Nassau in the Bahamas.

He died quietly at 3:30 p.m. after a 2-week illness which confined him to bed in his winter home. He had been there since December 1.

Since retirement from active politics in the late 1940's, the Senator, who was 98 and a bachelor, spent his time at Nassau, Ocean City, N.J., and in Bristol Township.

SERVICES MONDAY

His body will be flown back today for services at noon Monday at the Grundy family home, Walnut Grove Farm, on Neshaminy Creek. Burial will be private.

Senator Grundy, a Bristol industrialist whose estate is estimated at more than \$10 million, was the founder and first president of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association.

This is the organization that brought him national prominence as a congressional lobbyist.

Once in the national eye, his name became linked with old guard Republicanism which some politicians and political scientists often call "Grundyism."

FOUGHT FOR HIGH TARIFFS

His fight was constantly for high tariffs and low taxes which, he said, were next to religion with him.

He bitterly opposed James H. Duff's candidacy for U.S. Senate in 1948. Duff won and Grundy decided to leave the active scene.

However, he always had a keen interest in politics and candidates.

Until his recent illness, he was never in poor health, his doctors said, although at times he would enter hospitals for physical checkups and rests. The doctors said he had amazing stamina.

The Senator showed this kind of stamina all through his life, especially as the tough-minded political boss of the Grundy machine which controlled Pennsylvania politics for years.

TRAINED IN POLITICS BY FATHER

Senator Grundy's career in Pennsylvania politics began, like his business career, at the ground level.

He was trained in practical politics by his father, sitting in whenever the elder Grundy held conferences with the Republican leaders of his day.

His careful and practical approach found a parallel in his day-to-day work in the

woolen business. After a year in college he went to work first in the sorting room and then on through the mill until he knew every facet of the intricate manufacturing process.

LIFELONG HIGH TARIFF MAN

It was no accident that the two careers converged in a lifelong belief in the importance of American business and in the high protective tariff.

Nor was it an accident that in both lines of endeavor, he worked with earnestness, caution, a soft voice which could take on a firm edge, and with a clear sense of decision.

He was a meticulous dresser and his manners matched his attire. Mostly he wore dark business suits with white or striped shirts and collars to match. For years he wore high-topped, buttoned shoes. He was slightly above middle height and stocky, with a round, pink-cheeked face and a thatch of white hair neatly parted on the left side.

SOFT VOICE AND TWINKLING EYE

He greeted people in a soft voice and with a warm twinkle in his blue eyes—eyes that were sharply aware behind his white metal-rimmed glasses.

To his associates he was "Senator" or "Mr. Grundy" and at times in the political world he was called "Uncle Joe."

Senator Grundy never married. He made his home in a mansion on the Delaware River front in Bristol with a sister, Miss Margaret R. Grundy, who died February 1, 1952, at the age of 86.

He was born in Camden, N.J., on January 13, 1863, the son of William H. and Mary Lamb Grundy.

He attended the public schools in Philadelphia and then entered Swarthmore College. Immediately on leaving college he went into the worsted mills at Bristol to learn the business.

In 1887 he was admitted to partnership, and in time he bought out the interests of the partners, changing the firm's name in 1920 from Grundy Brothers & Co. to Grundy & Co. Inc., with himself as president.

BUILDPUP IN POLITICS

But long before that, from his start at the precinct level, he had built himself up in Republican politics in Bucks County until he was looked on as a power there and by degrees a power in Pennsylvania.

His political activities were not directed toward office seeking, however. At almost any time over a period of 30 years he could have had any office within the gift of the voters of his county. But the only post he ever held was that of councilman from the second ward of Bristol. He was a member for 45 years and rarely missed a meeting; he had to give it up when he was appointed to the Senate.

ONLY ONE REVOLT IN COUNTY

Until the incoming of Democratic voters in later years, the only serious revolt that threatened him in Bucks County came in 1927, when he sponsored a movement to supplant the old volunteer fire department in Bristol with a part-paid department. The volunteers resented this, and as an outgrowth of the row the Grundy ticket was opposed in the September primary. Only one council seat was lost by the Grundy faction.

From the period around 1910, on down the years, his political influence spread gradually and with accumulating power beyond the confines of Bucks County.

He operated quietly, but leader after leader in various of the 67 counties became known as "Grundy men." His voice swayed elections for mayor and other offices in Philadelphia, and for members of the legislature and Governor as well. In time Republicans in many other States were listening to his forthright espousal of the high tariff.

ORGANIZED MANUFACTURERS

A spearhead of his political power was the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association.

Not long after the turn of the century a strong movement grew up to tax the manufacturers of Pennsylvania. To fight this, Mr. Grundy organized the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. He became its first president.

He remained in this office until 1930, when he went to the U.S. Senate. At that time he gave up the presidency and became chairman of the board, retiring finally from that post and from the PMA in any official capacity in 1947. By that time the reins were firmly in the hands of the late G. Mason Owlett as president. Owlett was a former Republican leader of the State senate and a national committeeman, a post he held until his death in January 1957.

WAS CLOSE TO PENROSE

As the Grundy influence grew in national politics he found himself drawn close to Pennsylvania's U.S. Senator Boles Penrose. Out of this association came Mr. Grundy's first visible entrance into the national political arena.

He and Penrose worked hand in hand in the strategy—including the historic "smoke-filled room" operation—that resulted in the election in 1920 of Warren G. Harding as President.

That year the Pennsylvania delegation to the Republican National Convention was uninstructed—as it has been in many a Presidential year—but the delegates agreed to support their "favorite son," Gov. William S. Sproul. Philadelphia's Mayor J. Hampton Moore was to deliver the nomination speech for Sproul.

