

One of the themes of the Keynesian philosophy is that aggregate consumer purchasing power will automatically produce increased consumer demand. This increased consumer demand will stimulate the economy to produce to meet the demand. The economy in responding to meet the demand will employ more men, and so we get full employment.

I point out that this theory of economics is based upon the classical concept of the 19th and early 20th century when Lord Keynes was active. It is predicated upon an economy of scarcity, when indeed all that had to be done was to give more purchasing power to the consumers and automatically they spent the money for goods and services. I have suggested, and I believe I am right, that the U.S. economy of the 1960's is not one based upon scarcity, but rather one based upon plenty. Take the agricultural sector, for example. Even if we gave to our consumers twice the amount of purchasing power they have now they would not buy any more agriculture produce. Indeed, under doctor's advice Americans are actually eating less and more selectively. Therefore, increasing aggregate purchasing power will not help solve the farm problem. We actually are producing more than we need or our people can eat. I have to watch myself with you, so I hasten to state that I am talking, as the Keynesians are, in the aggregate. Of course, there are people in our society who could eat more, beneficially, if they had more money, but as important is their problem from a humane standpoint there are not enough of these people in America today to have any real impact on agricultural surpluses. In other words, taking care of the poor will not solve these aggregate economic problems. We must, therefore, direct our efforts at solving the distributive problem of getting ample good living to all our people on its own bottom. This is a special problem. It is not simple and it cannot be solved by dealing in Keynesian aggregates. It can be seriously damaged, however, along with our entire system by treating it in an aggregate fashion.

The next step in Keynesian philosophy is to have the Government enter the picture to bring about the increase in aggregate consumer purchasing power. This was the philosophy of the New Deal of the 1930's. Even in those days this did not work and it is doubtful how much it may have helped. In 1938, after 6 years of the Keynesian approach, we had 10,390,000 people unemployed (according to the old statistics * * * modern statistics would make this an even greater figure). This was 19 percent of the

labor force of 54,950,000. Contrast this, if you will, with our present picture of 66,700,000 persons employed out of a work force of 70,600,000 people, giving an unemployment figure of 3,900,000 persons. This is 5.6 percent of the labor force.

World War II; America becoming the "arsenal of democracy" in 1939 solved the great depression not Keynesian dogma or was this following Keynesian dogma? I shudder at the thought.

The reason the Kennedy proposals include Federal aid to education, Federal aid to depressed areas, Federal aid for community facilities, federally financed housing programs, federally supported health care programs, etc., is primarily to have the Federal Government assume the job that the Keynesian philosophy rests upon * * * get more money into consumption. The problems of education, housing, community facilities, health care, etc., are almost incidental in their minds to getting the aggregate purchasing power up. That is why people like myself who are concerned about solving educational, health, and housing problems have such a difficult time debating these people. We concentrate on meeting the social need involved in education, health, and housing. We point out with effectiveness, I believe, that we do a much better job solving these problems without the Federal Government getting massively into the picture.

If your interest is primarily aggregate purchasing power being implemented by the Federal Government, of course, you aren't going to be too concerned about what Federal programs you advance in order to bring this about * * * if one doesn't work, another might. And so it is with the Keynesians * * * they are looking around for almost anything that would justify Federal expenditures. That is another reason I worry about them. War is the easiest thing with which to justify Federal expenditures. Now, I am not suggesting these philosophers would actually take us to war to implement their economic philosophy. But I think it is perfectly right to state that making an economy work based upon peace is not a passion with them as it is with me. The way in which the Keynesians ignore the impact of World War II and the Korean war in propounding their philosophy is calloused and dangerous.

But look at consumer purchasing power during the recent recession. Did it go down? It did not. Total personal income in 1959 was \$383.3 billion; in 1960 it was \$404.2 billion. Disposable personal income was \$337.3 billion in 1959 and \$254.2 billion

in 1960. Did the people spend the additional money? No, for some reason or other they saved more. In 1959 they saved \$23.4 billion; in 1960 they saved \$26.4 billion. This reflects an economy which is based more on plenty than one based upon scarcity.

We have a lot of social problems to solve, but thank the Lord they are no longer the problems based upon the centuries of economics which was predicated upon the law of scarcity. For the first time in the history of man, I believe the problems that face us are the problems arising out of the laws of economics based upon plenty. New and tough problems are created all right and many of the problems revolve around individual problems of scarcity * * * but they are not the old problems of aggregate scarcity mankind has been fighting for centuries. Just as I have said in education, our society has gotten on top of the problem of mass education, quantity education, which no other society has achieved before. Now for the first time we can begin to attack meaningfully the problems of quality education, and the problems involved in quality education I submit are considerably more difficult than the problems of quantity education.

Yet what are the Kennedy proposals on education? Keynesian—getting the Federal Government to spend more money and directing the attention to the problems of quantity education which have largely been solved. In this process we damage the work that is going forward in quality education. The Federal Government can help in improving quality education so let's direct our attention there.

If there is disagreement on these two different fundamental approaches let's debate them honestly and see if we can resolve them. I say the Keynesian approach looks backward to the early days of the 20th century and that this approach will damage, not help to solve the problems that face us in the 1960's. President Kennedy and his advisers disagree. However, they, and you, try to put the debate on the basis that they are interested in the people and are forward looking, that their opponents, which includes me, are not interested in the people and are backward looking. That begs the question. Which is true? Let's start discussing the question itself. Let's put out in the open our conflicting facts and arguments and see which point of view justifies the epithet "mossback".

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Your Congressman.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1961

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

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

Our Father God, whose service is perfect freedom, we praise Thee for the vision of liberty which, like a bow of promise, arches the dark skies and inspires mankind to overthrow all despotism and to break the fetters of oppression.

We praise Thee O Lord for the judgment and wisdom of all those, guided by Thee, who designed and founded the na-

tions and institutions in which liberty is enshrined.

In this day of global conflict for the bodies and minds of man we pray that Thou wilt purge and cleanse our own hearts that we may be found worthy to march with the armies of emancipation which bring both liberty and release from the want and woe which beset so many millions of Thy children and grind them into the dust of poverty.

In this day of battle when there is sounding forth a trumpet which must never know retreat, we praise Thee for the courage, the labor, and the sacrifice of all those who are anywhere challenging and fighting the enemies of freedom.

In this day on ages telling, good Lord deliver us from discouragement, appeasement of evil, indifference, petty prejudice, and from all attitudes and

actions and words which may hinder the achievement of a just and lasting worldwide peace of good will.

We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1961, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 11, 1961, Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal

financial assistance for education, on May 12, 1961, reported it favorably, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 255) thereon, which was printed, together with minority and individual views.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination 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. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2010. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6094. An act to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 2010. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 6094. An act to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

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

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AT THE AEROMEDICAL FIELD LABORATORY, HOLLoman AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed construction of research and maintenance facilities for animals at the Aeromedical Field Laboratory, Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT AND FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries and the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT OF NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

A letter from the executive vice president, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the audit of the financial transactions of that council, for the year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COLLECTION OF FEES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES UNDER NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1957

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend benefits of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 to widows and surviving children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service Division, who were retired or who died in the service of any such organization prior to the effective date of such amendments (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS OF VETERANS WHO DIE IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES TO PLACE OF BURIAL

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

BALANCE SHEET AND PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT OF NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the National Shipwright, Navy Club of the United States of America, Springfield, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a balance sheet and profit and loss statement of that club, for the fiscal year May 1, 1960, to April 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN CONNECTION WITH GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY, VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

"Resolution requesting the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take action to halt the flood of surplus foreign military rifles into the United States and to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry

"Whereas an overwhelming rise in the importation of surplus foreign military rifles has occurred in the past 5 years, and the influx of said rifles has caused an alarming decline in the sale of domestic rifles, seriously affecting the rifle-making industry in this country and in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and has resulted in hundreds of skilled craftsmen being forced onto the ranks of the unemployed; and

"Whereas the importers of surplus foreign military rifles, pressing the advantage of the

low costs of foreign labor, can convert surplus military rifles to sport or hunting rifles at a very low cost thereby placing them in a position which enables them not only to undersell but also to imperil the domestic rifle manufacturing industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take such action, including the submission of legislation to the Congress of the United States, as may be necessary to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to Mr. Frank Ellis, Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C., and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate May 1, 1961.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the State Road Commission of the State of Utah, favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the July 1, 1961, deadline specified in section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code for a period of time sufficient to permit the 1963 Legislature of the State of Utah to consider the subject of outdoor advertising along the Interstate System of Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

A statement and resolution adopted by the 66th annual session of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, relating to the services of clergymen of the different religious groups at inaugural ceremonies; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The following report was submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 1619. A bill to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 256).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, dated May 5, 1961, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1858. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1859. A bill for the relief of Francisco Saverio Danna; and

S. 1860. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joseph S. Salama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1861. A bill for the relief of Emmett W. Gleeson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1862. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to permit the private carriage of letters and packets in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1863. A bill to provide for the establishment of a senior citizens service training program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 1864. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 1865. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1866. A bill for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1867. A bill to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

S. 1868. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated on Horn Island in the Gulf of Mexico to the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1869. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Hawaii,

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOR- TON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope; to the Committee on Banking and Currency. (See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "AGING AMERICANS"

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 145), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging 10,000 additional copies of the committee print, "Aging Americans—Their Views and Living Conditions," a report by the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, issued by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the 86th Congress, 2d session.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF GEORGE W. NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA submitted a resolution (S. Res. 146) for the Senate to adjourn on July 11, 1961, as a mark of further respect to the memory of Hon. George W. Norris, which was considered and agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 105(b) OF HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The amendment would provide an additional exception to the requirement that the purchasers or lessees of land from an urban renewal agency commence improvements on the land within a reasonable period of time. This exception would apply to a purchaser or lessee which, first, is a public body or nonprofit corporation; and second, acquires the property for subsequent disposition by it in accordance with the urban renewal plan. The amendment is designed to permit public agencies or private nonprofit corporations, such as industrial development foundations, to purchase

urban renewal land and hold it undeveloped while attracting industry to the locality.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1858) to amend section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENIOR CITIZENS SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Madam President, many critics of new programs and new legislation affecting the Nation's senior citizens have complained loudly that we are being too paternalistic and too welfare-statism.

In making these complaints, I gather that they mean that older Americans—especially those who are retired—should not just settle back and bask in the sun, sway in the rocking chair, stay cooped up in a home for the aged—and allow society to wait on them, hand and foot.

Madam President, there is a great deal of merit in urging older men and women—especially if they are able to get around—to remain active and useful in their retirement years. During the past 2 years of my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging, and now, as chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging, I have been impressed by the large number of older citizens who could make important contributions. Contributions not only to their own morale and well-being, but to the community at large.

Once again, therefore, I wish to introduce, for proper reference, a bill that would enable the growing numbers of such aged Americans to participate in training and refresher programs, for developing the necessary skills in the fields of community service.

This proposal has recently been publicized as a Senior Citizens Peace Corps. I think this is to be welcomed, since it will show that either on a domestic or an overseas basis, the senior citizens of America are just as anxious to express their deep-felt desire to be of help to their fellow men as are the youth of our Nation.

Madam President, I hope that my fellow Senators on both sides of the aisle will see the importance and the positive nature of the purpose of my bill, and that we forge ahead in the field of aging—beyond the mere statements of policy issued at the recent White House Conference on Aging—to make real and concrete our public declarations about encouraging our increasing population of older persons to continue to lead useful lives—in this case, by offering their time and their talents to the solution of problems affecting the community at large.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a brief description of its contents be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill

and description will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1863) to provide for the establishment of a senior citizens service training program, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 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,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Senior Citizens Service Training Program Act."

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that, within the large number of retired Americans, there are thousands of men and women who are able and willing to make significant contributions to the civic development of their communities and Nation, and who constitute a vast reservoir of manpower capable of being trained or retrained for currently unfilled roles in the broad area of occupations which obtain in the fields of health, education, and welfare, that, by assisting and encouraging retired Americans to perform on a part-time basis occupational roles (whether presently in existence or yet to be created) in such fields, the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments and civic-minded organizations, cannot only greatly contribute to the general civic development of the Nation, but also to the restoration of dignity and of a meaningful life to our otherwise retired population.

(b) It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide for the training or retraining of retired Americans for part-time occupational roles in the broad area of health, education, and welfare so as to enable them to lead more active and meaningful lives and, at the same time, to alleviate the existing shortage of personnel in this area of community service occupations.

MANPOWER SURVEYS

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall conduct manpower surveys, on a regional basis, within the fields of health, education, and welfare with a view to determining the kind and extent of part-time employment opportunities within such fields which are available to retired individuals. In carrying out such surveys, the Secretary shall cooperate with the Secretary of Labor, and shall have authority to utilize, on a reimbursable basis, such of the personnel and facilities of the Department of Labor, or of any other department or agency of the Government, as he deems necessary or desirable.

(b) On the basis of data collected by or made available to him as a result of such surveys or otherwise, the Secretary shall publish and disseminate among retired individuals and appropriate officials, groups, agencies, and organizations, within each region of the United States, information relating to—

(1) the kinds of positions within the fields of health, education, and welfare which are available within such region to retired individuals;

(2) the number of each kind of such positions which are so available; and

(3) the training required to qualify for such positions.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall, from time to time and in cooperation with State and local governments and civic organizations, establish and conduct, within the

various regions of the United States, occupational training programs which are designed to qualify retired individuals living within such regions for locally available positions in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

(b) In determining whether to establish and conduct one or more training programs within any particular region of the United States, the Secretary shall be guided by the following considerations:

(1) The number of positions within the fields of health, education, and welfare (within such region) which would be available to retired individuals, if properly qualified;

(2) The number of retired individuals desiring to participate in any such training program; and

(3) The type and extent of training required to qualify such individuals for such positions.

(c) The Secretary shall not conduct, within any region of the United States, any training program if, on the basis of all the data available to him, he finds that the positions for which training of senior citizens is provided can otherwise be filled by full-time job applicants.

GRANTS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) In carrying out the training programs provided for in section 4, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, utilize the services of public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies, which shall be reimbursed for their services through a system of direct grants to be created and administered by the Secretary for such purpose.

(b) The Secretary is further authorized to make direct grants to such organizations for demonstration projects designed to promote the interest of such organizations in undertaking the training and recruitment of retired individuals for employment within the fields of health, education, and welfare.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the sum of \$5,000,000.

The description presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

PROVISIONS OF SENIOR CITIZENS' SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM BILL

SECTIONS 1 AND 2

These sections present the findings of fact and the purpose of the bill, referring to the thousands of men and women who constitute a vast reservoir of currently unused manpower in health, education, and welfare, and the need to train or retrain these retired persons for part-time employment in such fields.

SECTION 3

The bill calls for manpower surveys by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Department of Labor, to determine the kind and extent of part-time employment opportunities in the fields of community services on a regional basis; publication and dissemination of the survey results on the kinds of positions suitable for senior citizens; the number of such positions available; and the training required for these positions.

SECTION 4

This part of the bill establishes the nature of the training programs required. The Secretary of HEW, in cooperation with State and local governments and civic organizations would conduct training programs for available positions—guided by the number of positions in a given region; the number of retired individuals desiring training, and

limited to training for positions which would remain otherwise unfilled by younger, full-time job applicants.

SECTION 5

The Secretary is authorized to use the services of both public and nonprofit organizations in pursuance of the purposes of the act; and to make direct grants to such organizations for pertinent demonstration projects.

SECTION 6

The bill authorizes appropriation of \$5 million for each of 3 years, starting July 1, 1961, for the purpose of carrying out the above provisions.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Senators McCLELLAN, COOPER, EASTLAND, KEFAUVER, and SYMINGTON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a slight measure of relief for cotton farmers whose cotton acreage has been flooded out by recent heavy rains. This is a companion measure to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives last Thursday by Representative GATHINGS.

The House Agriculture Committee was sufficiently impressed with the merits of this legislation and the need for urgent action on it to call a special session on Friday to approve the bill. I understand that the bill will probably be brought up for action in the House early this week. Department of Agriculture witnesses who appeared before the House committee testified in favor of the bill and stated that regulations to implement the legislation would be drawn up at once in order to get the program into operation without delay.

This is a simple piece of legislation and it is sorely needed to help farmers who have been unable to plant their allotted cotton acreage because of flood conditions or whose plantings have been washed out. Thousands of acres of cotton land in several States have been made unworkable by recent flood conditions. Passage of this legislation will enable cotton growers to transfer, under certain conditions, all or part of their acreage allotment from a flooded-out farm to another farm within the county or in an adjoining county. The Secretary of Agriculture will specify the counties to be covered by the transfer program and will prescribe regulations under which it will be carried out. I might mention that Congress voted this same type of relief for cotton farmers in 1958.

Madam President, cotton farmers in my State are caught in a severe cost-price squeeze and unless this transfer authority is approved, it may be bankruptcy for many of them. A great many farmers have already lost sizable sums in planting costs due to flood conditions.

Others have simply not had a chance to get any seeds in the ground because of standing water. If these farmers can move their flooded-out acreage to higher ground it will at least help to cut down on their losses. There is little planting time left and this bill must be acted upon at once if it is to be effective.

I introduce this companion bill to Representative GATHINGS' bill in order to give the Senate Agriculture Committee a specific bill to consider pending completion of House action on H.R. 7030. I hope that the committee will act prompt on this humanitarian measure.

In closing, I wish to point out that much of the losses suffered by cotton farmers in my State and other States in the flood region could have been prevented if these farmers had available to them weather information tailored to fit their farming needs. This type of weather information will be provided to farmers in southern and eastern Arkansas, western Tennessee, and southeastern Missouri if we can obtain funds to implement the special agricultural weather service project which has been proposed by me and others from this area. The long-range forecasts under this proposed program would have undoubtedly influenced many farmers to postpone their cotton planting to a later date. This special service for the farmers would at least have provided the farmers with some warning of the future rainfall prospects and would have tempered the producer's traditional eagerness to get his new crop in the ground.

There are no funds in the 1962 budget to initiate this special weather service project, but I am hopeful that the Congress will look with favor on our request for the small sum which is needed to get this program under way. I plan to testify on this project before the Appropriations Subcommittee tomorrow. The recent floods in the cotton-growing areas will have served some useful purpose if they help in drawing attention to the need for better weather service for farmers in our area.

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

The bill (S. 1865) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ISSUANCE OF A GOLD MEDAL TO BOB HOPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr.

LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, I introduced a Senate joint resolution authorizing the President to present a medal in the name of the American people to one of the great humanitarians of our time—Bob Hope.

Most Americans know Bob Hope primarily as a superb entertainer.

Over the years he has brought laughter and humor to many millions of men and women all over the world, from the stage, in the movies, and on radio and television, and no man has given more generously of his time and energy traveling around the world to entertain our Armed Forces.

In fact, he has given up some 18 Christmases at home so as to be with our military youth at far off bases, substituting to the best of his ability for the family that was in their minds and hearts.

There is another less known side of Hope's life. For many years also, quietly but consistently, this American has been engaged in a career of good works. He has appeared in nearly every State in the Union on behalf of charitable, civic, and philanthropic groups.

Around our land there are many Hope foundations for less fortunate people.

His organizing work is seemingly limitless; his travels almost constant; and his devotion inspiring.

Bob Hope, American patriot, has given of his time, his tremendous personality, and his physical resources to a selfless career of humanitarianism that now stands out in the annals of our country.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution to have the President of the United States present, in the name of the people of the United States of America, a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope, in recognition of his services to the country and to the cause of world peace, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (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:

Whereas moments enriched by humor are moments free from hate and conflict, and therefore valued by mankind; and

Whereas Bob Hope has given to us and to the world many such treasured moments; and

Whereas he has done so unstintingly and unselfishly, with heavy demands on his time, talent and energy; and

Whereas his contributions over a long period of years to the morale of millions of members of the United States Armed Services, in addition to those of our friends and allies, have been of immediate and enduring value; and

Whereas these contributions have been made during Christmas and at other times by personal contact in countless miles of travel around the globe, to the farthest outposts manned by American youth, during times of peace and war, often under dangerous conditions and at great personal risk; and

Whereas while at home he has given firm and imaginative support to humanitarian causes of every description; and

Whereas in all this Bob Hope has rendered an outstanding service to the cause of democracy, as America's most prized Ambassador of Good Will throughout the world. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States of America a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope in recognition of his aforesaid services to his country and to the cause of world peace.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment which I expect to offer to the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance to education, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be received and printed and lie on the desk until it is made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the desk, as requested.

Mr. THURMOND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TO ESTABLISH WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE THE OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSIONER; ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on March 29, 1961, I introduced in the Senate a bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 1474, and that at the next printing of the bill his name be added.

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

PROPOSED ANTARCTIC COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, on April 6 I introduced in the Senate S. 1516, a bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica.

Through an error, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was not included among those listed as cosponsors.

I am very pleased to have Senator HOLLAND on the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1516, Senator HOLLAND's name be added.

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

AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS WITH RESPECT TO THE MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRUGS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on April 12, 1961, I introduced the bill (S. 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] may be added as a cosponsor.

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

ADMISSION OF CHINESE COMMUNIST REGIME INTO UNITED NATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, which is designed to express the sense of the Congress concerning admission to the United Nations and diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communist regime. In addition I ask that the name of Senator DOUGLAS appear as a cosponsor on the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22.

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

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, and NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961:

S. 1817. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate

speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; and S. 1818. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, DOUGLAS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, NEUBERGER, and PELL were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961:

S. 1819. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; and

S. 1820. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes.

ORDERLY MARKETING ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of April 27 and May 8, 1961, the names of Senators TALMADGE, CHAVEZ, SMATHERS, BUSH, LONG of Louisiana, BARTLETT, WILEY, MCCARTHY, BIBLE, and MCGEE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1735) to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE on April 27, 1961.

ABOLISHMENT OF TAX AND PROPERTY QUALIFICATIONS FOR ELECTORS IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, and SYMINGTON were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961.

ABOLISHMENT OF LITERACY TEST QUALIFICATIONS FOR ELECTORS IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, and HUMPHREY were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy

test qualifications for electors in Federal elections, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961.

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. WILEY:

Excerpts from radio address by him on progress at the present session of Congress.

Address by him proposing the establishment of a United Nations Commission To Establish Criteria for Disarmament.

By Mr. BEALL:

Address entitled "The Responsibility of Being a Republican," delivered by Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland, before the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans, in Hagerstown, Md., on May 13, 1961.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech on "Israel—A Demonstration of Freedom With Responsibility," delivered at Clarksburg, W. Va., May 13, 1961, commemorating 13th anniversary of the State of Israel.

A PEACE INSTITUTE WITH NEW PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, the most important problem in the world today is that of how to preserve the peace. To that end, a new organization has been formed. It is headed by a great public servant, the Honorable James J. Wadsworth.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "A Peace Institute With New Program," which was published on yesterday in the Washington Star, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A PEACE INSTITUTE WITH NEW PROGRAM

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Early last month, a new organization came into town and set up shop almost without notice in an old smooth-faced, red brick building on 18th Street NW.

The events of the last few weeks—in Cuba, in Laos, in Algeria—may provoke the thought that the timing of this one could not have been worse if it had been planned that way.

But the leaders of the new organization believe that their reason for existing has taken on a new urgency and importance.

Called the Peace Research Institute, it is a private, nonprofit group aimed at the support, advancement, and promotion of study of the problems of preventing war.

The institute is unlike the antiwar organizations of the past—outfits which confined their appeals largely (without success) to the moral and religious sensibilities of mankind. It is embarked on a different approach, one it hopes will have a greater chance.

THE NEW DANGERS

Physical scientists have produced new weapons which for the first time actually endanger civilization. One small hydrogen bomb, for example, could incinerate a great city and its millions of inhabitants and imperil, with radioactive fallout, many thousands more hundreds of miles away.

Perhaps the social scientists using the research method can discover the means to

prevent the use of these new weapons and find out how international life can be regulated so that thermonuclear war may be averted.

The institute's first president is former Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration.

He served also as American representative on disarmament, 1958-61, and acted as chief negotiator for this country in international disarmament talks.

Dr. Arthur Larson, Director of the U.S. Information Agency under Mr. Eisenhower and now director of the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, is vice president and general counsel.

THE SOVIET AIMS

Mr. Wadsworth, as his experience makes plain, knows the Russians. The curious may wonder, therefore, how he could hope that the free world could persuade the Russians to sign an agreement on arms control and disarmament and live up to it, even with an inspection system.

But there is no doubt that he does.

In an interview he was asked whether research on peace problems would not be fruitless in the absence of any manifestation of a genuine Soviet desire to lessen world tensions.

"No, I don't think so," he replied. Of course, peace will never be certain unless all nations desire it. But there are such things as gradual disarmament, nuclear test bans, inspection systems, and the like where more facts and figures are needed before they could be implemented.

"For example, how many men and machines would it take to police a test ban adequately? What are the economic factors of disarmament? How can we strengthen international organizations? We need the answers to these kind of questions and I think the Peace Research Institute can help find them."

The former Ambassador believes that a fresh breeze of change is blowing across the intellectual community. Up until quite recently, there was very little concern among scholars with the problems involved in maintaining peace.

Today, Mr. Wadsworth says, there is a growing interest in applying the scientific method to the world's No. 1 problem.

His institute's primary objective is "to assure that the fullest use is made of research talents from all disciplines throughout the United States on problems of international relations in search of further knowledge of ways to prevent war."

In other words, it will function as a peace broker.

WORK WITH UNIVERSITIES

It will do this by maintaining a close working relationship with universities and other research centers in order to identify studies they might undertake if they had the financial resources and facilities.

Meanwhile, it will keep in close communication with Government agencies and international organizations to discover their research needs.

To carry on its work, the Institute will seek to negotiate contracts with Government agencies, civilian and military; obtain grants from foundations and other sources and establish a clearinghouse to keep all those concerned informed of current and completed research in the field.

A forerunner of PRI, the Institute of International Order, last year completed five pilot studies which identified more than 500 topics which need further exploration. The studies covered:

The technical problems of arms control; economic factors bearing upon the mainte-

nance of peace; the international rule of law; national and international decision-making and communication in relation to war and peace.

THE PRESENT-DAY RADICALS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, on May 12 there was published in Life magazine an editorial entitled "The Unhelpful Fringes—The Present Day Radicals, Left or Right, Bring Us Neither Hope Nor Realism."

In the editorial there is profound thinking with respect to a problem that appears to be growing in this country today; and I hope that every Member of this body who has not already read the editorial will find the time to read it.

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

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

THE UNHELPFUL FRINGES—THE PRESENT-DAY RADICALS, LEFT OR RIGHT, BRING US NEITHER HOPE NOR REALISM

Not since the 1930's, when technocracy, Father Coughlin and the American Communist Party were in full cry, has the fringe-group situation in the United States been so lively as it is now. Extremists are resuming their long-quiet ideological warfare; there is a rash of new little magazines, both left and right. Most of the new yearners, says Irving Kristol in Encounter, are "trapped in a peculiarly American dilemma: How to be a radical without becoming a crank." Are any succeeding?

Let's start on the right with the John Birch Society. The most striking fact about it is its growth rate: it claims to have doubled its membership every 4 months since December 1958 and is now aiming at 100,000. How come? Founder Robert Welch is not all that charismatic, and anyway most members have never seen him. Nor are they seduced by the standard hate group appeals—Birchers are not anti-Semitic or anti-Negro. What brings new members in, apparently, is a line of argument, clearly and sincerely put forth in Welch's bluebook, the society's bible.

"The purpose of the John Birch Society," says the bluebook, is "to promote less government, more responsibility, and a better world." Obviously any good Jeffersonian could join that cause, and many such have. Welch is a fundamentalist Whig who believes that forms of government don't matter much, since all government is dangerous to liberty; the quantity is what matters, and the more the worse. "I had rather have for America * * * a government of 300,000 officials and agents, every single one of them a thief, than a government of 3 million agents with every single one of them an honest, honorable public servant."

"The increasing quantity of government, in all nations, has constituted the greatest tragedy of the 20th century" (Welch). The less you know of American history, and of 20th century tragedy, the easier it is to sneer at that statement.

The rapid spread of Birchism, then, is a part of the Whig (miscalled conservative) revival of this country, itself a natural reaction to the welfare state. BARRY GOLDWATER's personal success as a speaker and writer is the healthiest sign of this revival; but there are others. The Young Americans for Freedom represent the strong minority reaction on many college campuses against the dull orthodox liberalism of the academic scene. Yet both GOLDWATER and the Y.A.F.,

as well as Wm. F. Buckley's National Review, have taken some pains to dissociate themselves from the Birchers; and indeed the distinction is crucial. Unlike GOLDWATER et al., Welch scores not only democracy (a perennial fraud) and both major political parties (ubiquitous opportunism) but the U.S. political process itself. "We are at a stage where the only sure political victories are achieved by nonpolitical organization." The Birch Society is semisecret and members occasionally resort to dirty tricks (such as midnight telephone harassment). But what really sets it apart from healthier organizations are its political desperation and its romantic pessimism about our system's capacity for self-correction. The Birch Society is the I.W.W. of the right.

To this heady mixture the Birch formula adds a patriotic foam of uncompromising war on communism, at home and abroad. Here, where they should be most useful, the Birchers go most wrong. The basic dilemma of modern Whiggery is how to combat a monolithic Soviet enemy with an 18th century style minimum government and budget. The Birch escape from this dilemma is to internalize a menace which is in fact predominantly external; i.e., to find as many Communists at home as abroad. The Communist conspiracy at home is thus ballooned to the point where it includes Chief Justice Warren, the ADA, thousands of Protestant ministers, and even (in Welch's own demonography, if not that of his followers) Dwight Eisenhower. Welch even speaks of a tightly organized conspiracy of nearly 40 million Americans, supporters of the welfare state. The conspiratorial view of events can explain anything and lead to any lunacy. But lunacy is not a monopoly of the far right.

"I feel a desperate shame for my country. Were I physically able to do so, I would at this moment be fighting alongside Fidel Castro." So read a telegram to a fairplay for Cuba rally in San Francisco on April 22, signed by C. Wright Mills. He is a prominent professor of sociology at Columbia, author of "The Power Elite" and other tracts, a witch-hunter to the left.

"Left" is an imprecise word in America these days. Lacking a coherent set of goals, non-Communist but tired of the cold war, some would-be leftists have discovered a pseudosolution to the cold war. The name of this pseudosolution is unilateral nuclear disarmament.

Bertrand Russell, by brilliant deductions from false premises, has made "Better Red than dead" a meaningful slogan in Great Britain. He has recently been gaining a numerically small but rather influential American following. The pacifist marchers from Aldermaston, and the 1960 split in the British Labor Party over Britain's arms policy, have their counterparts in this country. One may ignore the anti-civil-defense demonstrations, and the amateur frogmen clamped to newly launched nuclear submarines. But one cannot ignore bright American intellectuals who present muffled or roundabout versions of the straightforward Russell case for surrender to the Communists.

The peace fronts in America often serve Communist strategy, but that does not mean they are of Communist origin. The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) recently found its New York chapter infiltrated by Communists and immediately suspended its charter. The role of communism in such movements, considered all important by Birchers, is troublesome but exaggerated. Plenty of bona fide peace-mongers—some all-out pacifists, some not—are genuinely concerned with our Nation's, and the human race's survival. SANE, at least, has a stated objective not unlike Kennedy's: inspected and controlled disarmament.

Quite different, and more alarming, is the position of a newer organization, the Committees of Correspondence. Sparked by two distinguished Harvard professors, Sociologist David Riesman and Historian H. Stuart Hughes (a grandson of Charles Evans Hughes), the Committees of Correspondence is a discussion network that starts with a flat rejection of deterrence as a strategy. Riesman, for example, has described the United States-Soviet cold war as a sibling rivalry and employs other Freudian metaphors to malign any Westerner who is willing to use nuclear weapons in defense of his freedom. He says it takes more masculine courage to offer a Gandhian nonviolent resistance to armed communism than to fight it. Says his colleague, Hughes: "I can find no alternative to the renunciation of thermonuclear deterrence as an instrument of national strategy * * * we have set forth on uncharted ground * * * and may end in transcending more than one of the loyalties that most Americans take for granted."

In other words, the Kremlin blackmail strategy has already succeeded with Messrs. Riesman and Hughes. They would save not Western civilization, certainly, but Western lives by an act of faith in Communist intent. Their logic is based on a reading of the world situation at least as romantic and antipolitical as that of the Birch Society.

Thus both the leading new fringe positions, left and right, are shot through with escapism and desperation. Neither is helpful to the actual American situation. Extremists have often been utopian and inspiring; these are utopian and defeatist.

GARY COOPER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, over the weekend a great and beloved American has passed to his reward. I refer to a fellow Montanan, Gary Cooper.

He was born in Helena. He went to the schools of Montana, except for 4 years when he was in England. He also attended Grinnell College in Iowa. He left Montana in the early twenties to earn his livelihood as a newspaper cartoonist in Los Angeles, Calif. He did not meet with much success in that line of endeavor; and, becoming quite discouraged, was considering going back to Montana, when he met two colleagues from Helena, who told him that he could make easy money by falling off horses. On that basis, he stayed in Hollywood.

Gary Cooper's father was a distinguished member of the Montana Supreme Court, just as later my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], was also a member of that court.

It is with a deep sense of loss that we of Montana note the passing of this great actor, this great American, who was always just Gary Cooper, always just himself.

On behalf of the people of my State and, I am sure, on behalf of the people of the entire Nation, I wish at this time to extend to Mrs. Cooper, his wife; to his daughter; and to his mother, who is still alive, and is living in Los Angeles, our deepest sympathy; and I express the hope that the good Mr. Cooper did in his lifetime will live long after him.

He could well serve as an inspiration to the young America of today, because in his life he portrayed what he really was—a good American, a man who be-

lieved in his country, a man who did not put on airs, but who, I repeat, was always himself.

We will miss him because we loved him. We will miss him because he was a great man. Those of us who come from Montana will miss him because he was one of our own. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, I want to join the distinguished senior Senator from Montana in paying tribute to Gary Cooper, who left our State as a young man to become a great film star. His personal qualities fitted him well for the hero's role he so often played. In Montana we are proud that our State—part of the American West Gary Cooper came to personify—left its imprint on him.