WOOD-LOWDEN DEADLOCK

A 3-day deadlock between Gen. Leonard Wood and Gov. Frank S. Lowden, of Illinois, developed with California's Senator Hiram W. Johnson also in the play.

In the heat of this, friction between Mr. Grundy and U.S. Senator William E. Crow, chairman of the Pennsylvania delegation, burst into flame.

They stood face-to-face, and the mild Quaker Grundy defied and denounced Senator Crow. He demanded that the delegation desert Sproul and go over to another candidate. It was a forerunner of the predicament often faced by Pennsylvania's vote-laden delegation to the GOP's national conventions.

The upshot was the famous "smoke-filled" pow-wow and the decision to concentrate on Warren G. Harding. The decision was made in Chicago's Blackstone Hotel, still the scene of similar if less dramatic occasions. In 1920 Mr. Grundy was one of the conferees.

MISSING ONLY TWO CONVENTIONS

It has been noted—as it was then—that Bucks County's Grundy had been a delegate to the 1896 national convention that nominated William McKinley. He was on hand at every convention thereafter with the exception of the ones in 1940 and 1952.

After 1920, only a half dozen years went by—years of politicking and lobbying for high tariffs and low taxes on industry—before Mr. Grundy was in the national lime-light again.

This came in 1926, when Philadelphia's boss, William S. Vare, was elected to the U.S. Senate after a violent Republican primary contest with George Wharton Pepper, the latter supported by the Grundy faction. Mr. Grundy also had supported John S. Fisher for the governorship of Pennsylvania. Fisher was elected.

The Senate refused to seat Vare because of alleged excessive expenses in the primary.

Governor Fisher then appointed Mr. Grundy to serve out Vare's unexpired term.

DEFEATED IN BID FOR FULL TERM

But running for election to a full term, he was defeated in the G.O.P. primary of 1930 by the late James J. Davis, then Secretary of Labor in President Hoover's Cabinet. Davis had the support of the Vare organization in Philadelphia.

Senator Grundy followed the sun in his last years by spending winters in Nassau at his estate "Jacaranda," and his summers at Ocean City, N.J., where he had a house on St. James Place.

Between winter and summer, he always spent some time at his mansion overlooking the Delaware at 610 Radcliffe Street, in Bristol.

He was once the publisher of the old Bristol Courier. He also became a president of Farmer's National Bank and the Bristol Trust Co. before its merger with Fidelity-Philadelphia.

HIS ORGANIZATIONS

Besides his local industrial and financial activities, Senator Grundy was a director of the Bucks County Historical Society, a member of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and the Baronial Order of Magna Charta.

His membership at the Union League was as long as his political past. He was also a member of the Philadelphia Country Club more than 50 years.

The Senator's closest survivor is a second cousin, Mrs. James H. Emack, of Merion.

SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET SUBJUGATION OF RUMANIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday was the 16th anniversary of the brutal subjugation of Rumania by the Soviet Union. I was reminded of this anniversary by a letter I received from Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Romanians.

In my judgment, this letter contains many sound observations about the Soviet stooge governments of Eastern Europe and the policy that ought to be followed with respect to them.

The plight of the good people of Rumania is indistinguishable from that of the freedom-loving people of the other captive nations. No good conscience in the free world will rest easy until our enslaved Rumanian brothers are free.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter with personal references deleted, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE LEAGUE OF FREE ROMANIANS,
New York, N.Y., March 2, 1961.

HON. THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senator from Connecticut.

DEAR SENATOR: We will be deeply grateful if you could mention in the Senate the sad anniversary, the 6th of March, of 16 years since Rumania has been subjugated by the Soviet Union. We believe that beside the wide humanitarian interest, there is a more immediate concern in not forgetting the fact of enslavement and its consequences. As grave as the nuclear preoccupation may be, it should not obscure the issue of freedom, in which lies ultimately the solution for a peaceful world.

The imposing in Rumania through military force of a Soviet stooge government on March 6, 1945, in the wake of Allied cooperation and pledges of democratic pro-

cedures, is part of the same system, which after disrupting Europe and Asia, is now busy undermining and disrupting Latin America and Africa. The pledges proclaimed at Yalta for the freedom of Eastern Europe have been flagrantly violated. The same pledges undertaken through the United Nations Charter have been less obviously but also continuously infringed. As a matter of fact, one can say that the story of the United Nations is, in the main, a sequence of the more or less successful Russian infringements of the principles of the charter. What has been the attitude of the West during this period?

Looking back, the expansion of Soviet power in Rumania, Germany, and the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, has been possible because of Western political weakness and final acquiescence in every Russian aggressive move or demand.

This acquiescence in the subjugation of Rumania and the other east European countries, has not been dictated by any imperious necessity; but ultimately by the ever present wishful illusion that in placating the Russians by ceding to their demands, a foundation will be laid for a true understanding and peace assured. Everything that has happened since 1945 has shown the utter fallacy of such a view, but unfortunately this same fallacy seems to still motivate certain actions of the U.S. Government.

In the case of Rumania, after recognizing the Communist puppet government, in 1947 the United States signed a peace treaty with it and brought it into the United Nations in 1955. The United States has recently even concluded a cultural agreement with this non-representative government. Despite such American endorsements the Communist puppet regime in Bucharest is following its Soviet preestablished course of action. It performs every Soviet directive, votes in the United Nations on Soviet orders, works through their diplomatic corps, especially in Latin America and Europe, for Soviet subversive objectives. In Rumania the same ruthless political persecution and suppression of freedom and human rights continues as in former years.