Mr. Cooper was born May 7, 1901, in Helena, Mont., son of a British lawyer who had come west, married a Montana girl, and managed a ranch as well as practiced law.

As the distinguished majority leader has said, Gary Cooper's father was a judge of the Montana Supreme Court. In later years I was privileged to succeed Mr. Cooper as a justice of the supreme court in the same line of the judiciary that he occupied in Montana.

The family went to England when Gary was 9, but returned to Montana 4 years later. He worked on the family ranch during the manpower shortage of World War I, helping tend 450 head of cattle.

His Hollywood career began in 1924, after 2 years at Grinnell College in Iowa and brief stints in door-to-door solicitation for a photography studio, and in selling advertising space on a theater curtain. The Fox Western Studios took him on as a rider at \$10 a day.

Although he played varied roles, including the memorable "Sergeant York," for which he won an Oscar, Gary Cooper was above all else a hero of the West. In "High Noon," perhaps the finest western ever filmed, Mr. Cooper's performance as the courageous sheriff of a town on the edge of panic will not be forgotten.

Besides Cooper the film star, there was Cooper the man. Modest in success, wholesome in his personal life, and courageous when afflicted by a fatal disease, Gary Cooper was indeed an American hero.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, I join the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished junior Senator from Montana in expressing my deep regret at the death of Gary Cooper. Gary and his wife have been our friends for many years. He was an outstanding American, a great sportsman, a fine gentleman, in addition to his extraordinary talents as an actor.

My wife and I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Cooper and all the family at the untimely loss of this outstanding citizen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, for one who at one time in his life had great affection for the stage and for the performing arts, the death of Gary Cooper comes as a distinct shock, and for a very good reason. No one could have followed

the theater and the motion picture industry without recognizing that the fare that had been "dished up" was not too well regarded or too acceptable in many quarters of the country. If I had to use one term to describe what Gary Cooper personified in his presentations to the country, it would be the word "wholesome." He was always wholesome, and he was fit fare for men, women, and children ever since I remember his first presentation.

So through the performing arts he made a great contribution to the country. He made it in the form, not only of entertainment, but edification, as well. And when one has done that, he has indeed ingratiated himself in the affection of everyone; and that is why I think Gary Cooper's passing is so universally mourned.

I share with the majority leader and his colleague from Montana the sense of bereavement that they feel when a great performer, who has done so much for entertainment and instruction, has had to pass away at an untimely age.

ADDRESSES OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN HAWAII

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Madam President, it was my privilege last week to accompany Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON from here to Honolulu on the first leg of his historic trip to southeast Asia. The Vice President was most enthusiastically received by the citizens of the Aloha State. This was partly in recognition of the high office he holds and the constructive leadership he has given for many years in Congress, but more perhaps because the people there know that he, more than any other national leader, was responsible for two accomplishments of great importance to Hawaii, to the Nation, and to the whole Pacific area: the granting of statehood to Hawaii, and the establishment of the East-West Cultural and Technical Interchange Center.

During his brief stay in Honolulu, the Vice President addressed a joint session of the Hawaii Legislature and was guest of honor at groundbreaking ceremonies at the East-West Center. His stirring remarks recognize the importance of the Pacific area to the Nation and to the world.

He forcefully expressed the American determination, not only to win the cold war, but also to win the peace.

I ask unanimous consent that his two addresses be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JOINT SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII, MAY 9, 1961

Aloha.

I am never so much at home as in the halls of a legislative body among representatives of free men and women. I feel very much at home with the Hawaiian House and Senate this afternoon—even though your senate does leave something to be desired; namely, Democrats.

My earliest boyhood memories are of the legislature of my own State of Texas, where my father served as a pioneer frontier law-

maker. One footnote to history is that my father wanted to name me after the man who was speaker of the house of representatives when I was born. As things have turned out, I am just as glad my mother prevailed. Think of the confusion that would have existed in Washington in recent years had my name been "SAM RAYBURN JOHNSON."

All of you can understand, I am sure, my great pride last summer at Los Angeles when my name was placed in nomination before the Democratic Convention by that man who had been my father's colleague, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States—Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

That pride was approached—if not exceeded—by the fact that my nomination was seconded by an able, valiant, and courageous son of these islands, your Congressman—my great and good friend—DAN INOUE.

Will Rogers once said he never met a man he did not like. I can say that in my years in Washington I never met a man or woman from these islands I did not like. Certainly I shall always cherish the friendship of one of the most dedicated and valuable public servants our Nation and your State have produced—my former colleague and continuing close friend, OREN LONG. I would also like to pay my sincere respects to one good Hawaiian and good American that the Democratic Party let get away, Senator HRAM FONG. With these men and with my old personal friend Jack Burns, I expect to continue in the future—as in the past—working for the greatness of America and for the good of your State.

The mission that brings me here is a mission undertaken at the request of a man who wants peace—who is determined that our country and our cause will prevail—and who understands that the works of freedom can know no East and no West—the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

My purpose on this mission to some of the young, growing independent nations of Asia is that of a factfinder. I go seeking to determine what must be done now to safeguard the security of those who are free—and what must be done together in the future to fulfill the opportunities and responsibilities of freedom among the peoples of Asia.

The United States does not accept—will never accept—the fatalism of those who preach that freedom can be strong, steadfast, and sure only in one area of the world. Our freedom is a fortune, and we recognize it—but men can never be truly free saving unto themselves this fortune God meant all his children to share.

Our President has said—and it is the spirit of his administration—that "Our democracy must demonstrate that it is still prepared to contend patiently, as well as with insight and passion, for the cause of human freedom in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, as well as in areas now held in satellite status by the Soviet Union."

For this contention, the United States must and will commit the full strength of its great capacity, the full moral force of our devotion to peace, the full energy and vitality of our people, to that cause of human freedom everywhere. Freedom cannot be secure in our world until the yoke of poverty, illiteracy, and disease is lifted off the shoulders of men everywhere.

Our end is freedom. Our means are the means of peaceful men.

To the peoples around the Pacific, Americans can and do point with the greatest of pride to these islands of Hawaii where the proudest heritages of East and West have met and brought into being a vital and living democracy.

Hawaii offers to the eye some of the world's greatest natural beauty. But far more important is the inspiration Hawaii

offers to the hearts of men by the example here of the brotherhood and harmony that has been achieved among your peoples under freedom.

For Hawaii, statehood has been achieved. You are proud of it. All of us who participated in this fulfillment of your dream are proud to have had a part. But statehood is not the end—it is only the beginning—of Hawaii's greatest role.

Hawaii is for the free world the bridge between West and East, opening the way to the cooperation and understanding between these cultures that is the only sure road to universal peace.

I would say to you of the Legislature of Hawaii—and to all the Americans in these islands—that your leadership in Washington wants to work with you to make our 50th star shine as a star of the first magnitude.

Your economy in Hawaii prospers today. We want to work with you not merely to maintain that prosperity but to increase it for all the people.

The foundation must be laid for broader industrialization.

The continuing strength of your agriculture must be assured and its diversification moved forward.

Education at all levels presents a challenge of rare opportunity here. It is my special hope that the East-West Center will help make Hawaii one of the world's greatest centers of learning, research, and scholarship.

Hawaii has never been lacking in enterprise in meeting the needs of its people. I want you to know that Hawaii will never be lacking in support, understanding, and interest from this administration.

There are problems to be met. The cost of living must not be allowed to increase artificially or unnecessarily. The foundation for strong industry and strong agriculture demands that attention be given to the basics of water supply and soil utilization as in the mainland States. Where there are gaps in essential Federal services between territorial status and statehood, those gaps must be closed.

Hawaii waited patiently and faithfully through many generations for attainment of statehood. It is my pledge to you that Hawaii will never again sit at the second table.

We in Washington, we on the mainland, we who are Americans from every State, salute you—welcome you proudly to the Union—and say to you from our hearts, aloha.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE DEDICATION OF EAST-WEST CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, MAY 9, 1961

This is one of the most personally gratifying moments of my public life. I am proud—and I shall always be proud—to have been the first sponsor of legislation providing fulfillment of your vision here of this great East-West Center.

Thomas Jefferson—before his death—looked back over his grand and noble life and asked that the stone on his grave commemorate the three achievements of which he was most proud:

First, that he was author of the Declaration of Independence;

Second, that he wrote the basic statement of religious freedom in the Virginia resolutions; and

Third, that he was founder of the University of Virginia.

I am not quite ready to contemplate my own epitaph—but of the works to which I have contributed I have the greatest confidence that this East-West Center will outlive them all.

Many individuals from Hawaii—and on the mainland—shared the vision embodied in this center. I cannot name them all. But I would like to express my gratitude

and ask your recognition of the one man whose energy, faith in America, and confidence in Hawaii contributed most—Jack Burns.

Since the earliest Americans landed on the far shore of the North American Continent, this hearty breed has moved westward, planting seeds as they moved, hoping others would share the ripened fruit in later harvests. We today follow in that tradition. We plant a seed from which we believe will grow a mighty tree spreading its branches over the lives of generations to come all around this great ocean of the Pacific.

The world will note what a different seed it is that freemen plant. The adversaries of freedom in the capitals of communism plant seeds of division, of strife, of suspicion, of hatred, of death and destruction. We are never more proud—we are never more nearly our true selves—than when we plant, as we do today, a seed of peace.

Aggressors may forget but freemen must always remember this:

The aggressor may destroy cities, lay waste to the farms, infiltrate the jungles, penetrate the deserts. He may ford the rivers and even seek to span the seas. But wherever there remains an enlightened and independent man, the aggressor will never securely hold the gains of his aggression.

The ultimate defense of freedom lies not in weapons systems nor in the implements of arms. These we must maintain as responsible men to deter the folly of those few leaders who acknowledge no responsibility to God or man or their own people. But freedom's surest defense and freedom's greatest force is the enlightenment of the minds of the people.

Arms can never make us invulnerable nor enemies invincible, but the support we give to education can make freedom irresistible.

This Center is a testament of our faith in this proposition. But this Center is more. It is an expression of a peculiarly important faith which American experience has bequeathed to us today. Out of many cultures—from many races and religions—we in America have enriched our free society with many prized contributions. The wealth of this diverse heritage we have fused together into the one great contribution which is indelibly American: that is the living proof America itself offers that the unity of mankind is not impossible.

The unity of people, cultures, heritages, races, religions, and regions in the United States represented as great a challenge in the beginning as the unity many dismiss as impossible in other regions of this world. America's success in unity—a success crowned gloriously in these islands—is a cornerstone on which the world can and must build.

A common language is only a convenience. A common heritage is only a comfort. A common currency is only a detail. Such things are the results of unity, not the cause. We must by our American example and leadership encourage independent nations to understand that unity always is possible and forever imperative.

The survival of freedom and independence must come through the free association and unity of those who aspire to peace among themselves and with their neighbors. The peaceful man is not always free; but the freeman is always a man of peace. To keep both their peace and their freedom, freemen on every continent can profitably turn to uniting themselves together in common purposes above and beyond their common defense. Unity affords the greatest strength against attack from without. But—far more important—unity affords the greatest strength for attack on the evils of poverty, illiteracy, and disease.

The world must be rid of poverty before it can be free of fears.

The world must be able to read before it will be able to build.

The world must be healthy before its people can be truly hopeful.

It is to accomplish such goals that we must and do encourage men who are independent to begin the work of uniting to prevent the compromise of their independence.

Back to the beginning of history, division has been—as it is today—the chief instrument of despots and tyrants. The oldest such division which tyrants have used against peace and freedom is the world's division between East and West. It is this division which we must end to clear the way to a world where peace is universal and freedom is universally secure.

The road to that goal is long. It will not be easy. In our lifetime—and even in the lifetime of our own children—the goal may not be realized. But we must reach toward it and work for it. We are reaching for that goal here today.

The purpose of this East-West Center is not for West to teach East or East to study the West. The purpose here is to bring together two proud and honorable cultures whose strengths are drawn from antiquity, and to fuse a new strength—a new strength for freedom that will last through eternity.

The concept of the East-West Center is as broad as the vast Pacific area it will serve. The center will flourish and grow within the heart of your own great university. The two institutions will do much to reinforce each other. But their missions and their service will not be the same. The University of Hawaii is here to serve Hawaii. The East-West Center is here to serve the world.

To this center we shall bring the wise men of the West and invite the wise men of the East. From them we shall hope that many generations of young scholars will learn the wisdom of the two worlds united here and to use that wisdom for the purposes and ends of mankind's highest aspirations for peace, justice, and freedom.

I am proud that three of the most distinguished educational leaders of the United States are advising on the development of this center: Clark Kerr, president of the University of California; John Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp.; and Herman Wells, president, of Indiana University.

As we dedicate this center we are not unmindful that since its conception communism has crudely acknowledged it by entering into competition against it. Communism has instituted in Moscow a center dedicated to the same purpose. But in this, as in much else, we ask the watching nations of the world to observe the contrast between a free society and the society which holds the State supreme. While we here seek to bring the youth of many lands together with our own—confident that freedom will not only prevail but be enriched—the Communists rigidly exclude students at their center from contact with, or exposure to, their own young people.

The free society has nothing to fear from its own freedom. The closed society must—above all else—fear itself. We by maintaining devotion to the principles on which our society was founded, by working without ceasing for the perfection of the unity which is our greatest strength, by continuing faithfully to plant these seeds of peace, can face the future not with fear, but with anticipation of the ultimate success of our cause.

**SENATOR GORE, OF TENNESSEE,
CHOSEN AS CHAIRMAN OF U.S.
DELEGATION TO INTERPARLIAMEN-
TARY UNION**

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, my esteemed colleague from Tennessee

has established a distinguished record in foreign affairs.

He is, as we all know, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Africa.

For some time, he was the Senate adviser to the U.S. delegation to the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests.

In addition, he has been a member of the American delegation to the Interparliamentary Union. This organization is composed of parliamentarians from 60 countries and exerts important influence in the fields of disarmament, the expansion of parliamentary systems, and the discussion of world problems. As a member of our delegation in past years, I have come to know many of these parliamentarians and to achieve a better understanding of our mutual problems.

Now, in recognition of his wide background, his fellow members of the U.S. delegation have this year elected my colleague as their chairman. I am highly gratified by their choice.

In this post, in which he succeeds the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of the House of Representatives, my colleague will lead this country's delegation to the next annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Brussels in September.

My colleague does not take this assignment lightly. Upon his election to the chairmanship, he called attention to the delicate nature of his new undertaking by forecasting the probable belligerency of the Soviet Union at this year's meeting as a result of the difficult situations which have arisen in the Congo and Cuba.

I believe I state the unanimous sentiment of the Senate when I express my full confidence in his leadership and wish him and the others in our delegation godspeed at the September meeting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee with regard to his colleague's assuming such an important post in the Interparliamentary Union. A better choice could not have been made, and I think the Senate will recognize that this is an appointment in which it has full confidence. We know that, under Senator ALBERT GORE, we shall be well and capably represented.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I appreciate the words of the majority leader about my colleague [Mr. GORE]. I think the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union to be held this year at Brussels will be particularly important. I can think of no better or safer hands to hold the chairmanship of the delegation than those of my colleague [Mr. GORE], who has had wide experience and is very knowledgeable in foreign affairs. He has the esteem of parliamentarians not only in this country but also in all nations which will be represented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 189, H.J. Res. 143.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 143) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the reason for consideration of the resolution at this time is that the date involved is the coming Friday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, similar action was taken on virtually an identical resolution last year. The resolution has already passed the House of Representatives. If this week is to be designated as National Transportation Week, of course there must be action at once.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the resolution.

The resolution (H.J. Res. 143) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and that the consideration of nominations on the executive calendar begin with those designated to be U.S. marshals.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul H. Black, and sundry other candidates, for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Marvin S. Cashion, and sundry other candidates, for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive H, 87th Congress, 1st session, a treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, signed at Rio de Janeiro on January 13, 1961 (Executive Rept. No. 6).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with U.S. marshals.

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be a U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the nominations for U.S. marshals be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the nominations were considered and agreed to en bloc, as follows:

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be a U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the nominations for U.S. attorneys be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the nominations considered and agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

B. Andrew Potter, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Oklahoma for a term of 4 years.

Joseph Peter Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam 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.

TREATY OF EXTRADITION WITH BRAZIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, for the information of Senators I think it should be mentioned at the present time that in addition to the two treaties which it has been announced were to be considered today, the Senate will consider the Treaty of Extradition with Brazil which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations today. The vote on this treaty will likewise be delayed until tomorrow. We shall have three votes on three treaties tomorrow, by the addition of the Treaty of Extradition with Brazil, to be considered also by the Senate today.

OPPOSITION TO DEPRESSED AREAS LEGISLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, one of the most vigorous opponents of depressed areas legislation was Oldham Paisley, publisher of the Marion Daily Republican at Marion, Ill., which was alleged to be deep in the heart of a depressed area.

After the bill recently considered was passed and signed, editor Paisley produced a front page editorial for his publication under the title "We Said We Did Not Need Santa Claus—Here Is the Proof."

It is regrettable that the photographs included in this editorial cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because they are most revealing. The text, however, can be inserted, and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of the editorial be made a part of my remarks.

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

WE SAID WE DID NOT NEED SANTA CLAUS—
HERE IS THE PROOF

For many months, the Daily Republican has said that Marion and Williamson County were not in a depressed area despite the allegations of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

We told Senator DOUGLAS, and all other politicians, seeking votes by offers of Santa Claus, that we were not depressed and had not been for a long time.

The Chinese have stated that one picture is worth a thousand words. With that statement in mind, we made these Polaroid photos this week and last week, and they are only a portion of the pictures that could be made, to show that Marion is progressive and not depressed.

Every one of these pictures is something that has happened in Marion since January 1, 1961, or are happening now. You can verify these pictures yourself and when you do, you will find many other views that show that Marion is on the move, without the aid of Santa Claus. None of these are Government-aided projects.

Five new homes now under construction on Julianna Street in the Castellano addition. There are three more homes being built on Laura Lane, the next street south.

Marshall Skelcher has almost sold all of the 64 5-acre tracts he offered for sale on April 15. The view above shows the old

Louie Sanders home. The Marion water tower and telephone tower are visible in the background of above photo, taken on the site.

Site for the new Marion Presbyterian Church, to be built at the end of South Carbon Street. Plans are now being completed and it is hoped to start construction this summer. Dr. W. W. Ritchey home and barn in the background.

Foundations for two new homes, in addition to a new home for John Goss, being built on Hadfield Street, in the Clarence Cagle addition, east of Parish Park Place. Cagle is now planning for another addition.

New home of William S. Giles on South Carbon Street, into which they moved a week ago.

Ninety-four-room Castellano motel, under construction on new Highway 13 in north part of city. Marion Castellano expects to have 51 rooms ready for occupancy in August.

The Bank of Egypt recently opened their expanded lobby with its modern banking facilities. The above photo shows how the lobby has been doubled in size, with a fine private office for the bank president. Growth of the bank made this expansion necessary.

Two new homes under construction on Red Bud Lane in the Charles Shoot addition to Marion. Another house is now under construction, across the street from these two homes, west of Longfellow School.

Four new homes on West Goodall Street, near North Russell Street being built by Williams Realty. The corner house is being built by Harry Dawson. Foundations have been laid for two more homes on opposite side of street by Charles Shoot.

Nearly complete \$50,000 remodeling and refurbishing of Feurer Brothers IGA at 113 South Russell, opposite the high school.

Work is progressing rapidly now on the \$500,000 Bracy warehouse, being built on the Illinois Central tracks, back of Motel Marion.

Facts are much better than fiction and the allegation that we are "depressed" is fiction. You can, if you wish, add to these concrete examples of our progress, some Federal projects, such as the post office improvements and the two housing projects nearing completion, but any way you figure it, Marion is progressing and we are proud to be a part of such a progressive community.

NIXON'S CRITICISM OF KENNEDY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, on the evening of May 6, former Vice President Nixon addressed a Republican statewide meeting in Des Moines, at which he made an address on public affairs, political and otherwise. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the story in the Des Moines Register of May 7, 1961, written by George Mills, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NIXON CHARGES FARM DECEIT; CORN PRICES FORCED DOWN, HE CONTENDS; RAKES FREEMAN IN TALK AT DES MOINES

(By George Mills)

Richard M. Nixon charged in Des Moines Saturday night that the Kennedy administration broke the corn market in order to force farmers to comply with the new feed grain program.

Nixon, the 1960 Republican presidential nominee, addressed a \$25-a-person GOP chicken dinner at KRNT theater. He is on a four-speech Republican tour.

FOUR THOUSAND TICKETS

The fund-raising affair produced more than \$100,000 before deduction of expenses. Ticket sales exceeded 4,000.

The smiling Nixon was in friendly political territory in Iowa, and he seemed to realize that fact. He carried this State by more than 170,000 votes last fall.

He was hatless and his hair was wind-blown when he stepped off a plane at the airport Saturday afternoon.

The whole airport production was almost a rerun of a Nixon 1960 campaign appearance in Iowa. There was a welcoming crowd, smaller than last fall but warmly friendly, small girls carrying signs, all kinds of autograph seekers, lots of politicians, even some of the same newspapermen who barnstormed with Nixon during the campaign.

He denied in effect that he is running for President in 1964.

PRIVATE CITIZEN

"My political future is probably behind me," he said in an interview. "I am here as a private citizen." The tour, however, is being looked upon as a drive by Nixon to strengthen his bid for continued leadership of the Republican Party.

He indicated he may speak out on foreign policy questions under certain conditions.

"If it helps the country, I will say it," he declared. "If it is going to hurt the country, I will keep my mouth shut."

He declined to criticize the Kennedy record in Cuba and Laos. The situation in both places is in a state of flux, he said, and it would not be right to inject criticism into a situation when the prestige of the Nation is at stake. He said the Democrats should have followed the same policy with President Eisenhower.

"Democratic criticism of President Eisenhower over the U-2 incident was disgraceful," he said.

RAKES FREEMAN

Nixon delighted the crowd Saturday night as he aimed at Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman the kind of ammunition the Democrats used to fire at Ezra Taft Benson, who was Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture.

"None of us expected that farm prices would be broken to force compliance," Nixon said. He declared Freeman promised not to pistol whip the farmers by such dumping of Government-owned corn on the market. He called that policy economic blackmail.

"The higher farm prices pledged 6 months ago have not been fulfilled," Nixon said.

"Average prices received by farmers in April were under those of a year ago. Here in Iowa the farmer acutely knows of the sharp decline in the price of corn."

Nixon said the administration's sales policy "seems to me to be at least unfair to those who are now marketing corn produced last year." He declared that dumping of corn is going on "day after day." He said the Department "insists that it is selling only deteriorated corn."

LARGE AMOUNTS

"But the daily sales report of the Commodity Stabilization Service reveals to one and all that large amounts of storable No. 1 and No. 2 corn are being placed on the market," he said.

Cheap feed will mean cheap livestock next year, Nixon added.

"Especially there is concern that depressed corn prices will encourage overexpansion of numbers," he said. "With this only can come disastrous hog prices in the fall of 1962."

Nixon expressed approval of the basic Federal farm program now in force. The use of payments in grain to encourage farmers to retire land from production was endorsed in the 1960 Republican platform, he said.

"But this difference I must emphasize," he said. "We were committed to a voluntary program, not one that forces the farmer to comply by threatening to destroy his market."

Nixon called the administration's long-range farm program "a frontier without freedom."

CITES CONTROLS

"It could impose marketing quotas and controls upon every farmer in the Nation," he said. "Safeguards against actions by one commodity group which might adversely affect other segments of the agricultural economy are not provided. Safeguards for the farmer who wants to be free of Government regulation are not provided."

He said the proposed controls would increase unemployment both on and off the farm. Fewer farmers would be needed to produce the lessened output, he said, and fewer wage earners to handle the smaller flow of production from the farm. Small cities and towns would be damaged, he contended.

Nixon said that a farm program should not "blight the opportunities of our farm people and mire them utterly in controls and regimentation."

A report from Chicago Saturday night told of Nixon criticizing President Kennedy for asking newspapers to use self-restraint in the handling of news in these times. Nixon said in a taped TV show that the President's request was "well intentioned but unrealistic."

Nixon said that any press censorship in peacetime is dangerous, "voluntary or otherwise."

"If we make errors in this," Nixon said, "it should be on the side of printing the news rather than suppressing it."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the article, an editorial from the Des Moines Register of May 9, 1961, in connection with the address.

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

NIXON'S CRITICISM OF KENNEDY

Richard M. Nixon adopted a responsible and understanding line on foreign affairs in his speech in Des Moines. He did not try to make political capital out of the difficulties of the Kennedy administration in Laos and Cuba.

However, he did criticize President Kennedy for asking newspapers to go easy on covering news of such situations and national security affairs. He said any press censorship in peacetime, voluntary or otherwise, is dangerous—and we thoroughly agree. The strength of democratic government depends on keeping the people, who ultimately rule, informed about what their Government is doing. Nixon is right in saying that "if we make errors in this, it should be on the side of printing the news rather than suppressing it."

In discussing agricultural policy, Nixon was less cogent. He attacked the Kennedy administration for breaking the price of corn to force farmers to comply with the new feed-grain program. He said this policy was unfair to those now marketing corn produced last year.

But all farmers are eligible for the price support on corn and do not have to accept the market price if they have storable grain. Corn prices rose more than the usual seasonal amount from November to March and in March were somewhat above the price of a year earlier. Quality of corn this year has been below average, and now that the end of the loan period is near (last of May), more low-quality corn ineligible for loan is

coming to market. The market price of corn, however, is only 5 to 8 cents lower than it was a year ago.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has sold more corn this year, but with stocks at an all-time high, this is to be expected. Lots of old corn is going out of condition.

Nixon said the lower corn price was worrisome, because cheap feed will generate cheap livestock next year. But he endorsed the payment-in-kind feature of the new feed-grain program and recalled that this idea had been advocated by the Republicans last fall. This payment-in-kind proposal is the thing to worry about in connection with cheap feed generating more livestock and lower prices. The payment in kind would put back into the market a lot more grain from Government stocks.

Nixon called the administration's long-range farm program a frontier without freedom. He said this program might lead to marketing quotas and controls on every farmer. He did not seem to recognize that Secretary Freeman's proposals are not a program but a new method of developing farm programs. The proposed new law would not give the Secretary any authority to impose controls.

The former Vice President said he thought the new feed grain program was sound "in basic concept," and he affirmed that "no one believes more deeply than I that the Government has an obligation to help farmers solve their problems."

Nixon is undertaking the role of leader of the loyal opposition, which is commendable. From his experience in Government and his position as titular leader of the Republican Party, he can do much to help guide the administration and to acquaint the people with its failures and weaknesses. The enthusiasm of his audience of party faithful in Des Moines shows that he maintains a powerful hold on Republican opinion in this State.

STEWART UDALL, GREAT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, after 8 long years of frustration the Nation's conservationists find new hope in the administration's vast programs to protect and develop the Nation's resources.

Less than a month after taking office President Kennedy and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall began to reverse corrosive policies which had brought conservation and resource development to a virtual standstill. Secretary Udall's policy announcements indicate a return to the conservation philosophy of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

In less than 4 months he has scrapped the partnership policy of hydroelectric development and initiated a Federal program of planning, constructing, and interconnecting generating plants to provide an adequate supply of low-cost power for homes, farms, and industry in areas whose economies would otherwise remain static. He has promised a stronger and more aggressive reclamation program.

Secretary Udall has also announced that no more applications for lands in the public domain will be accepted from private individuals until September 1962. This moratorium will give the Bureau of Land Management an opportunity to study the 60,000 applications now on file and stop the scandalous speculation in public lands.

He has taken over the administration of the Department of the Interior with vigor and imagination. If his first 4 months as Secretary are any indication, he will be one of the greatest Secretaries of the Interior we in the United States have had.

Madam President, recently Secretary Udall was unjustly accused of requesting an oil company executive to solicit \$100 contributions to the forthcoming Jefferson-Jackson Day Democratic dinner.

After the facts became known, it developed that the Secretary's name was used without his knowledge or approval. Ironically enough, the only decision made to that date by the Secretary concerning the oil industry adversely affected this executive's company.

Mr. Udall is a veteran of World War II, a successful attorney, a son of a former chief justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, and was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. He possesses an almost aggressive reputation for integrity. His reputation is far above reproach.

Madam President, an excellent editorial captioned "Those \$100-a-Plate Dinners," was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of Ohio's great newspapers, on May 5, 1961. It points out clearly the unfairness of the attack on Secretary Udall and discusses frankly the real issue involved. I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point as part of my remarks.

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

THOSE \$100-A-PLATE DINNERS

We can't get too excited about Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall's suggestion to a friend that it would be well to bring a few more friends to a \$100-a-plate Democratic dinner. Republicans have \$100-a-plate dinners too, and it is a good bet that Republican leaders have indicated to friends that a fine turnout on such occasions would be a very fine thing.

We doubt very much that Mr. Udall, who possesses an almost aggressive reputation for honesty, would consider attendance by members of the oil industry at such a dinner any reason for future favors. Indeed, men like Udall are usually tougher on their friends than anyone else; they lean backwards, and their friends know it.

But we can get rather excited about \$100-a-plate dinners. No dinner is worth \$100. Why are they held? To pay off campaign deficits, and such deficits are quite bipartisan. Sometimes the Democrats are in the hole, sometimes the Republicans.

It is to help to pay off a Democratic campaign deficit of more than \$2 million that the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner is to be held on May 27, and even a political party must pay its debts if it is to remain a respectable member of society. Costs of campaigning have gone up, and it is almost impossible to conduct a campaign in these days of television without going into the red.

Well then, how could the situation be improved? How could it be altered so that party debts could be paid without putting the bee on a few individuals who possess that much money? It could be done by broadening the base of giving to make up such deficits. This is not precisely a new thought. Attempts have been made to do it, and thousands have sent in a dollar, and

even more. But there has never been enough response to pay the bill.

Perhaps it would be easier to get contributions for a known deficit of such-and-such an amount, than to ask for funds just-in-case. Perhaps the drive for funds should take place after the election, instead of before the election.

Some 34,082,289 Americans voted for President Kennedy. If every one of these contributed 6 cents it would wipe out the \$2 million debt—and leave a margin. If every one of the 33,881,866 Americans who voted for Richard Nixon contributed 6 cents, it would put \$2,032,911.96 in GOP coffers.

It would be a mighty easy way to pay campaign deficits if someone could figure out an inexpensive way to collect the money, and it would put an end to \$100-a-plate dinners, in addition to giving everyone a far greater feeling of participation.

But to attempt to make Udall the goat for \$100-a-plate dinners is ridiculous. They were well established when he was in knee pants.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, it is no secret that money is essential in political campaigns. The cost of political campaigns, especially presidential campaigns, has reached enormous levels. Tens of millions of dollars are spent.

Both political parties raise money as best they can. It is a sad commentary on our Republican form of government that such a vital instrument of freedom as a presidential campaign must depend for its financing on methods less equitable and rational than those used by charities.

Madam President, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana and majority leader of the Senate [Mr. MANSFIELD] has proposed legislation to help correct this situation. His bill, S. 227, will, among other things, shorten the length of presidential campaigns, thus saving political parties millions of dollars and saving political leaders and citizens generally from the wear, tear, and distractions of enduring prolonged political campaigns. It will also provide up to \$1 million for each political party for the tremendous costs of television and radio broadcasting.

In introducing this legislation in the Senate on January 9, 1961, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] made a magnificent speech in which he said:

I do not think that it serves the interests of the entire Nation when elections can be influenced significantly or even decided by the question of which candidate can raise the most money. I do not think it serves the national interests when the expenses for those who campaign to serve all the people must be financed by a relative handful of people and organizations which make large contributions directly or indirectly. I do not think it adds to the dignity and vitality of the Nation's political life when another major source of political finance is the patently unsatisfactory practice of selling \$2 steaks at \$100-a-plate dinners.

Madam President, the majority leader has completely stated the case for reform of presidential campaign financing. Let us go ahead and do something about it.

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

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

COMPETENT MEN IN IMPORTANT GOVERNMENT POSITIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in yesterday's issue of the New York Times magazine there appeared an article by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], having to do with much of the work which he and his committee have undertaken relative to the difficulties which confront the administration of the Government in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "To Do Our Best, We Need Our Best," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TO DO OUR BEST, WE NEED OUR BEST

(The times require Government servants of the highest caliber. A Senator outlines these ways of removing the barriers that keep good men out of Washington.)

(By HENRY M. JACKSON)

Look at the front pages of the newspapers. Around the world the din of battle in the cold war is rising. Khrushchev and Mao believe that the free world is off balance, and that by pushing on the pressure points, from Cuba to Laos, from the Congo to Vietnam, from Geneva to space, they can force us to take several steps backward.

Our Government's ultimate resource in this struggle is the people who work for it. People make the decisions on which success or failure turns. People man the action posts—as diplomats in trouble areas, as technical-assistance workers in Africa, as scientists in aero-space laboratories, as negotiators with the Soviet Union, as strategic planners in the Pentagon and as soldiers guarding the boundaries of freedom in Korea.

For nearly two years, our Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery has been making a nonpartisan study of how our Government could best organize to meet the mortal challenges of the cold war. A main question has been what the Government can do to make sure that the jobs of first importance to the survival and flourishing of our free way of life will be filled with first-rate people.

The posts of special concern are at the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet levels. They embrace the top positions in the Departments of State and Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Treasury, the International Cooperation Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the like.

Many of these top posts are now occupied by officials coming from the career services—Foreign Service officers or Pentagon old-timers. In good part, however, these positions are held by private citizens temporarily in Government service. They come from and return to private life—the law and industry, labor organizations, and universities or research centers.

The level of excellence in our public service must keep pace with the mounting com-

plexity of the national-security issues we face. We confront a twin problem:

1. The career services must be made a better training ground of candidates for these top spots.

2. We must lower the barriers which now discourage highly qualified people in private life from serving governmental tours of duty.

A President should draw freely upon the seasoned and able members of the career service in filling many of the key foreign-policy and defense jobs. The new Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Roger Jones, will profit from his background as a former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and a veteran of 20 years with the Bureau of the Budget.