The only effect of a policy of recognition and collaboration with stooge governments, is to help entrench Communist domination in the countries themselves, thus furthering Moscow's plans. If this were the aim of the U.S. Government, well and good, but if it is not, then it is high time to revise the tenor of the present policy toward Soviet stooge governments. Western pampering of the Soviet puppets and helping them to gain international respectability, have encouraged the Russians to increase their demands and threats. Nothing would help to restrain Russia in her expanding aggressive drive as much as reversing the present policy, by divesting the Soviet pawns of their undeserved aura of independent governments. Treated openly and on all occasions as the unrepresentative, Moscow dominated regimes they are, their usefulness for the Russian world power policies would largely diminish.

Moreover, their ensuing loss of prestige inside the subjugated countries themselves would create new problems for the Kremlin. We believe that such a course would be of more benefit to the United States than any amity programs with Communist governments.

We warmly thank you for anything you can say on this sad occasion in support of the oppressed Rumanian people and their legitimate aspirations for liberty and national independence.

I remain,

Yours respectfully,

MIHAIL FARCASANU,

President.

ACTIVITIES OF OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on March 1, the Secretary of the Interior submitted a report to the Senate on the activities of the Office of Saline Water.

This is pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 448 of the 82d Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1961.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Saline Water Act of 1952 (Public Law 448, 82d Cong., 2d sess., as amended) requires the Secretary of the Interior to make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session. Inasmuch as the operations of the Department of the Interior during the year 1960 were carried out under the direction of the previous administration, I have asked the staff of the Office of Saline Water to summarize the activities of that Office for purposes of this report.

STAFF REPORT—SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES FOR 1960 OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

The activities of the Office are carried out under three divisions: Research, Processes Development, and Demonstration. The demonstration plant construction program is authorized by Public Law 85-883.

The Office of Saline Water has continued its efforts to stimulate interest in the development of low-cost saline water conversion processes among private research and industrial firms. Meetings have been held with representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, National Science Foundation, Department of State, International Cooperation Administration, and the United Nations Special Fund. Within the Department of the Interior, active assistance is received from the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Mines, and Geological Survey.

The American Chemical Society requested the Office of Saline Water to sponsor jointly with them an annual symposium on saline water conversion. The first of this series was held during March of 1960 with approximately 300 scientists and engineers in attendance. In December of 1960 the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, in cooperation with the Office of Saline Water, sponsored a similar symposium. Members of the staff also participated in a number of other scientific or professional meetings.

The fundamental research activities carried out by the Division of Research have produced good and useful results and new knowledge has been developed which has led to new or improved conversion processes. Twenty-two fundamental and applied research investigations were supported during the past year. Those investigations ranged from theoretical studies on behavior of ions in aqueous solutions, through studies of potential processes or phenomena for converting saline water up to the operation of laboratory prototypes. In order to assure continued progress toward the low-cost goals of the program, greater emphasis must be placed on fundamental research to develop successful solutions to many difficult technological problems. Further research can provide the knowledge to substantially improve existing processes and also holds

promise of developing entirely new methods which may permit the attainment of a major breakthrough.

"The research data obtained from the laboratory investigations of Division of Research are translated into bench-scale equipment, and complete pilot plants to obtain applied research data by the Division of Processes Development. In this division, 38 research and development contracts were active during the past year.

"Saline water conversion has advanced to include a number of different processes. Major groups are: (1) Distillation with the use of fuels; (2) solar-heat distillation; (3) membrane processes; (4) separation by freezing; and (5) other chemical, electrical, or physical conversion methods. There are a number of different processes in each major group.

"In general, the distillation processes are the most advanced today because they have been under development for a much longer period of time than other methods. Pilot equipment is being operated on sea water to develop methods of scale control—a major problem in all distillation cycles. Laboratory development of several different distillation processes is underway. Solar distillation pilot units are being operated to determine ways of reducing capital costs. Research and development work is being carried out at the Bureau of Reclamation Laboratories in Denver, Colo., on electrodialysis. During the past year a major part of the development effort has been on freezing processes. This new approach to the economical conversion of saline water to fresh has only recently reached the pilot plant stage of development. A 15,000-gallon-per-day pilot plant using one type of freezing process is now operating on sea water at Wrightsville Beach, N.C. A 35,000-gallon-per day pilot plant to further develop another type of freezing process is nearing completion at St. Petersburg, Fla.

"In accordance with the timetable established by the Congress, five processes and sites have been selected for the demonstration plant program. Three of the plants were designed and construction contracts have been awarded. The design of the fourth plant has been started and a contract for the design of the fifth plant will be negotiated early in 1961.

"Based on the Office of Saline Water cost estimating procedure, it is estimated that the three plants now under construction will produce fresh water at approximately \$1 per thousand gallons. Plants now being constructed utilize the most promising of the presently known processes. However, the size of the plants now being erected are not large enough to adequately demonstrate the full economic potentials of the selected processes.

"In order to gainfully utilize the technology now being developed in the demonstration plant program, large scale plants should now be designed and built to produce fresh water from the sea. Engineering projections indicate that the product water from such plants may cost less than 50 cents per thousand gallons. The design of additional demonstration plants would be based on variations of existing processes and new processes still under development. This should be carried forward as a cooperative endeavor with States and municipalities that now face severe or impending water problems.

"Under present legislation, the Office of Saline Water is authorized to conduct a research program only through fiscal year 1963. If the Congress approves the present modest budget request of \$1,755,000 for research and development work, the remaining unappropriated balance of the \$10 million authorization approved by the Congress in 1956 will be only \$702,000. Unless new legislation is approved by the Congress, the research and development program will,

of necessity, be sharply curtailed during the next fiscal year and then expire at the end of that year.

"Legislation to enlarge and extend the authorization of the Office of Saline Water is being studied by the Department. Basic and applied research on saline water conversion cannot be completed in the foreseeable future and large production plants are necessary to gain necessary operating experience. In a program as crucial as the development of low-cost demineralization of water promises to become, there will always be a necessity for continued improvements on existing processes. With each passing year the program will undoubtedly become increasingly important to the future well-being of the Nation and the world. It seems only prudent, therefore, to seek an indefinite extension of the program and a fiscal authorization to allow an increase in appropriations comparable with emerging water problems.

"More detailed information is contained in the 'Saline Water Conversion Report for 1960' of the Office of Saline Water."

Comprehensive surveys are now underway to determine the specific requirements of an adequate program. However, it is readily apparent that this important program should be continued on an expanded basis. As soon as these studies are completed, we will provide the Congress with our recommendations and detailed justification for a dynamic program.

With warm regards, I am,
Faithfully yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership that tomorrow the Senate immediately go into executive session, so that all Senators who wish to speak on the Meriwether nomination will have the opportunity to do so.

Should there be a lapse before 2 o'clock, the Senate can go into legislative matters, so that other matters can be taken care of as in the morning hour.

THE UDALL PUBLIC LAND FREEZE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on March 2 the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an Interior Department press release and a letter from Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall. The Udall letter is in reply to an earlier communication sent to him by Senators GORDON ALLOTT, HENRY DWORSHAK, BARRY GOLDWATER, and myself.

So that the RECORD will be complete, I ask unanimous consent that the February 14 letter and the March 3 letter of the four Senators be included in the RECORD following my remarks. Those Senators who may believe that Congress still has a role to play in public land matters may find them of some interest.

The Secretary of Interior's public lands freeze has the effect of creating a vast 180 million acre wilderness area in the Western United States for the next 18 months. This was done without congressional approval. Moreover, it was done without either notice or public hearings. If it is "unfortunate" to "immediately criticize" such unprecedented action, then I can only conclude that Congress has totally abdicated its responsibility over our public lands and that we now have a Government by Executive order.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1961.

HON. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We vigorously protest the recent Interior Department order dated February 14 which locks up 180 million acres of public domain land. This order is hasty and ill-advised, and will be extremely detrimental to all Western States. In effect, it establishes a "no new starts" policy in public land development for the next 18 months.

Your recent press release on this matter indicates that this freeze for 18 months is invoked against all of the Western States except Alaska. With one stroke of your pen, you have unilaterally suspended a major portion of the public land laws enacted by the U.S. Congress. All future applications submitted by individuals for public lands have thus been rendered null and void, in at least the following instances: homesteads, desert entries, public sales (including second proviso sales), small tracts, private recreation, and private applications for public purposes.

This unprecedented step was taken without any notice; there were no hearings. In fact, none of the procedural safeguards supposedly embraced in the concept of due process of law was observed. Our constituents, who are vitally concerned with administration of the public domain, were conspicuously ignored.

The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall control the public lands. Your unilateral executive edict not only skirts around the Constitution, but it also circumvents the expressed will of Congress. No bills were submitted by your Department requesting authority from the Congress to suspend existing law.

Moreover, your order places an 18-month freeze on growth in major areas of the West which are greatly dependent on the public domain. It disrupts the orderly development of our public lands and will create a colossal 18-month backlog of public land applications. It discriminates against the West and may well contribute to the creation of "depressed areas" all over the western United States.

The reason given for this drastic action is that the freeze will bar the activities of certain "unethical promoters." Where a scalpel was clearly prescribed to cure this troublesome malady, you have used a guillotine. Such radical meat-ax surgery on the Western States is uncalled for when specific remedies are readily available.

The act of June 28, 1934, known as the Taylor Grazing Act, section 7, states:

"Provided that upon the application of any applicant qualified to make entry, selection of location, under the public land laws, filed in the land office of the proper district, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause any tract to be classified, and such application, if allowed by the Secretary of the Interior,

shall entitle the applicant to a preference right to enter selection."

The preamble of this act says:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the highest use of the public lands and pending its final disposal."

In view of these congressional mandates, we request a more clear definition of your authority.

Your release indicated that unethical locators have abused the privilege of filing for lands. This is true in three States, California, Nevada, and Arizona. Positive action was taken by the past administration to correct these practices. Portions of southern California were withdrawn by decisions where classification indicated the lands were not suitable, but this was after classification, not before. The problem in Nevada has been compounded by the Pittman Act, of which you are aware, and the fact that nonresidents of that State may apply for desert entries. Legislation to modify this was proposed by the previous administration, but Congress took no action.

Private exchanges of land to improve the land pattern and to bloc up classifying lands are needed. Separate allotments and range adjudications require these exchanges. Will these be delayed for another 18 months under this freeze? Exchanges are necessary in many instances to provide access to public lands for hunting, fishing, picnic areas, and other recreational needs. Are these necessary actions to be held in a deep freeze until September 1, 1962?

Two bills which would have permitted sales of land, whether isolated or not, if properly classified for sale at the fair market value to cities, counties, and States, and that purchase of these at not less than fair market value to individuals would have freed much of the present backlog of land cases. These bills, introduced by Representative ASPINALL and Senator MURRAY, were studied in committee hearings; but the House Committee, of which you were a member, took no action. Furthermore, several bills were introduced in the last session and similar proposals have been proposed in this session which have to do with congressional approval for withdrawals exceeding 5,000 acres of unreserved public land. Your recent action of withdrawing public lands seems inconsistent to these proposals to say the least.

If it is the intent of the administration to not allow filing applications for public lands by other than States and local communities as stated in President Kennedy's special message on natural resources, the question arises why not consolidate the Bureau of Land Management with some other agency. Other agencies have graziers, foresters, mineral examiners, soil programs, engineers and others to manage their lands.