Yet today, our career services are really not geared to produce enough officials with the large executive talents, width of perspective, and breadth of experience needed in top positions. For the most part, regular career officers have very few chances to see the problems of foreign and defense policy "in the round." An official normally spends almost his whole career in one agency. Even there, he may not be exposed to the problems of the department as a whole.

Further, our Government has been very niggardly in giving civilian officials opportunities for advanced training. They rarely have a chance to get away from day-to-day pressures to get fresh perspectives, and acquire new skills and knowledge.

In this respect, our civilian career services have much to learn from the personnel-development programs of the Armed Forces. Promising officers follow career patterns designed to expose them to the problems of their services as a whole. At regular intervals they profit from attendance at the admirable service schools. Today almost every military officer must attend the National War College or its equivalent and serve in a joint or international command, before he can receive his first star.

A program for developing more leaders from the career service should stress greater flexibility and latitude in job assignments, and movement between agencies. A pilot program has recently been started for the exchange of outstanding civilian and military personnel between the Departments of State and Defense. This program could profitably be expanded to include personnel from the Budget Bureau, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency and related agencies.

In addition, we should give more civilian officials of outstanding ability opportunities for advanced training. How better to develop an international monetary expert than by a stint of service on Wall Street? And how better to equip a Pentagon official with an understanding of the political and economic forces at work in the world than by a year spent in travel and research at a center for advanced international studies?

There is a long leadtime in bringing an official to the point where he is ready for leadership. We ought to be worrying now, in 1961, about those who will fill the key foreign-policy and defense posts in 1981. The time is overdue for the Government to strengthen and broaden its programs for bringing the cream of our college students into its service.

Suppose, for example, that our junior-recruitment programs could bring to Washington each year 200 young men and women from the very top of their classes. If these people started working for the Government at an average age of 25 and if half of them remained in Federal service for 40 years, we would be able to develop a pool of 4,000 executives on the job and in training. At any given time, 1,500 of these would be at

the peak of their powers, with 25 or more years of varied Government experience to draw on.

I am convinced that the returns from establishing such a career-leadership reserve are well worth whatever special cost or effort may be involved.

Programs to strengthen the career services must be matched by steps to make it easier for people in private life to accept key Government assignments.

The kind of people required is in very short supply. They must have not only executive ability but also a feeling for how business is done in the Government and an understanding of the problems of national-security affairs. Only a very few possess this sought-for combination of talents.

Men and women having these talents are found in both political parties. The yardstick for making appointments to top national-security posts should therefore be ability to do the job—regardless of party. This was true in the time of Stimson, Forrestal and Lovett. And it is as true today in the cold war.

We simply cannot afford the luxury of placing needless barriers in the path of gifted citizens willing to come to Washington. But today we do. Take the conflict-of-interest laws. The subcommittee's study soon made it clear that these laws, though aimed at desirable and necessary objectives, have adverse unintended side effects as now written. They place needless roadblocks in the path of able people willing to accept Government posts.

I therefore urged the administration to submit at this session of Congress comprehensive proposals for modernizing the body of statutes dealing with conflicts of interest. The administration's proposals have now been put before the Congress. They merit speedy congressional study and action.

We cannot legislate honesty. Yet statutes and regulations will always be required to keep officials from getting into compromising situations, and to deal with the very few persons who are tempted to use public office for private gain.

Seven conflict-of-interest laws are now on our statute books. They have been enacted over the course of a century. Four of them became law over 90 years ago.

The existing statutes are in good part archaic. They are more concerned with the problems of the Civil War period than of today's cold war. They have not been updated to reflect the social and economic revolution our country has undergone in the past century. They take inadequate account of the rise of the modern corporation, the growth of public ownership of stocks, the Government's contemporary need for the services of part-time consultants and advisers, the heavy traffic between public and private employment and the peculiar problems now posed by the scientist-adviser.

Further, the draftsmanship of these statutes is defective. Compliance with the letter of these laws can result in ridiculous consequences. They are therefore often simply ignored or winked at.

In their present form, these conflict laws often needlessly hamstringing the Government in filling critical jobs. One example: The legal profession has been one of the prime recruiting grounds for top-level national security officials. Yet today's statutes make it peculiarly hard for members of the bar to serve the Government.

Five of these laws aim at keeping Government employees from acting on behalf of other persons in their business relations with the Government. Since it is mainly the legal profession that acts in this representative capacity, the impact of these statutes falls largely on lawyers.

The lawyer's problem is compounded by the fact that law firms must do business in the form of partnerships. A lawyer remaining in a partnership after taking on a Government assignment becomes subject to the conflict-of-interest laws on two counts—because of what he may do and also what his partners may do. The partners cannot take part in activities denied the lawyer without exposing him, and possibly even the partnership as a whole, to the consequences of illegal behavior.

A lawyer taking on a full-time Government job meets this problem by resigning from his firm. But what of the lawyer-adviser asked to serve the Government as a part-time consultant on, say, disarmament or foreign aid?

The services of such consultants may be required only 1 or 2 days a month. Yet as top advisers, task force members, or trouble-shooters on spot assignments, they can do much to shape our foreign and defense policies in wise directions.

A lawyer helping the Government in this capacity obviously cannot be expected to resign from his private practice. But from the standpoint of the conflict-of-interest laws, both he and his partners are now treated as if he worked for the Government full time. As a result, countless lawyers of superior qualifications are forced to turn down consultancies.

Let me cite two cases illustrating the absurdities that can result:

A practicing lawyer in New York who is also an amateur art authority regretfully declined an appointment as an unpaid adviser to the Federal Commission of Fine Arts. Acceptance might have required either his resignation from his law firm or withdrawal of the firm from antitrust cases, tax problems and all other legal work involving the Federal Government.

The other case comes from the files of our subcommittee itself. I invited a distinguished attorney in one of the Capital's leading law firms to serve as a temporary subcommittee consultant on the problem of modernizing the conflict-of-interest statutes. I had in mind a memorandum requiring about a week's work.

The lawyer apologetically declined our invitation. The reason? Unless he resigned from his law firm, he could not advise us on the conflict-of-interest laws without in the process entangling both his partners and himself with these very same laws.

Another example of how these laws now make it difficult for the Government to secure officials from private life: Today, most people have a heavy stake in the retirement or life-insurance plans of their employers. Few men can afford to withdraw from such plans, which are so important not only to their future but to their families. Yet a strict reading of existing conflict statutes leaves it open to doubt whether a private citizen in Government can continue to participate in the retirement and insurance programs of his regular employer.

The stock-investment problem is another deterrent to public service: In recent years the Senate, and particularly the Armed Services Committee, has required candidates for high national-security posts to sell stocks the committee believes the officials could not retain and still properly discharge their duties.

The stocks, for the most part, have been those of companies doing business with the Pentagon. Our new Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, had to sell very substantial holdings in the Ford Motor Co., while accepting a salary reduction of more than 90 percent in the process.

So far, the committee has found no good yardsticks for determining which stocks an official may keep, and which he must sell.

Each portfolio tends to be considered by the Senators as an individual case.

There is real need to guard the public against favoritism in official decisions. The question is how to do this without imposing unreasonable sacrifices upon men accepting Government jobs. The Senate, through the Armed Services Committee, is now searching for better ways to handle the problem of stock divestment.

Making it easier for outstanding men to come to Washington is only half the task. The other half is to keep them there. Both the turndown and the turnover rates have been unsatisfactorily high. I can recall one 6-month period when the Defense Department alone lost its Deputy Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, and its General Counsel.

It may take 2 or 3 years to master a job. A heavy price is paid when an official is lost just as he has reached the height of his usefulness. Little can be done to prevent a man from resigning if he so decides, but it is desirable to secure advance assurances from appointees that they will remain in office at the pleasure of the President and their department chiefs.

Finally, any program for raising the excellence of our public service must try to do something about Government salary scales. Particularly at the sub-Cabinet level, the pay of most officials lags far behind the salaries they could command in private life—not only in business but even in the academic world.

Some major adjustments upward are clearly needed. Roger Jones, the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, suggested to our subcommittee that even \$20 million annually, wisely used to adjust the top salary grades, would make it dramatically easier to hold outstanding career officials and to enlist the help of more first-rate private citizens.

In his penetrating testimony, Mr. Robert Lovett told our subcommittee:

"While the challenges of the moment are most serious in a policy-making sense, I see no reason for black despair or for defeatist doubts as to what our system of government or this country can do. We can do whatever we have to do in order to survive and to meet any form of economic or political competition we are likely to face. All this we can do with one proviso: we must be willing to do our best."

And to do our best, we need our best. In time of hot war we put our ablest people to work wherever they are. We sweep aside pointless barriers to public service. In this time of equally fateful cold war, we must do the same.

We need the finest leadership, the finest planners and the finest administrators our country can produce. The "help wanted" sign is up for keeps.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, at the conclusion of routine morning business, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

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

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARIES OF SENATORS BUSH, DODD, AND BOGGS

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I wish to take a moment today to extend birthday congratulations to my two dis-

tinguished colleagues in the Senate, Senators BUSH and DODD of Connecticut. It is quite a coincidence that both Senators from Connecticut have their birthdays on the same day. It is paralleled by the fact that Senator JAVITS and I have our birthdays on the same day. So far as I know, except for these two instances, there is no similar occurrence in the history of the Senate.

Both Senators from Connecticut have afforded us a good example of solidarity by entering the world on the same day. Although they bear different party labels, they have worked together in harmony, and both of them serve their State and their Nation well. It has been my privilege to work closely with Senator DODD on the Judiciary Committee, and with Senator BUSH in the development and support of legislation. I have learned to value their qualities of intellect, ability, and dedication, and it therefore gives me special pleasure to salute them on this anniversary day.

At the same time, I want to extend the same congratulations to our colleague from Delaware, Senator BOGGS, who also is celebrating his birthday today. Senator BOGGS is in good birthday company, which is precisely where he deserves to be, for, by his manifest ability he has given full proof of the judgment of the good people of Delaware in electing him to this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

LUNCHEON TODAY FOR LORD ATTLEE

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, Earl Clement Attlee, formerly Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, will be in Washington this week. Lord Attlee is here in the cause of disarmament. This afternoon he will talk with President Kennedy. Later in the week he plans a conference with Mr. McCloy, who is in charge of our disarmament negotiations. Tomorrow at 12:30 in room G-219, an informal organization of Members of Congress for Peace Through the Rule of Law is giving a luncheon for Lord Attlee.

All Members of the Senate are welcome. Any of them who may hear this announcement or may read of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they will get in touch with my assistant, Mr. Benjamin Read, will be welcome guests.

We would like to have a large attendance in honor of this eminent and very great world statesman.

THE AMERICAN YOUTH CIVIC PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I would like to draw your attention to a youth program which though small

points the way toward achieving helpful recreation programs for our youth. It is especially noteworthy since the original initiative to organize this group was undertaken by the teenage youth themselves.

This organization, the American Youth Civic Organization, was organized in ward 23 in Cleveland. This is an area where there is need for wholesome recreation and the opportunity for delinquency preventative work.

This youthful civic organization established a program for young men, 14 years of age and over, for the avowed purpose of offering Cleveland youth an opportunity to serve their community. With such a service motif they secured the interest and cooperation of John F. Kovacic, Cleveland city councilman and of Milton Bowman, mayor's traffic safety coordinator.

Under the sponsorship of these teenagers, regular meetings are held, parliamentary procedures learned, discussions of traffic safety are discussed, educational films are exhibited and dances for the young people in the ward provide needed social fellowship.

I wish to commend young Joseph Sterned, Jr., and Tony Peikovsek, the present officers, and I am encouraged to know the ideals of the American Youth Civic Organization are spreading out into nearby wards of Cleveland.

Madam President, I believe our Cleveland young men are to be congratulated and encouraged in this very worthwhile effort.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 227, S. 1852.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, this bill would authorize appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in a total of \$12,499,800,000. This is an enormous sum, even by today's standards, and an authorization of this magnitude is another reminder of the high cost of preparedness in the troublous and perilous times in which we live.

Earlier this year, President Kennedy sent to the Congress an eloquent special message on defense. In that message, the President outlined our basic defense

policies. Many parts of the message deserve remembering, but one sentence in particular could hardly be quoted too often. That is the sentence beginning:

The primary purpose of our arms is peace, not war—to make certain that they will never have to be used.

I mention that at this point in an attempt to avoid an impression that in our preoccupation with providing an adequate defense, we have overlooked the primary purpose of such a defense.

An annual authorization of appropriations for the procurement of the major weapons is a new departure for the Senate and for the Congress. Until this year, appropriations for these purposes have been sought on the basis of authorizations that were practically without limitation. The existence of such authorizations made it difficult for the Committees on Armed Services to discharge the responsibilities imposed on them by the rules of the House and the Senate. The requirement for more specific authorizations in these areas was imposed in 1959, to be effective this year, in the hope that this procedure would permit the Committee on Armed Services to contribute more to the formulation of our defense policies, and that this review by the Committees on Armed Services would assist the Committees on Appropriations in their deliberations.

The authorization bill that is before the Senate was formulated after hearings at which the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the military chiefs of the Armed Forces testified before the committee. The Secretary of Defense presented an unusually comprehensive and informative statement. In only one respect does the committee recommendation differ from the recommendations of the executive branch. When one considers that the bill involves many different weapons and a total of more than \$12 billion, this is a complimentary indication of the committee's reaction to the programs of the President and the Secretary of Defense. This is an appropriate time to point to the statement by the Secretary of Defense that—

Our predecessors did a very thorough job in preparing their fiscal year 1962 proposals.

While the recommendations of this administration differ somewhat in their emphasis, it is only fair to observe that in its major outline the current program for weapons procurement is a continuation of the major programs proposed in President Eisenhower's administration.

One area to which additional emphasis is devoted is our capability to prevent and to respond to limited wars. A major part of our defense expenditures has been applied recently to the attempted achievement of an invulnerable strategic missile force. Elements of this force include Polaris submarines and the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman ballistic missile systems. The need for such systems is fundamental in view of the threat that we face, but unfortunately these systems are limited in their versatility. They add nothing to our ability to defend ourselves in a conflict not involving

the exchange of nuclear weapons at long range. Our prayer is that potential adversaries will share our realization of the cataclysmic effect on both sides of such a devastating exchange and that they will be constrained from precipitating it.

Although not all of these actions are directly related to the authorization bill before the Senate, the President has proposed several courses of action for strengthening our ability to deter or confine limited war. Among these are expanded research on nonnuclear weapons, additional transport aircraft and amphibious transports, procurement of additional quantities of conventional ammunition, modification of existing tactical fighters, and development of an advanced tactical fighter. I shall be surprised if these actions are not indicative of the trend in defense plans for the immediate future. I think it is clear that other steps to improve our conventional forces will be forthcoming.

Before discussing in general terms the weapons for which this authorization is intended, I should like to describe the one change recommended by the committee. This is in the form of an additional authorization of \$525 million for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command. In explaining a recommendation representing a composite judgment of 17 members, it is virtually impossible to specify the factors that motivated each member in reaching a decision. In this instance, there were several grounds upon which a decision to procure additional bombers might reasonably be based. To some members, the most persuasive argument for taking this action is that manned bombers constitute a proved system, while intercontinental ballistic missiles are new, and have many complexities and uncertainties. Other members may have been motivated by the realization that a state of mutual deterrence, or an effective agreement banning atomic weapons, might leave us inadequately prepared in systems to respond to conventional warfare. Still other members were impressed by the more deliberate response that may be made with manned systems and by the greater utility and flexibility that these systems afford. Another justification for procuring more manned bombers is to assure adequate launching vehicles for the standoff missiles such as Hound Dog and Skybolt. Some of the B-52's in our current force are already several years old. By the time the Skybolt development is completed and this missile system is operational, a substantial part of the B-52 force may be approaching the end of the period of effective use.

In recommending additional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft, the committee is mindful that it does not have the complete power of decision in this area. The Committees on Appropriations may not concur in this recommendation. Even if the Committees on Appropriations agree with this view, there is no assurance that the executive branch will obligate funds for this purpose. To use a legal term, Con-

gress is not empowered to mandamus the executive branch to require use of the authorizations and appropriations granted. But I remind the Senate that in other years we have provided amounts above those recommended by the executive branch at a time when the executive branch insisted that no more was required, and yet the additional amounts were eventually used, at least in part, to enhance our retaliatory strength.

Madam President, for my part, I am unwilling to rest the future security of this Nation altogether on long-range intercontinental missiles at this stage of their development.

I shall now turn to some of the items that this bill is intended to authorize for procurement. In doing so, I shall refrain from detailing the numbers of the missiles and the aircraft to be procured, and from indicating the part of the total authorization that is allocated to any one weapon. This information is available in the committee and will be made available to Members of the Senate who may desire to see it. It is the committee's hope, however, that both Congress and the executive branch will make a new start in their policies on publicizing the details of our defense program. This is a subject on which it is difficult to find a satisfactory middle ground. It probably would be unreasonable to come before the Senate with a bill authorizing appropriations totaling more than \$12 billion and to say, in effect, that this authorization is for defense, but I can give you no further details. At the same time, I cannot believe that it is in the public interest to designate and publicize the purpose for which every dollar is spent by the Department of Defense. An unreasoning insistence on the publication of such information adds substantially to the cost of our defense, and, more seriously, it gives our potential enemies a tremendous advantage over us. It is not inconceivable that we could destroy ourselves by insisting upon a full exercise of the privilege of knowing the most intimate defense secrets.