Your records indicate that in many States the Federal Government is by far the largest landowner. For example, the Federal Government now owns and manages 86 percent of the State of Nevada, 69 percent of the State of Utah, 65 percent of Idaho, 51 percent of Oregon, 48 percent of Wyoming, 45 percent of Arizona, 46 percent of California, 36 percent of Colorado, and 35 percent of New Mexico, to mention a few. The Bureau of Land Management manages over 17 million acres in California, 15.5 million acres in Oregon, 47 million acres in Nevada, 24 million acres in Utah, 12 million acres in Idaho, 13 million acres in Arizona, 14 million acres in New Mexico, 8 million acres in Colorado, and 6.5 million acres in Montana.

The Bureau of Land Management is the one agency of the Government that is required to make public lands available after classification and now you propose to freeze these lands for 18 months. It is true there is a backlog, but comparing the number of applications filed with the backlog the per-

centage is no greater now than it has been in the past. The percentage of backlog in land cases is no greater than those in mineral cases, yet mineral leasing is proceeding.

So that we may have full information on the full implications of this order, we request that you furnish to us the number of land applications filed by individuals in each category for each of the Western States, by each month during the past 5 years. This, of course, does not include Alaska. We also request the number of land cases which were closed, and the number which were patented. We also would like the number of cases on appeal both in the Director's office of the Bureau of Land Management and your office as of January 1, 1961.

We, as Western Senators vitally interested in the continued growth of the West, hereby request that you reconsider and amend your order of February 14, so the people of those States who are most concerned in this matter at least may be given an opportunity to be heard.

We assure you that we stand ready to cooperate with your Department on any land program that is in the best public interest.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE F. BENNETT.
HENRY DWORSHAK.
BARRY GOLDWATER.
GORDON ALLOTT.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1961.
Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We received your letter of February 28, today with regard to the 18-month moratorium on private land applications which was the subject of our letter to you of February 23, 1961. Neither the statements issued at your press conference nor those in your letter answer the question of your authority to withdraw public lands, subject to the land laws, from all types of entry prior to classification. Your letter states you have been advised by your solicitor that you can suspend the privilege of submitting applications prior to classifications within the general powers of the Secretary. We request specific citations for this authority.

In spite of the statement you made "that we exhibit severe misunderstanding of the background giving rise to this action," we are familiar with the so-called Engle study, the Moss study, and the Hoffman reports concerning land speculators. We do not condone speculation in public land transactions, but we fail to agree with you that the backlog of cases and the activities in a few States of a few land speculators necessitates such broad action as you took on February 14, 1961.

We assume you were familiar with H.R. 4060 introduced by Chairman ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on February 9, 1961, which says in part:

"That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no withdrawal of public lands from settlement, location, sale or entry, and no reservation of such lands for any public purpose and no secondary withdrawal or reservation of lands theretofore withdrawn or reserved."

"And no renewal or extension of any such withdrawal, reservation, exclusion, or permit which is now or shall hereafter be proposed by any department or agency of the Government shall be effective until the expiration of 60 calendar days from the date on which the head of the department or agency having administrative jurisdiction over the lands proposed to be affected thereby shall have notified the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of the nature and scope of the proposal or of his concurrence therein."

No such prior notice was given to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and no notice was given the public. The action you took on February 14, was unusual and hasty inasmuch as Congress did not have an opportunity to even consider the Aspinall bill by that time. We feel strongly an opportunity should have been given for public hearings on a matter of such importance. You froze applications on approximately 180 million acres of public lands without either notice or hearings.

You issued a policy statement on the same data as the press release which announced the moratorium on individual land application for 18 months. The policy announcement said that the Director of the Bureau of Land Management "will institute procedures" to carry out the announced policies. We have seen no announcement of such procedures and except for a generalized statement that a few land exchanges might be considered, the implication was that all other land applications by individuals would be frozen until September 1, 1962.

We want a further explanation whether the safeguards on private land exchanges set up by former Secretary Seaton are to be abandoned or whether the requirements for exchanges will be further tightened. At your press conference on February 26, you stated that Mr. Seaton's anti-speculation order on private exchanges was being abrogated and that you and your Department were ready to go ahead. This does not seem consistent with the impression gained from your original announcement. We are pleased that our letter has had the effect of altering your thinking on land exchanges.

Inasmuch as we are vitally concerned with the processing of existing applications for private exchanges and if former Secretary Seaton's safeguards are to be scrapped, we will appreciate a week-by-week report of every land exchange consummated by the Bureau of Land Management in your Department.

In the same press conference in answer to a question, you indicated that you were making a new announcement which rounded out the original announcement. This was to the effect that the States of California, Nevada, and Arizona were in worse shape in terms of backlogs than other public land States, and you now feel that in some of the Western States where the activities haven't been so heavy you may lift the moratorium. We are pleased that our letter may have the effect of substantially modifying your original announcement.

We want to assure you again that if legislation affecting the public lands is introduced and if we consider such legislation to be in the best public interest, we will be glad to cooperate with your Department.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE F. BENNETT.
GORDON ALLOTT.
BARRY GOLDWATER.
HENRY DWORSHAK.

SUMMER RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise to comment on a concurrent resolution which I am about to send to the desk, which involves the sense of the Senate in taking a summer recess to coincide with the school year.

The point of the resolution is to try to bring the work of the Senate in step with the rigidity of the schedule that Members with children must adhere to. As it stands now, the Senate, at least in the years since World War II, has generally been in session 9 or 10 months.

until September or October. To Senators with children it means that they are denied an opportunity to vacation with their families. It means that when a Senator is freed from the business of the Senate, free to go back to his State, his children are confined in Washington because of the school schedule.

The whole purpose of the concurrent resolution is to try to bring the two into cadence, into step.

We know that Congress was once regulated in this respect by the Constitution before the adoption of the so-called lame duck amendment in the 1930's. Congress met in December of each year. Sometimes the session ran into the early summer, and in alternate years Congress was compelled to adjourn on the fourth of March. However, the lame duck amendment brings Congress into session in January of each year. I suspect that the development of air conditioning and the international complications which have surrounded us from time to time have caused the Senate in particular, and the House on most occasions, to stay in session longer and longer each year. The consequence is that the family life of some Members of both Houses of Congress, as well as of staff members of both Representatives and Senators, has been largely disrupted in the process.

In the resolution we propose no change in the length of time the Senate or the House would be in session. We only attempt to change the time in which we would be in recess.

We would still meet for 9 or 10 months, if the times seemed to require it, but we would meet at times which would coincide with the needs of our families.

Mr. President, I submit the concurrent resolution. Sharing in the sponsorship of the resolution are some 30 Senators. I ask that the resolution lie at the desk for a week, and I ask unanimous consent that a table of Senate and House adjournment dates since World War II be printed immediately following my remarks.

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

Congressional Directory, 86th Cong., 1st sess.

Congress	Ses- sion	Date of begin- ning	Date of ad- journment	Length in days
80th.....	1	Jan. 3, 1947 ¹	Dec. 19, 1947	351
	2	Jan. 6, 1948	Dec. 31, 1948	361
81st.....	1	Jan. 3, 1949	Oct. 19, 1949	290
	2	Jan. 3, 1950 ²	Jan. 2, 1951	365
82d.....	1	Jan. 3, 1951	Oct. 20, 1951	291
	2	Jan. 8, 1952	July 7, 1952	182
83d.....	1	Jan. 3, 1953	Aug. 3, 1953	213
	2	Jan. 6, 1954 ³	Dec. 2, 1954	331
84th.....	1	Jan. 5, 1955	Aug. 2, 1955	210
	2	Jan. 2, 1956	July 27, 1956	207
85th.....	1	Jan. 3, 1957	Aug. 30, 1957	239
	2	Jan. 7, 1958	Aug. 24, 1958	230
86th.....	1	Jan. 7, 1959	Sept. 14, 1959
	2	Jan. 6, 1960	Sept. 1, 1960

¹ There was a recess in this session from Sunday, July 27, 1947, to Monday, Nov. 17, 1947.

² The House was in recess in this session from Thursday, Apr. 6, 1950, to Tuesday, Apr. 18, 1950, and both the Senate and the House were in recess from Saturday, Sept. 23, 1950, to Monday, Nov. 27, 1950.

³ The House was in recess in this session from Thursday, Apr. 15, 1954, to Monday, Apr. 26, 1954, and adjourned sine die Aug. 20, 1954. The Senate was in recess in this session from Friday, Aug. 20, 1954, to Monday, Nov. 8, 1954; from Thursday, Nov. 18, 1954, to Monday, Nov. 29, 1954, and adjourned sine die Dec. 2, 1954.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming for offering the resolution. It seems to me, after only 5 years as a Member of Congress, that the quality of the work of Congress during the summer months, when families are divided after a long session, generally without any break, deteriorates to some degree. I should think that the quality of our work would be improved if we placed our institution on a more orderly, more efficient, and more businesslike basis.

Again I commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I cannot let this opportunity pass without carrying out the instructions of Mrs. Muskie. She insists that I convey to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming our gratitude for this constructive idea.

Mr. McGEE. I assure the Senator from Maine that we have had an expression of gratitude from almost every Senate wife; but the lines of communication are not always the best, apparently, between some of the wives and husbands, otherwise there would be more names on the list of cosponsors. However, Mrs. Muskie has been one of the more ardent supporters of the proposed legislation.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator has 4½ additional votes from the Muskie family.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) to establish a date for adjournment of Congress, submitted by Mr. McGEE (for himself and Senators ANDERSON, BURDICK, CASE of South Dakota, ENGLE, FONG, GRUENING, HART, HICKEY, JACKSON, KUCHEL, McCARTHY, MORSE, MOSS, CHURCH, MUSKIE, HARTKE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, METCALF, BIBLE, CLARK, YOUNG of Ohio, BYRD of West Virginia, PROXIMIRE, DODD, KEFAUVER, BARTLETT, and HUMPHREY), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That (a) except in time of war, the two Houses shall recess on the thirtieth day of June, or the next preceding day of session in each year and shall stand in recess at least until 12 o'clock meridian of the first Tuesday in October or the third day (Sundays excepted) after Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with subsection (c) of this section.

(b) The consent of the respective Houses is hereby given to a recess of the other for the period specified in subsection (a).

(c) The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall immediately notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader or the minority leader of the Senate and the majority leader or the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN NEW YORK STATE HIGHEST SINCE 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Thursday, New York Labor Commissioner Martin P. Catherwood announced the New York State unemployment figures for mid-January of this year. His figures showed unemployment in New York State to be 7.3 percent of the total labor force.

This is the highest level of unemployment since the postwar recession of 1949. There are a total of 557,231 New Yorkers presently out of work. This is a serious and pressing situation, both in terms of the economy of our State and in terms of the grave human problems of affected workers and their families. I cannot imagine anything more frustrating than desiring work and not being able to obtain it. This is what we should be worried about; not about figures and statistics, but about men and women and their jobs.

Mr. President, there are a number of things that the Federal Government can and should do to stimulate our economy and help reduce unemployment throughout the Nation. In essence, what we are looking for right now are economic firecrackers. We need programs that will make our economy snap up and move faster. We do not need dynamite or a nuclear explosion. Within the context of a free competitive economy, we must seek to promote accelerated production and economic growth, while at the same time preserving the fundamental form and structure of our national economy.

I want to discuss today two of the economic firecrackers which are of the highest priority and are of the greatest immediate interest. Both have received considerable congressional attention and can and should be acted on and put into effect in the very near future.