For my part, I prefer to absorb the criticism that will come from some quarters over such a policy in the firm belief that the general public supports this view. Hardly a week passes in which I do not receive correspondence from my constituents protesting the extent to which our defense plans, bases, weapons, and programs are publicized.

I now turn to a discussion of the authorizations for the different services and the impact of the bill upon them.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Department of the Army authorization in this bill total \$761,800,000. Of this sum, \$211 million is authorization of appropriations for the procurement of five different types of Army aircraft; \$550,800,000 is authorization for the procurement of eight different types of missiles. The aircraft and missile types are enumerated and briefly described in the committee report, and I shall not discuss each one at this time unless some Member of the Senate desires information about one of them.

In general, the Army aircraft types are intended to provide a gradual in-

crease in the capability of the Army for air mobility within the combat zone. They do not provide strategic airlift and they do not provide close air support of ground forces since, under our current Defense operation, these functions are provided by other Armed Forces.

Army missiles for which appropriations would be authorized by this bill include the Hawk, which provides a field army with a defense against low altitude aircraft; improvements to the Nike-Hercules system, which is deployed around cities and critical installations for defense against aircraft; the Redeye, which will provide individual troops with close protection against low flying aircraft; the ENTAC, a new antitank guided missile of promising effectiveness; and additional quantities of Honest John and Little John missiles. In the longer ranges the bill would authorize appropriations for the Sergeant, a solid propellant successor to the Corporal, and for the Pershing, a solid propellant successor to the Redstone.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Navy part of the bill provides authorization of appropriations not only for aircraft and missiles, but for the construction and conversion of naval vessels.

The \$2,915 million authorization is for naval vessels; \$1,585,600,000 is authorization of appropriations for Navy and Marine Corps aircraft; and \$606,400,000 is for Navy missiles, some of which will be used for Marine air wings. In addition, there is an authorization of \$27 million for surface-to-air missiles to be used by Marine divisions.

The Navy vessel authorization is for funds to finance procurement of 36 new ships, including 10 Polaris-type submarines, a submarine tender, 7 guided missile frigates, 3 nuclear attack submarines, and 4 vessels to be used in the amphibious and vertical assault operations of the Marine Corps—22 older ships could be modernized with this authorization, which also includes an item to restore the unobligated balances that were borrowed to accelerate the procurement of 5 Polaris submarines, pursuant to the President's order earlier this year.

Missiles to be procured by the Navy include those for installation aboard ships such as Tartar, Terrier, and Talos; air-to-air types, such as Sparrow and Sidewinder; and the air-to-surface missile, Bullpup. The Sparrow, Sidewinder, and Bullpup missiles will be procured both for the Navy and the Marine Corps. As one might expect, the largest part of the Navy missile authorization is for missiles to arm the 29 Polaris submarines that will have been placed under contract through the fiscal year 1962.

The Navy and Marine Corps aircraft types include two types of fighters; two types of attack planes that can deliver nuclear bombs, and are also effective for close support of ground troops; helicopters for antisubmarine warfare, for transporting Marine Corps troops in vertical envelopment, for search and rescue; a new land based plane for antisubmarine work; and a carrier-based early warning and interceptor control aircraft.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The bill proposes authorization of appropriations for Air Force aircraft procurement in the amount of \$3,812 million, and for Air Force missile procurement in the amount of \$2,792 million.

Five hundred and twenty-five million dollars of the Air Force aircraft authorization is restricted to appropriations for procurement of long-range manned aircraft that I have discussed earlier. Other types to be procured are the KC-135, a jet tanker; the F-105, a high performance fighter that also has the characteristics for effective support of ground troops; the T-38, a jet trainer; the T-39, a training and mission support type; the T-40, also for mission support; and the C-130E, a turboprop transport. This authorization includes sums for projects not requiring authorization of appropriations under section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149, such as items for modifications to aircraft already in inventory, replenishment spares, and for aircraft still under development, such as the B-70 and the C-141. Indeed, the part of the Air Force aircraft authorization that requires authorization under a strict construction of section 412(b) is less than the part that does not require such authorization.

In Air Force missiles, the authorization is intended to support appropriations for continued procurement of the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles; the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile; the Bullpup air-to-surface missile, that is also used by the Navy and the Marine Corps, and drones for training purposes.

As in the case of aircraft, the missile-procurement appropriation authorization includes several items that are related to and associated with missile systems, but are not strictly for the procurement of missiles themselves. Items of this type include modifications, component improvement, industrial facilities, and ballistic missile support costs. In the case of the missile authorization, these items constitute a relatively small part of the total missile procurement request.

Madam President, in his testimony before the committee, the Secretary of Defense indicated that the program proposed does not provide everything that everyone would like to have, and that there is room for differences among reasonable men as to what constitutes the optimum combination of programs for the Nation's defense. The Secretary stated that the executive branch had carefully examined all the principal alternatives, and had selected a combination of programs intended to give the Nation an adequate defense, at the least cost, in the light of the threat as it is viewed today.

The committee has also weighed the alternatives, and endorses this authorization request as another step toward providing the defense capability that we need. In this connection, I would be less than forthright if I failed to point out the difficulty of being finite about the specific number of any type of ship, aircraft, or missile that should be procured in a given fiscal year. To use

a hypothetical illustration: If the Department's authorization request proposes procurement of 25 units toward a total objective of 100 for an operational inventory, it is exceedingly difficult for a layman to reach an informed judgment on whether this is the correct rate, or whether one-half that amount or twice that amount should be authorized. The specific numbers of any type to be procured in a given year depend upon many related questions, including the existence of reasonably satisfactory substitutes, the total amount of money to be spent on national defense, the contractor's capability to produce and deliver, the existence of the necessary facilities and installations to accommodate the weapons, and the availability of trained personnel to operate them. Thus, I would underscore Secretary McNamara's statement that this bill does not provide all of everything that each of the Armed Forces would desire; but I believe it reflects a mature consideration of relative priorities, and that it will permit a substantial increment to our defense capabilities.

Madam President, that concludes my statement.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California, who is a hard working and very valuable member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Madam President, I wish to say that I subscribe wholeheartedly to the statement made by the chairman of the committee in closing his presentation of this matter. In this bill we have not provided everything for everyone; neither have we done everything that everyone wants. But I agree that this bill constitutes a mature and careful evaluation of the defense needs of our country.

I call attention to the fact that the committee made a determination which I regard of major importance, as a policy matter, to the defense of the country; namely, the decision to authorize the appropriation of \$525 million for the procurement of long-range manned bombers for the Strategic Air Command.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is true that it was impossible to provide in the bill authorization for the procurement of the B-70, because it is not subject to procurement.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California is correct in that statement. Section 412, as passed by the Senate, required authorization of appropriations for research and development; in conference it was necessary to yield on that part of section 412; and, as of today, the requirement for an authorization of appropriations applies only when the weapon is to be procured for operational use.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, this bill does not bear directly upon whether at some subsequent time we shall procure the B-70, except insofar as the committee has stated very clearly and insofar as its action has very clearly in-

dicated that the committee does believe in the need for manned bombers in the future. But at the present time the B-52 is the only one which is subject to immediate procurement, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it is the only long-range manned aircraft that is capable of immediate procurement; and the Senator from California has correctly stated that in this bill the committee does not in any wise undertake to pass upon the merits of the B-70 or the speed with which that program should be carried forward. But the bill reflects the unanimous opinion of the committee that it is not wise at this time to abandon the procurement of manned long-range aircraft.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding to me.

I should like to make the additional statement that in my opinion the committee has made an intelligent and an important decision on a policy matter; namely, that it is the consensus of opinion of the committee that manned bombers will be necessary for a long time to come; and, that being true, that we shall purchase the ones which are immediately subject to procurement, without prejudice to the B-70, because the B-70 is the next bomber in the line of production and is the next generation of manned bombers for this country.

I should like to express the hope that from here on we shall proceed on the basis that we do intend to keep manned bombers in the arsenal of our Nation, and that we shall do what we can to expedite, speed up, and bring into the arsenal of our country at the earliest possible moment the B-70, as a complete weapons system subject to procurement sometime in the future, under a bill such as the one now under consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator relate the authorization just a little to the regular defense budget? Since I left the Appropriations Committee, I do not follow it quite as closely as I used to. I used to follow these matters very closely. The committee report indicates that on January 19, 1961, there was a proposal covering these general procurement items. According to the committee report, that was on January 19, 1961.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume that was a proposal which came from the previous administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. That was a proposal of President Eisenhower.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then there is a current proposal, carried in column 2 of the table which appears on page 15 of the committee report. Incidentally, I think these figures might well be inserted in the Record, as a part of the distinguished Senator's remarks, to indicate what these totals are.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to ask unanimous consent that the table which appears on page 15 of the committee re-

port be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather there is an increase in the new proposal of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1¼ billion for these various procurement items.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is approximately correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would probably be reflected by an increase in the budget for this administration over what was submitted by the prior administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is already reflected. Budget estimates covering these items have already been submitted by the present administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice that when the Secretary of Defense appeared he made mention, in his remarks, of these procurement items based on a preliminary reappraisal. He said that later there will be a complete reappraisal. I would gather, from that statement, that there might even be some additions to these procurement items when that resurvey is made.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is wholly likely, but from my knowledge of the purpose of the resurvey, the only items for which authorization might be required and might be involved would be for transport aircraft, because for the immediate future the resurvey is related more to the means of fighting what we call conventional wars. I do not think it would involve any more of the long-range type missiles, or aircraft, or naval vessels, that are required under section 412(b).

Mr. DIRKSEN. One could assume that if the international picture, either in one place or another, becomes more critical, there may be a reevaluation and new steps will be found necessary to meet the new conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been in this Chamber when we passed appropriation bills for \$52 billion for the Air Force within 10 minutes. This country was at war, the administration said it was necessary, and the Congress forwarded the availability of the money as rapidly as possible.

In case the international situation were to deteriorate very badly, of course it would be necessary to have additional appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the distinguished Senator will yield further, and I trust this will not be construed as a narrow partisan or parochial remark, it does seem to me, as one surveys the situation around the world and what our needs may be, and the increasing cost of weaponry of all kinds, that, as we think of it in the context of both the military and the domestic programs, rapidly we are getting into an area that is best equated by the old phrase, "Guns versus butter," "Guns and butter," or "Guns or butter." The question is, then, Where shall the emphasis be?

I say, frankly, to the very distinguished Senator from Georgia, that the matter is of concern because on tomorrow we shall bring into the Chamber the Federal aid to education bill, that has been

increased by \$250 million by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Now we are expected to spend \$850 million across the board for each of the first 3 years in grant money, not to speak of loans and funds for scholarship purposes.

In proportion, there are programs for what I think of, for want of a better term, in the welfare field. It is incumbent upon the Congress to be rather cautious as to how it operates in this field, in our estimates of our military needs, which are likely to grow, when we think in terms of the parliamentary fall in Iran, the difficulties in Laos, the difficulties at Geneva, the difficulties in Latin America, the possibility always of a movement toward Berlin and the recognition of East Germany as a sovereign country, and every other situation that one can direct attention to, trouble and stress of one kind and another.

Obviously, it means that this country, in order to be safe and secure, must be in the forefront in the weaponry field; and that costs money.

So I become a little distressed about the way we are authorizing funds on the domestic front for a variety of purposes, when I have never been persuaded that the urgency is such that it must be done at this particular time, if at all.

I do not ask particularly for a comment, but I thought, in view of the fact that this procurement authorization is before us, that observation ought to be made, because the Congress must come to grips with the question, since it has exclusive authority over the public purse.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I suppose that every Member of this body has his own method of arriving at what he regards as priorities in the requirements of our Federal Government. I would not question any Senator's views with respect to the priorities of any program or its cost. For my part, I have never had any great difficulty in arriving at my own priority. In today's troubled world I have always placed those measures that will assure the security of these United States above all others, and I have no difficulty in my own mind in drawing the line between the procurement of weapons to defend this country and programs of social reforms, however desirable they may be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may address one other observation to the distinguished Senator, I notice that there was a reduction of \$138 million in the B-70 program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In considering and discussing the matter in various quarters, I gather that those who are subcontractors in the electronics field and those who had already been engaged would have to let their skilled workers go if the funds were not available. I thought there had to be a pretty urgent reason for taking that work out of the program, because if the companies who have these highly skilled technicians would have to let these people go because contracts were canceled, they would have to leave or find new work.

Mr. RUSSELL. That issue cannot be determined conclusively by this bill, be-

cause it does not deal with programs of research and development.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The B-70 program is in the process of development. Undoubtedly it will be dealt with when the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense is before the Senate.

In the committee over which I am privileged to preside there was a very extensive discussion of the desirability of expediting the B-70 program over and above what was provided even in the Eisenhower budget, in addition to the effect of the reduction, to which the Senator has referred, proposed in the budget of the Kennedy administration. The effect of that of course will be to slow down the development program. It will slow down the work on every aspect of the B-70, subcontractors and all.

My own view is that we ought to proceed to procure the B-70 at the earliest possible date or do away with the program altogether.

This was involved to a degree in the administration's program, because the procurement program as submitted by the administration did not contemplate the acquisition of any manned bombers after 1962. The Senate Committee on Armed Services was simply not willing to assume the responsibility of stopping the procurement of manned bombers in 1962. As I stated in my statement, I do not know what motivated all of the members of the committee, but the committee members were unanimous on that one point. All 17 members felt we should continue to procure manned bombers after 1962.

In my opinion, missilery has not yet achieved that stage of perfection and development which would warrant placing all the future security of this country on the operation of the missile system.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I have only one other question. Was there a unanimous report from the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was a unanimous report by all 17 members.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of the members of the Committee on Armed Services on the minority side are unavoidably detained. Therefore, I felt it necessary to ask some questions in this field. I am sure there will be no objection to consideration of the bill today, in view of the fact that the report was unanimous.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was no opposition to the report or to the bill in the committee. One of the able and distinguished members of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has just entered the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that certain members of the Committee on Armed Services who will probably reach the city in a little while, if they desire to have remarks included in the RECORD, insofar as possible be permitted to include the remarks in the RECORD at this point in connection with the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be pleased to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who is one of the most vigilant and thorough members of our committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the kind remarks by the chairman of the committee. I rise to say that I think the report represents the opinion of the committee as a whole.

The members on the minority side appreciate the leadership which the distinguished Senator from Georgia provided, particularly on the issues with respect to which we had some problems. The authorization for bombers and decisions with respect to some of the classified projects were decisions which were unanimous, so far as I know.

I think there was some difference of opinion with respect to the Nike-Zeus, but the decision of the committee was by a substantial majority and did not run along party lines at all. It is a pleasure for me to share in the support of the bill and to say that there was no partisan division on the bill.

So far as I know, the members of the minority support the features of the bill as it is presented at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my recollection, Madam President.

I have been exceedingly happy to observe how free from partisanship the committee has been in its approach to all of the problems that have come before us since I have been privileged to preside over the committee as chairman. I have presided during Republican administrations and Democratic administrations. I state on this floor that a person in the committee room who did not know whether we had a Democratic or Republican administration would have been hard put to know what administration was in power as we considered the measures that were referred to us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I think that is typical of the very distinguished chairman of the committee. He has rendered an astonishingly constructive service not only to the Senate but also to the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I join in the testimony and tribute voiced by my distinguished colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to point out, along with the Senator from South Dakota, that this is the first time a bill of this nature has come before the Senate; that is, an authorization bill for what is ordinarily called military hardware for the forthcoming budget year, including missiles and aircraft and major military items which heretofore have not been authorized, in the sense that no authorization was required.

As no doubt has been stated by the Senator from Georgia, the Senator is the author of the amendment to last year's

military authorization bill which provides that authorizations shall be necessary for these major items. This is a very distinct step forward, with many advantages to the Senate and to its committees, in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, in getting a well understood and rounded out missile program which will give to the Congress a far better opportunity to exercise its judgment and its legislative will.

Under present law the military program has to come before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and of course the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as the Appropriations Committees. This is the first year of operation, and I think it has already proved its merit and its advantages.

There is one thing I wish to mention, which I am sure the Senator from Georgia has covered. The bill does authorize additional manned bombers as a striking force, at least in the long-range-type bomber. The Senator from Mississippi thinks this is not only sound but also needed.

The bill does not mention the B-70 program. I assume the Senator from Georgia perhaps touched on that in his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to do so, yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi did not have an opportunity to be present in the Chamber all the time the Senator from Georgia was speaking. The fact that the B-70 program is not included in the authorization bill would in no way preclude the Congress from making an additional appropriation should it see fit to do so; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that we did not deal with the B-70 program in the bill because that program is still under development, and that there is no requirement in section 412(b) for authorization of appropriations for research and development.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. We took a unanimous position, as I said, in favor of not discontinuing the procurement of manned bombers in 1962.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I felt sure the Senator had covered that, but I wished to cover it from my viewpoint and to say that in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi the B-70 is a companion, in effect and as a practical matter, to the manned bomber program which is covered by the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California expressed the same view.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator from Mississippi understands the facts now, at the proper time he will certainly support a request for additional funds to step up and push forward at a more rapid rate the B-70 program, because the development of the manned bomber is in our frontline of defense. I think we will need such craft for many years to come, and I do not believe it will be rapidly replaced by any kind of missile.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is my understanding—and if I am incorrect in my understanding, I hope to be corrected—that all actions proposed to be taken under the bill are consistent with the further development of the B-70. But the bill is a procurement bill which deals with the actual cost of planes or parts in being. It is not a bill which deals with authorization for research funds for research. Funds for research and development on the B-70 can be provided by the appropriations bill for the Department of Defense, and if so, that action would be wholly consistent with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had already stated that when the appropriation bill is before the Senate, every Senator will have an opportunity to express himself with respect to the continuation of the B-70 program, but that under the language of section 412(b), the program does not require authorization of appropriations in a measure of this type.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is my understanding. I wanted to make the record clear so far as my own position is concerned, because personally I am one of those who believe that the manned bomber will be with us for some time.