First, I hope that in the next few days Congress will enact legislation to extend the period for which the unemployed workers are eligible for unemployment benefits. Frankly, I think we should establish a Federal program similar to that just enacted by New York State, whereby whenever unemployment is serious, additional unemployment coverage automatically goes into effect. Governor Rockefeller's program specifically provides that when the number of unemployed, who have exhausted their benefits within a 13-week period, exceeds 1 percent of the labor force covered by unemployment insurance, then the period of eligibility for unemployment benefits automatically increases.

This "trigger point" insures that additional coverage will be available as soon as economic conditions become severe enough to warrant it. There would be no delay as a result of hesitancy in obtaining the necessary legislative or executive action.

Also, Mr. President, it is of vital importance that the full Senate gets down to work this week on constructive area redevelopment measures to help unemployed Americans and to deal with conditions in serious pockets of joblessness throughout the land.

I believe that if the majority in Congress had been slightly more accommo-

dating last year, we would have a program in effect right now. What the country needed was a program last August—not a political issue last November.

One of the major roadblocks at the moment seems to be a substantial difference of opinion as to what agency should have jurisdiction over this legislation. Mr. President, I hope this is not a bad omen.

To my way of thinking, the most sensitive and important issue with which we must deal in acting upon area redevelopment legislation is the need to avoid the pirating of industries from one area to another. It would be unwise and, in fact, wasteful to enact legislation which simply provided for the shuffling of existing jobs from one area to another. What we must be concerned about above all is creating new jobs.

There are several areas of substantial unemployment in New York State, many of which would presently qualify under the several area redevelopment bills pending before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. They are: Buffalo, Utica, Rome, Amsterdam, Auburn, Elmira, Gloversville, Ogdensburg, Massena, Malone.

Fortunately, there are also areas in New York in which employment is presently high and in which economic conditions are favorable. Thus, New York State has a special interest in seeing to it that adequate safeguards are set up to prevent the pirating of industries from these New York communities which are now healthy. The definitions of eligible industries in any area redevelopment bill enacted by the Congress must receive our full and vigorous scrutiny.

These are by no means the only steps we can take. There are a number of pending proposals which can and must receive congressional attention in the months ahead.

The two steps I have discussed are essential in that they would immediately bring some measure of relief to those in need, add spending power to our economy, and provide some long-range hope for pockets of serious joblessness throughout the Nation.

In addition, we must continue to accelerate and expand existing Federal programs on a temporary basis, where such expansion would provide additional job opportunities. Much has already been done in this respect at the Federal level and in my own State of New York.

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the situation now building up in New York State. It is a simple matter. We need more jobs—both new jobs and jobs in industries now operating at sub-normal production levels. I have seen this situation develop and become increasingly more pressing in recent months. I have supported and will continue to support measures to deal with it in an effective and responsible manner.

NEED FOR ECONOMIC REFORM OF DEPRECIATION TAX POLICIES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the urgent need for economic reform of our

depreciation tax policies was emphasized in a letter which I received last week from Mr. William E. Zabel, Jr., president of the Lithographers & Printers National Association, Inc.

Mr. Zabel, whose organization represents an industry employing over 300,000 people and some 28,000 companies, not including newspapers, points out that existing inadequate depreciation allowances prevent and hamper the replacement of wornout and technologically obsolescent machinery in the printing industry.

Mr. Zabel writes:

We are especially handicapped by the long periods of time over which we are required to write off the costs of heavy equipment. A classic example is a printing press installed in 1935 at a cost of \$34,000. To replace it in 1958, 23 years later, an investment of \$128,000 was required.

Even conceding that the replacement was technologically improved, and more productive than the old one, the cost of the new press was four times the old—an obvious hardship on the taxpayer.

As sponsor of legislation directed at modernizing our current depreciation tax policies, I am especially interested in Mr. Zabel's views and in the graphic example he supplies concerning replacement costs in the printing industry. As we know, the printing industry is only one of many which are seriously hampered by existing depreciation laws. Mr. Zabel's example can be applied throughout the economy, to every American business caught between rising replacement costs and static, unrealistic tax policies.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 8, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 7, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Edward R. Murrow, of New York, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency. Donald M. Wilson, of New Jersey, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Paul Rand Dixon, of Tennessee, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1960.

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Lee Loewinger, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Attorney General vice Robert A. Bicks, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 7, 1961:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years; U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; and a Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; and an Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Frank Burton Ellis, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Leonard S. Bailey	William C. Hughes
Robert H. Barnum	Thomas J. Killian
Harry R. Canaday	Eric C. Lambert
Ralph G. Coburn, Jr.	William M. McCloy
Robert W. Copeland	Leslie L. Reid
James D. Hardy	Carl E. Watson
Harry H. Hess	

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Donald E. Hale
Hugh Warren

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admirals

Edward J. Costello, Jr.
Edgar H. Reeder
Harold W. Torgerson

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Alton K. Fisher
Samuel S. Wald

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35, title 10, of the United States Code and secs. 8373 and 8376, title 10, of the United States Code, as amended by Public Law 559, 86th Congress:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. William P. Farnsworth XXXXXXXX (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Meiling XXXXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John H. Foster XXXXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. McCoy, Jr. XXXXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Jay G. Brown XXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Jess Larson XXXXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Ramsay D. Potts, Jr. XXXXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew B. Cannon XXXX (colonel, Air Force Reserve), U.S. Air Force.

Col. William R. Lovelace XXXXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

Col. Benjamin W. Fridge XXXXXXXX Air Force Reserve.

Col. Nicholas E. Allen [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. John W. Richardson [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Robert W. Smart [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Thomas H. King [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph T. Benedict [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Wilbur A. Smith [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Howard W. Cannon [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Alexander B. Andrews [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. William C. Lewis, Jr. [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. John I. Lerom [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Russell F. Gustke [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Edward J. Haseltine, [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Asa W. Candler [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Roger L. Zeller [XXXXXX], Air Force Reserve.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard T. Coiner, Jr. [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Troup Miller, Jr. [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Stevenson [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry R. Spicer [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Wendell W. Bowman [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harold C. Donnelly [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arno H. Luehman [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Stanley J. Donovan [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dolf E. Muehleisen [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles M. McCorkle [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lloyd P. Hopwood [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Don O. Darow [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Victor R. Haugen [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles B. Westover [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Marvin C. Demler [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William E. Eubank, Jr. [XXXX] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. William C. Kingsbury [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank P. Corbin, Jr. [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Bell [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jermain F. Rodenhauser [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Allen W. Rigsby [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Gill [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Rogers [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Dany [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Wise [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert T. Wilson, Jr. [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. White [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Gent, Jr. [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Cecil E. Combs [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dwight O. Monteith [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Conrad F. Necraso [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles B. Root [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Augustus M. Minton [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Homer A. Boushey [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester W. Cecil [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Augustus M. Minton [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack N. Donohew [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Nils O. Ohman [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Taylor 3d [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Curtis R. Low [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry G. Thorne, Jr. [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William B. Keese [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Avelin P. Tacon, Jr. [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Delmar E. Wilson [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Carpenter 3d [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Knapp [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack G. Merrill [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. McGehee [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr. [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul S. Emrich [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Moore [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Austin J. Russell [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Warren [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Francis C. Gideon [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore R. Milton [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Aubrey L. Jennings [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force, under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon [XXXX] (Regular Air Force, Medical).

Brig. Gen. Clifford H. Rees [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Bell [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Allen W. Rigsby [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Gill [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John M. Breit [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Rogers [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Wise [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. L. Render Braswell [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Cecil E. Combs [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Nils O. Ohman [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Avelin P. Tacon, Jr. [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Delmar E. Wilson [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Carpenter III [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Knapp [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert E. Greer [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. Bestic [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack G. Merrill [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul S. Emrich [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Moore [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Austin J. Russell [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Warren [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Francis C. Gideon [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore R. Milton [XXXX] (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Stewart S. Maxey [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. John M. Hutchison [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. John R. McGraw [XXXX], Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Willis F. Chapman [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Jack E. Thomas [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Wilbur W. Aring [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Douglas E. Williams [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Boyd Hubbard, Jr. [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Linscott A. Hall [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Jack A. Gibbs [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Baskin R. Lawrence, Jr. [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Murray A. Bywater [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. John H. Chick [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Kenneth R. Powell [XXXX], Regular Air Force.

Col. Kyle L. Riddle [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. William S. Rader [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Thomas B. Whitehouse [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. George M. Higginson [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. William T. Smith [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert R. Rowland [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. James W. Chapman, Jr. [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. David M. Jones [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. John T. Fitzwater [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Pinkham Smith [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. William W. Veal [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Tarleton H. Watkins [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Adriel N. Williams [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Alvan C. Gillem II [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Rollen H. Anthis [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Horace A. Hanes [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Paul W. Norton [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Marion C. Smith [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Arthur W. Kellond [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. George H. Krieger [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Oran O. Price [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Benjamin G. Willis [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Gerald F. Keeling [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Fred J. Ascani [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Gordon T. Gould, Jr. [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Lewis E. Lyle [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Harry J. Sands, Jr. [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. John W. O'Neill [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Charles H. Roadman [XXXX] Regular Air Force, Medical.
 Col. John H. Bell [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Arthur G. Salisbury [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. John A. Roberts [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Donald E. Hillman [XXXX] Regular Air Force.
 Col. Abe J. Beck [XXXX] Regular Air Force.

The nominations beginning Edwards Abrams, Jr., to be major, and ending Earl E. Waugh, to be major, which nominations were received by the Senate on February 20, 1961.

The following nominations were reported favorably by Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, under authority given by the Senate on March 3, 1961, with the recommendation that the nominations be confirmed:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE
 AMBASSADOR

George F. Kennan, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Philip H. Coombs, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

UNITED NATIONS

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank status of Ambassador Extraordinary and

Plenipotentiary, and a deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

John Howard Morrow, of New Jersey, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Charles P. Noyes, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSION

Neal J. Hardy, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 7, 1961:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Edward K. Mills, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1956, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 119: 165: *Great peace have they who love Thy law.*

O Thou Lord God, omnipotent and omniscient, may our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress, upon whom rest such heavy responsibilities, accept the challenge to give their wisdom and strength to help heal the hurt and heartache of humanity.

We humbly confess that we are frequently frightened and frustrated when we think of the vast amount of physical power and energy which our modern world possesses and that we must choose between faith and fear, between courage and cowardice, between strength of character and weakness.

May all the resources, which have been made known and placed at man's disposal by research and discovery, never be used perversely but dedicated to Thy glory and to mankind's highest welfare.

Grant that men and nations may be blessed and endowed with those moral and spiritual controls and disciplines which will direct and channel all their power and energy to beneficent and peaceful purposes and ends.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

MARCH 2, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with regret that I submit to you my resignation from the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business.

It was an honor and a privilege to serve on this committee, and I wish to comment that the Members with whom I served all worked hard to produce an outstanding record in the last session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 46, 87th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARVEY, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5188) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5188, with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there are some 75 items in title I of this bill and all the items in title II are for pay act costs. The bill covers practically every agency and department of the Government. The budget estimates were about \$1,200 million. If our colleagues will turn to the table in the back of the report it will give you the budget estimates and the committee action.

There were substantial cuts made, perhaps a 35- or 40-percent reduction under the budget estimates. I do not think there is very much in here to give