Madam President, if the Senator will indulge me further—

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to say for the record that one feature of the bill which I believe should be commended is the way in which it supports the statement by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, that we should put the defense posture of this country in such form that we will not be forced to go into nuclear wars. The distinguished chairman of the committee knows that in committee he and I both have felt that once we started the use of nuclear weapons, it would be hard to have a small nuclear war. So we have felt that supports should be given to beefing up, if we will, the conventional forces of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps particularly, and to a certain extent the Air Force, so that we can deal with limited war situations in a limited way, and not be forced into a nuclear war because of inability to meet a situation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator knows, I have been interested for many years in large, all-cargo aircraft to provide an ever-ready airlift for mobility of our fighting ground forces. I should like to ask what the situation is regarding that type of craft. I believe it is now designed as the C-141, the giant cargo plane that will have a capability to fly over both oceans without refueling and stops. The plane is one of the most badly needed instruments in our arsenal, I believe.

Mr. RUSSELL. The subject is dealt with on page 13, next to the last paragraph, of the committee report.

I had stated that we included in the authorization funds for the continued development of the B-70 as well as the C-141, the new jet transport, though it was not necessary to do so. We did this because the Air Force, in making up its presentation to the committee, included the item. The law does not require that the authorization deal with weapons systems that are in the stage of research and development, but in this instance we did, because we approved all the aircraft that the Department of the Air Force recommended to us. So there are funds included in the totals for the development of the C-141.

No one has been more prophetic in his statements as to our defense needs than has the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who for several years was "the voice in the wilderness" insisting that we modernize our lift capability. Today we see the necessity for doing so. While we are starting a little late, we will try to expedite the program so far as we can.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator, who is chairman of the committee, for those kind remarks. There will be sufficient funds, therefore, available to move the program along at the most rapid possible speed consistent with normal design, performance, and perfection of the type of aircraft it is to be.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee is so advised.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for the inclusion of that item.

EXHIBIT 1

	Proposal of Jan. 19, 1961	Current proposal	Difference
Aircraft:			
Army.....	\$193,700,000	\$211,000,000	+\$17,300,000
Navy and Marine Corps.....	1,527,000,000	1,585,600,000	+58,600,000
Air Force.....	3,197,000,000	3,287,000,000	+90,000,000
Missiles:			
Army.....	520,500,000	550,800,000	+30,300,000
Navy.....	473,000,000	606,400,000	+133,400,000
Marine Corps.....	24,981,000	27,000,000	+2,019,000
Air Force.....	2,811,000,000	2,792,000,000	-19,000,000
Naval vessels: Navy.....	1,825,000,000	2,915,000,000	+1,090,000,000

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, when the military procurement bill was under consideration in the Senate Armed Services Committee, I offered an amendment which would have had the effect of speeding up by 1 or 2 years the date when the Nike-Zeus anti-ICBM missile system, the free world's only antimissile

system under development, would be operational. The amendment would have authorized allocation of \$169 million for fiscal year 1962 to permit the Army to go into limited production of certain component parts of the Zeus system prior to completion of final tests on this vital defense weapons system,

as was done with the Atlas and Polaris missile systems. I urged the committee to make these funds available to the President so he would at least have congressional authority if he should change his mind on Zeus component part production because of further breakthroughs the Soviets may make in coming months in developing their anti-ICBM missile system. The committee, however, by a decisive vote concurred in the administration's position on declining to expedite the Zeus program.

This decision by the administration and the committee has concerned me so that I considered offering the same amendment on the Senate floor. I have decided, however, against doing this because of the decisive vote in committee and also because information surrounding the development of the Zeus system is of such a highly classified nature that I feel it should be discussed only in executive session of the committee.

I shall not labor the point on the Senate floor today except to again express my grave concern about this decision, especially in view of the recent setbacks the free world has suffered at the hands of the Communists and also in view of the intelligence information we have available as to the progress being made by the Soviet Union in developing a Soviet antimissile system. My statement before the Armed Services Committee is classified as "secret," but it is available to any Member of this body wishing to study the facts and figures contained therein. In addition to this, I have twice this year, on February 2 and 24, addressed the Senate on the importance of speeding up the operational date of the Zeus system, and on February 22 I wrote a letter to every Senator attaching my first speech and the January 30 issue of *Missile and Rockets* magazine, which contained a series of important articles on the Zeus system.

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 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 funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1962 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For aircraft: For the Army, \$211,000,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, \$1,585,600,000; for the Air Force, \$3,812,000,000, of which amount \$525,000,000 is authorized only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command.

MISSILES

For missiles: For the Army, \$550,800,000; for the Navy, \$606,400,000; for the Marine Corps, \$27,000,000; for the Air Force, \$2,792,000,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: For the Navy, \$2,915,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico; and

S. 712. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments; and

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider certain treaties on the Executive Calendar.

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

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I call up Executive C (86th Cong. 2d sess.), the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil.

The Senate, as in committee of the whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive C (86th Cong. 2d sess.), the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which was read the second time, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL, 1954

The Governments represented at the International Conference on Pollution of the Sea by Oil held in London from 26th April, 1954, to 12th May, 1954,

Desiring to take action by common agreement to prevent pollution of the sea by oil discharged from ships, and considering that this end may best be achieved by the conclusion of a Convention,

Have accordingly appointed the undersigned plenipotentiaries, who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) For the purposes of the present Convention, the following expressions shall (unless the context otherwise requires) have

the meanings hereby respectively assigned to them, that is to say:—

"The Bureau" has the meaning assigned to it by Article XXI;

"Discharge" in relation to oil or to an oily mixture means any discharge or escape howsoever caused;

"Heavy diesel oil" means marine diesel oil, other than those distillates of which more than 50 percent, by volume distills at a temperature not exceeding 340° C. when tested by A.S.T.M. Standard Method D. 158/53;

"Mile" means a nautical mile of 6080 feet or 1852 metres;

"Oil" means crude oil, fuel oil, heavy diesel oil and lubricating oil, and "oily" shall be construed accordingly.

(2) For the purposes of the present Convention the territories of a Contracting Government mean the territory of the country of which it is the Government and any other territory for the international relations of which the Government is responsible and to which the Convention shall have been extended under Article XVIII.

ARTICLE II

The present Convention shall apply to sea-going ships registered in any of the territories of a Contracting Government, except

(i) ships for the time being used as naval auxiliaries;

(ii) ships of under 500 tons gross tonnage;

(iii) ships for the time being engaged in the whaling industry;

(iv) ships for the time being navigating the Great Lakes of North America and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as the lower exit of the Lachine Canal at Montreal in the Province of Quebec, Canada.

ARTICLE III

(1) Subject to the provisions of Articles IV and V, the discharge from any tanker, being a ship to which the Convention applies, within any of the prohibited zones referred to in Annex A to the Convention in relation to tankers of—

(a) oil;

(b) any oily mixture the oil in which fouls the surface of the sea, shall be prohibited.

For the purposes of this paragraph the oil in an oily mixture of less than 100 parts of oil in 1,000,000 parts of the mixture shall not be deemed to foul the surface of the sea.

(2) Subject to the provisions of Articles IV and V, any discharge into the sea from a ship, being a ship to which the Convention applies and not being a tanker, of oily ballast water or tank washings shall be made as far as practicable from land. As from a date three years after the date on which the Convention comes into force, paragraph (1) of this Article shall apply to ships other than tankers as it applies to tankers, except that—

(a) the prohibited zones in relation to ships other than tankers shall be those referred to as such in Annex A to the Convention; and

(b) the discharge of oil or of an oily mixture from such a ship shall not be prohibited when the ship is proceeding to a port not provided with such reception facilities as are referred to in Article VIII.

(3) Any contravention of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Article shall be an offense punishable under the laws of the territory in which the ship is registered.

ARTICLE IV

(1) Article III shall not apply to—

(a) the discharge of oil or of an oily mixture from a ship for the purpose of securing the safety of the ship, preventing damage to the ship or cargo, or saving life at sea; or

(b) the escape of oil, or of an oily mixture, resulting from damage to the ship or unavoidable leakage, if all reasonable precautions have been taken after the occurrence of the damage or discovery of the

leakage for the purpose of preventing or minimizing the escape;

(c) the discharge of sediment—

(1) which cannot be pumped from the cargo tanks of tankers by reason of its solidity; or

(ii) which is residue arising from the purification or clarification of oil fuel or lubricating oil,

provided that such discharge is made as far from land as is practicable.

(2) In the event of such discharge or escape as is referred to in this Article a statement shall be made in the oil record book required by Article IX of the circumstances of and reason for the discharge.

ARTICLE V

Article III shall not apply to the discharge from the bilges of a ship—

(a) of any oily mixture during the period of twelve months following the date on which the Convention comes into force in respect of the territory in which the ship is registered;

(b) after the expiration of such period, of an oily mixture containing no oil other than lubricating oil.

ARTICLE VI

The penalties which may be imposed in pursuance of Article III under the law of any of the territories of a Contracting Government in respect of the unlawful discharge from a ship of oil or of an oily mixture into waters outside the territorial waters of that territory shall not be less than the penalties which may be imposed under the law of that territory in respect of the unlawful discharge of oil or of an oily mixture from a ship into such territorial waters.

ARTICLE VII

As from a date twelve months after the present Convention comes into force in respect of any of the territories of a Contracting Government all ships registered in that territory shall be required to be so fitted as to prevent the escape of fuel oil or heavy diesel oil into bilges the contents of which are discharged into the sea without being passed through an oily-water separator.

ARTICLE VIII

As from a date three years after the present Convention comes into force in respect of any of the territories of a Contracting Government, that Government shall ensure the provisions in each main port in that territory of facilities adequate for the reception, without causing undue delay to ships, of such residues from oily ballast water and tank washings as would remain for disposal by ships, other than tankers, using the port, if the water had been separated by the use of an oily-water separator, a settling tank or otherwise. Each Contracting Government shall from time to time determine which ports are the main ports in its territories for the purposes of this Article, and shall notify the Bureau in writing accordingly indicating whether adequate reception facilities have been installed.

ARTICLE IX

(1) There shall be carried in every ship to which the Convention applies an oil record book (whether as part of the ship's official logbook or otherwise) in the form specified in Annex B to the present Convention. The appropriate entries shall be made in that book, and each page of the book, including any statement under paragraph (2) of Article IV, shall be signed by the officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned and by the master of the ship. The written entries in the oil record book shall be in an official language of the territory in which the ship is registered, or in English or French.

(2) The competent authorities of any of the territories of a Contracting Govern-

ment may inspect on board any such ship while within a port in that territory the oil record book required to be carried in the ship in compliance with the provisions of the Convention, and may make a true copy of any entry in that book and may require the master of the ship to certify that the copy is a true copy of such entry. Any copy so made which purports to have been certified by the master of the ship as a true copy of an entry in the ship's oil record book shall be made admissible in any judicial proceedings as evidence of the facts stated in the entry. Any action by the competent authorities under this paragraph shall be taken as expeditiously as possible and the ship shall not be delayed.

ARTICLE X

(1) Any Contracting Government may furnish to the Contracting Government in the territory of which a ship is registered particulars in writing of evidence that any provision of the Convention has been contravened in respect of that ship, wheresoever the alleged contravention may have taken place. If it is practicable to do so, the competent authorities of the former Government shall notify the master of the ship of the alleged contravention.

(2) Upon receiving such particulars the latter Government shall investigate the matter, and may request the former Government to furnish further or better particulars of the alleged contravention. If the Government in the territory of which the ship is registered is satisfied that sufficient evidence is available in the form required by law to enable proceedings against the owner or master of the ship to be taken in respect of the alleged contravention, it shall cause such proceedings to be taken as soon as possible, and shall inform the other Contracting Government and the Bureau of the result of such proceedings.

ARTICLE XI

Nothing in the present Convention shall be construed as derogating from the powers of any Contracting Government to take measures within its jurisdiction in respect of any matter to which the Convention relates or as extending the jurisdiction of any Contracting Government.

ARTICLE XII

Each Contracting Government shall send to the Bureau and to the appropriate organ of the United Nations—

(a) the text of laws, decrees, orders and regulations in force in its territories which give effect to the present Convention;

(b) all official reports or summaries of official reports in so far as they show the results of the application of the provisions of the Convention, provided always that such reports or summaries are not, in the opinion of that Government, of a confidential nature.

ARTICLE XIII

Any dispute between Contracting Governments relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention which cannot be settled by negotiation shall be referred at the request of either party to the International Court of Justice for decision unless the parties in dispute agree to submit it to arbitration.

ARTICLE XIV

(1) The present Convention shall remain open for signature for three months from this day's date and shall thereafter remain open for acceptance.

(2) Governments may become parties to the Convention by—

(i) signature without reservation as to acceptance;

(ii) signature subject to acceptance followed by acceptance; or

(iii) acceptance.

(3) Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the Bureau, which shall inform all Governments that have already signed or accepted the Convention of each signature and deposit of an acceptance and of the date of such signature or deposit.

ARTICLE XV

(1) The present Convention shall come into force twelve months after the date on which not less than ten Governments have become parties to the Convention, including five Governments of countries each with not less than 500,000 gross tons of tanker tonnage.

(2)—(a) For each Government which signs the Convention without reservation as to acceptance or accepts the Convention before the date on which the Convention comes into force in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article it shall come into force on that date. For each Government which accepts the Convention on or after that date, it shall come into force three months after the date of the deposit of that Government's acceptance.

(b) The Bureau shall, as soon as possible, inform all Governments which have signed or accepted the Convention of the date on which it will come into force.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) Upon the request of any Contracting Government a proposed amendment of the present Convention shall be communicated by the Bureau to all Contracting Governments for consideration.

(2) Any amendment communicated to Contracting Governments for consideration under paragraph (1) of this Article shall be deemed to have been accepted by all Contracting Governments and shall come into force on the expiration of a period of six months after it has been so communicated, unless any one of the Contracting Governments shall have made a declaration not less than two months before the expiration of that period that it does not accept the amendment.

(3)—(a) A conference of Contracting Governments to consider amendments of the Convention proposed by any Contracting Government shall be convened by the Bureau upon the request of one-third of the Contracting Governments.

(b) Every amendment adopted by such a conference by a two-thirds majority vote of the Contracting Governments represented shall be communicated by the Bureau to all Contracting Governments for their acceptance.

(4) Any amendment communicated to Contracting Governments for their acceptance under paragraph (3) of this Article shall come into force for all Contracting Governments, except those which before it comes into force make a declaration that they do not accept the amendment, twelve months after the date on which the amendment is accepted by two-thirds of the Contracting Governments.

(5) Any declaration under this Article shall be made by a notification in writing to the Bureau which shall notify all Contracting Governments of the receipt of the declaration.

(6) The Bureau shall inform all signatory and Contracting Governments of any amendments which come into force under this Article, together with the date on which such amendments shall come into force.

ARTICLE XVII

(1) The present Convention may be denounced by any Contracting Government at any time after the expiration of a period of five years from the date on which the Convention comes into force for that Government.

(2) Denunciation shall be effected by a notification in writing addressed to the Bureau, which shall notify all the Contracting Governments of any denunciation received and of the date of its receipt.

(3) A denunciation shall take effect twelve months, or such longer period as may be specified in the notification, after its receipt by the Bureau.

ARTICLE XVIII

(1)—(a) Any Government may, at the time of signature or acceptance of the present Convention, or at any time thereafter, declare by notification in writing given to the Bureau that the Convention shall extend to any of the territories for whose international relations it is responsible.

(b) The Convention shall, from the date of the receipt of the notification, or from such other date as may be specified in the notification, extend to the territories named therein.

(2)—(a) Any Contracting Government which has made a declaration under paragraph (1) of this Article may, at any time after the expiration of a period of five years from the date on which the Convention has been so extended to any territory, give notification in writing to the Bureau, declaring that the Convention shall cease to extend to any such territory named in the notification.

(b) The Convention shall cease to extend to any territory mentioned in such notification twelve months, or such longer period as may be specified therein, after the date of receipt of the notification by the Bureau.

(3) The Bureau shall inform all Contracting Governments of the extension of the Convention to any territories under paragraph (1) of this Article, and of the termination of any such extension under paragraph (2) of this Article, stating in each case the date from which the Convention has been, or will cease to be, so extended.

ARTICLE XIX

(1) In case of war or other hostilities, a Contracting Government which considers that it is affected, whether as a belligerent or as a neutral, may suspend the operation of the whole or any part of the present Convention in respect of all or any of its territories. The suspending Government shall immediately give notice of any such suspension to the Bureau.

(2) The suspending Government may at any time terminate such suspension and shall in any event terminate it as soon as it ceases to be justified under paragraph (1) of this Article. Notice of such termination shall be given immediately to the Bureau by the Government concerned.

(3) The Bureau shall notify all Contracting Governments of any suspension or termination of suspension under this Article.

ARTICLE XX

As soon as the present Convention comes into force it shall be registered by the Bureau with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XXI

The duties of the Bureau shall be carried out by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland unless and until the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation comes into being and takes over the duties assigned to it under the Convention signed at Geneva on the 6th day of March, 1948, and thereafter the duties of the Bureau shall be carried out by the said Organisation.

In witness whereof the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done in London this twelfth day of May, 1954, in English and French, both texts being equally authoritative, in a single copy, which shall be deposited with the Bureau and of

which the Bureau shall transmit certified copies to all signatory and Contracting Governments.

For the Government of Australia:

For the Government of Belgium:

Subject to acceptance.

M. A. VAN BOECKEL.

For the Government of Brazil:

For the Government of Canada:

Subject to ratification.

ALAN CUMYN.

For the Government of Ceylon:

Subject to acceptance.

T. D. PERERA.

For the Government of Chile:

For the Government of Denmark:

Subject to acceptance.

MOGENS BLACH.

For the Government of Finland:

Subject to acceptance.

S. SUNDMAN.

For the Government of France:

Sous réserve de ratification.

R. MASSIGLI.

For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

Subject to acceptance.

KARL SCHUBERT.

For the Government of Greece:

Subject to acceptance.

M. SAKARIS.

KOSTAS LYRAS.

For the Government of India:

For the Government of Ireland:

Subject to acceptance.

F. H. BOLAND.

For the Government of Israel:

For the Government of Italy:

Subject to acceptance.

GIULIO INGIANNI.

For the Government of Japan:

Subject to acceptance.

S. MATSUMOTO.

For the Government of Liberia:

Subject to acceptance or ratification by the President with the advice and consent of the Liberian Senate.

GEORGE B. STEVENSON.

S. EDWARD PEAL.

For the Government of Mexico:

Subject to acceptance.

G. LUDERS DE NEGRI.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

Subject to ratification.

A. H. HASSELMAN.

For the Government of New Zealand:

Subject to acceptance.

For the Government of Nicaragua:

F. H. CONER.

For the Government of Norway:

Subject to acceptance.

SIGURD STORHAUG.

For the Government of Panama:

For the Government of Poland:

For the Government of Portugal:

For the Government of Spain:

For the Government of Sweden:

Subject to acceptance.

G. BÖÖS.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Subject to ratification by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

Y. MALIK.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

Subject to acceptance.

GILMOUR JENKINS.

PERCY FAULKNER.

For the Government of the United States of America:

For the Government of Venezuela:

For the Government of Yugoslavia:

Subject to acceptance.

PREDRAG NIKOLIC.

ANNEX A

PROHIBITED ZONES

(1) Subject to paragraph (3) of this Annex, the prohibited zones in relation to tank-

ers shall be all sea areas within 50 miles from land, with the following exceptions:

(a) *The Adriatic Zones*

Within the Adriatic Sea the prohibited zones off the coasts of Italy and Yugoslavia respectively shall each extend for a distance of 30 miles from land, excepting only the island of Vis. When the present Convention has been in force for a period of three years the said zones shall each be extended by a further 20 miles in width unless the two Governments agree to postpone such extension. In the event of such an agreement the said Governments shall notify the Bureau accordingly not less than three months before the expiration of such period of three years and the Bureau shall notify all Contracting Governments of such agreement.

(b) *The North Sea Zone*

The North Sea Zone shall extend for a distance of 100 miles from the coasts of the following countries:

Belgium,
Denmark,
the Federal Republic of Germany,
the Netherlands,
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

but not beyond the point where the limit of a 100-mile zone off the west coast of Jutland intersects the limit of the 50-mile zone off the coast of Norway.

(c) *The Atlantic Zone*

The Atlantic Zone shall be within a line drawn from a point on the Greenwich meridian 100 miles in a north-north-easterly direction from the Shetland Islands; thence northwards along the Greenwich meridian to latitude 64° north; thence westwards along the 64th parallel to longitude 10° west; thence to latitude 60° north, longitude 14° west; thence to latitude 54°30' north, longitude 30° west; thence to latitude 44°20' north, longitude 30° west; thence to latitude 48° north, longitude 14° west; thence eastwards along the 48th parallel to a point of intersection with the 50-mile zone off the coast of France. Provided that in relation to voyages which do not extend seawards beyond the Atlantic Zone as defined above, and which are to ports not provided with adequate facilities for the reception of oily residue, the Atlantic Zone shall be deemed to terminate at a distance of 100 miles from land.

(d) *The Australian Zone*

The Australian Zone shall extend for a distance of 150 miles from the coasts of Australia, except off the north and west coasts of the Australian mainland between the point opposite Thursday Island and the point on the west coast at 20° south latitude.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3) of this Annex the prohibited zones in relation to ships other than tankers shall be all sea areas within 50 miles from land with the following exceptions:

(a) *The Adriatic Zones*

Within the Adriatic Sea the prohibited zones off the coasts of Italy and Yugoslavia respectively shall each extend for a distance of 20 miles from land, excepting only the island of Vis. After the expiration of a period of three years following the application of prohibited zones to ships other than tankers in accordance with paragraph (2) of Article III the said zones shall each be extended by a further 30 miles in width unless the two Governments agree to postpone such extension. In the event of such an agreement the said Governments shall notify the Bureau accordingly not less than three months before the expiration of such period of three years, and the Bureau shall notify all Contracting Governments of such agreement.

(b) *The North Sea and Atlantic Zones*

The North Sea and Atlantic Zones shall extend for a distance of 100 miles from the coasts of the following countries:

- Belgium,
- Denmark,
- the Federal Republic of Germany,
- Ireland,
- the Netherlands,
- the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

but not beyond the point where the limit of a 100-mile zone off the west coast of Jutland intersects the limit of the 50-mile zone off the coast of Norway.

(3)—(a) Any Contracting Government may propose—

(i) the reduction of any zone off the coast of any of its territories;

(ii) the extension of any such zone to a maximum of 100 miles from any such coast, by making a declaration to that effect and the reduction or extension shall come into force after the expiration of a period of six months after the declaration has been made, unless any one of the Contracting Governments shall have made a declaration not less than two months before the expiration of that period that its interests are affected either by reason of the proximity of its coasts or by reason of its ships trading in the area, and that it does not accept the reduction or extension, as the case may be.

(b) Any declaration under this paragraph shall be made by a notification in writing to the Bureau which shall notify all Contracting Governments of the receipt of the declaration.

ANNEX B

Form of oil record book

I. FOR TANKERS

Date of entry			
(a) Ballasting of and discharge of ballast from cargo tanks			
1. Identify numbers of tank(s)	-----		
2. Type of oil previously contained in tank(s)	-----		
3. Date and place of ballasting	-----		
4. Date and time of discharge of ballast water	-----		
5. Place or position of ship	-----		
6. Approximate amount of oil-contaminated water transferred to slop tank(s)	-----		
7. Identify numbers of slop tank(s)	-----		
(b) Cleaning of cargo tanks			
8. Identify numbers of tank(s) cleaned	-----		
9. Type of oil previously contained in tank(s)	-----		
10. Identify numbers of slop tank(s) to which washings transferred	-----		
11. Dates and times of cleaning	-----		
(c) Settling in slop tank(s) and discharge of water			
12. Identify numbers of slop tank(s)	-----		
13. Period of settling (in hours)	-----		
14. Date and time of discharge of water	-----		
15. Place or position of ship	-----		
16. Approximate quantities of residue	-----		
(d) Disposal from ship of oily residues from slop tank(s) and other sources			
17. Date and method of disposal	-----		
18. Place or position of ship	-----		
19. Sources and approximate quantities	-----		

(Signature of officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned)

(Signature of master)

II. FOR SHIPS OTHER THAN TANKERS

Date of entry			
(a) Ballasting, or cleaning during voyage, of bunker fuel tanks			
1. Identity number of tank(s)	-----		
2. Type of oil previously contained in tank(s)	-----		
3. Date and place of ballasting	-----		
4. Date and time of discharge of ballast or washing water	-----		
5. Place or position of ship	-----		
6. Whether separator used: if so, give period of use	-----		
7. Disposal of oily residue retained on board	-----		
(b) Disposal from ship of oily residues from bunker fuel tanks and other sources			
8. Date and method of disposal	-----		
9. Place or position of ship	-----		
10. Sources and approximate quantities	-----		

(Signature of officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned)

(Signature of master)

III. FOR ALL SHIPS

Date of entry			
Accidental and other exceptional discharges or escapes of oil			
1. Date and time of occurrence	-----		
2. Place or position of ship	-----		
3. Approximate quantity and type of oil	-----		
4. Circumstances of discharge or escape and general remarks	-----		

(Signature of officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned)

(Signature of master)

Certified a true copy of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, and of the annexes thereto:

[SEAL] E. J. PASSANT,
Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

LONDON, September 16, 1954.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor. Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I yield.

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

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the convention is designed to prevent the pollution of the high seas by oil discharged from ships, especially tankers.

Oil pollution of the high seas constitutes an international problem in that oil dumped in the ocean can drift many miles and befoul beaches and harbors sometimes hundreds of miles from where it was discharged. Such pollution is not only harmful to coasts and coastal wa-

ters, but also to birds and other wildlife and marine resources.

Since World War I, this has been a problem that has engaged the efforts of maritime nations from time to time. All previous such efforts have failed, for various reasons. The present convention was negotiated at London in 1954 but not signed by the United States for lack of consensus among the interested Government agencies and industry groups. In fact a technical working group at that time recommended against acceptance of the convention for various reasons, the principal of which were: First, the prospect of strengthening the convention at another conference scheduled 3 years hence; and second, the fear that adherence then might result in a weakening of the U.S. industry's effective voluntary controls over pollution.

The prospective conference, however, never materialized. In 1958 the convention entered into force for most of the maritime nations of Europe and in 1959 the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization—IMCO—assumed responsibilities under the convention and also certain functions from the United Nations. In the light of these more recent developments, the executive branch undertook to review the convention. The result of this review is the present recommendation that the United States accept the convention, subject to certain conditions.

The 21 articles of the convention are summarized on pages 2-4 of the committee report. In brief terms, the convention seeks to alleviate the pollution problem by prohibiting the discharge of oil and oily wastes, as defined by the convention, in areas close to land. In general, the prohibited zone extends 50 miles from shore. In certain badly polluted areas it ranges as high as 100 miles for ships. For tankers, the prohibited zones are necessarily somewhat larger. To insure compliance with this prohibition, the convention requires ships to carry oil-record books which are open to inspection by all convention parties. On these books are to be entered all actions that might result in a discharge of oil or oily matters. Again, for tankers the requirements are more stringent. Violators of the convention will be tried in the courts of the country of the ship's registry.

Madam President, I believe of the matters discussed by the committee and set forth on pages 4-7 of the report, only two need to be mentioned here. The committee took great pains that the record be entirely clear on the supremacy of U.S. laws in U.S. territorial waters. The convention itself is quite specific on this point, but lest there be any doubt, the State Department's proposed understanding states that "article XI effectively reserves to the parties to the convention freedom of legislative action in territorial waters, including the application of existing laws, anything in the convention which may appear to be contrary notwithstanding. Specifically, it is understood that offenses in the U.S. territorial waters will continue to be punishable under U.S. laws regardless of the ship's registry." The Department

of State, moreover, gave verbal assurances to the committee that there can be absolutely no doubt on this point.

The second matter that I wish to call to the attention of the Senate concerns the reference of disputes to the World Court.

The article in question reads:

Any dispute between contracting governments relating to the interpretation or application of the present convention which cannot be settled by negotiation shall be referred at the request of either party to the International Court of Justice for decision unless the parties in dispute agree to submit it to arbitration.

Under this provision, disputes referred to the Court would not be subject to the so-called Connally reservation by which the United States reserves to itself the right to decide what is within its domestic jurisdiction and therefore not subject to the Court's jurisdiction. Here it is important to keep two things in mind. In the first place, the United Nations Charter, of which the Court's statute is an integral part, contains a general prohibition against intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. In the second place, it is difficult to conceive of any issue arising under this treaty that might involve the question of domestic jurisdiction. The convention applies to vessels far out at sea. It does not pertain to vessels in U.S. territorial waters, nor to oil or oily wastes produced from fields or drilling operations, as was made clear at the committee's hearings. The committee accepted the Department of State's view that a reservation, such as the Connally reservation was entirely unnecessary in this case.

Madam President, the committee endorsed this convention as a necessary first step toward the prevention of oil pollution of the high seas. Neither the State Department, nor the industry, nor the committee pretends that this treaty is perfect. However, the understanding, reservations, and recommendations attached as a condition to our ratification will bring the treaty more in line with accepted U.S. standards and practices. Moreover, with the machinery of IMCO now functioning, and a review conference scheduled for 1962 to consider strengthening amendments to the treaty, it is in the national interest to accept the convention. As long as we remain outside of the convention, we have little or no opportunity to improve it. An industry spokesman has assured the committee that its acceptance will not result in the lowering of high "good housekeeping" standards now employed voluntarily by the industry.

Under these circumstances, I urge the Senate to advise and consent to ratification subject to the conditions set forth on page 4 of the committee's report.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, inasmuch as the United States has been one of the principal sufferers from the dumping of oil on the high seas, it seems to be very much in our interest to approve the convention. The Senator from Alabama has very ably presented the reasons why we should be concerned with the convention and why we should approve it. I simply wish to associate

myself with his remarks and to urge that the convention be approved subject to understandings and reservations as set forth in the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its parliamentary stages up to and including the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, in the English and French languages, which was signed at London on May 12, 1954, in behalf of certain states, but not the United States of America, subject to the following understanding and reservations and with the following recommendation:

The acceptance by the United States of America of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, is subject to the following understanding:

In accepting the convention the United States declares that it does so subject to the understanding that article XI effectively reserves to the parties to the convention freedom of legislative action in territorial waters, including the application of existing laws, anything in the convention which may appear to be contrary notwithstanding. Specifically, it is understood that offenses in U.S. territorial waters will continue to be punishable under U.S. laws regardless of the ship's registry;

The acceptance by the United States of America of the said convention is subject to the following reservations:

1. The United States accepts article VIII of the convention, subject to the reservation that, while it will urge port authorities, oil terminals, or private contractors to provide adequate disposal facilities, the United States shall not be obliged to construct, operate, or maintain shore facilities at places on U.S. coasts or waters where such facilities may be deemed inadequate, or to assume any financial obligation to assist in such activities;

2. The United States accepts the convention subject to the reservation that amendments communicated to contracting governments under the provisions of paragraph (2) of article XVI will become binding upon the United States of America only after notification of acceptance thereof has been given by the United States.

The United States of America, in accepting the convention subject to the aforesaid understanding and reservations, recommends that the parties give consideration to the formulation of amendments to the convention at the earliest practicable date to bring about—

- (1) International uniformity in fines and penalties;
- (2) International uniformity of enforcement;
- (3) A more realistic definition of what shall constitute oil pollution;
- (4) The right of access of each contracting government to the official reports of other contracting governments filed with the bureau which relate to its own vessels; and
- (5) A more flexible arrangement for fixing the time within which contracting governments shall notify the bureau whether or not they accept an amendment.

Attest.

Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I believe it is the understanding that the

vote on that question will be deferred until tomorrow. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask, then, that the further consideration of the convention be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the further consideration of Executive C will be temporarily laid aside.

MODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LOAD LINE CONVENTION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the proposal (Ex. I, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on May 31, 1949, for modification of article 3(e) of the International Load Line Convention signed at London on July 5, 1930, which was read the second time, as follows:

(e) A "new ship" is a ship, the keel of which is laid on or after the 1st July, 1932, all other ships being regarded as existing ships; except that where the Convention has been modified as provided in Article 20(1), the term "new ship" shall, so far as the modification is concerned, be taken to mean a ship the keel of which is laid on or after the date of the coming into force of the modification, all other ships being regarded, so far as the modification is concerned, as existing ships.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, since 1933 the United States has been a party to the International Load Line Convention. The basic purpose of this convention is to limit the extent to which ships engaged in international commerce may be loaded. Such vessels are marked with so-called load lines, which, taking into account the season and the area where the ship will be operated, indicate the point beyond which the vessel may not safely be submerged.

Some 64 countries are now parties to this convention.

The treaty now before the Senate makes a slight technical change in the provisions of article 3 of the convention. The convention itself distinguishes between ships existing at the time the convention came into effect and ships whose keels were laid thereafter. The amendment now under consideration clarifies the definition of the term "new ship." The effect of the amendment is that modifications in ship design agreed to under the convention are not to take effect retroactively but would apply only to new ships.

The committee has received no objections from the industry to the adoption of this amendment and on May 9, after a brief hearing, without objection ordered the convention favorably reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the proposal will be considered as having passed through its parliamentary stages up to and including the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to acceptance by the United States of America of a proposal made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on May 31, 1949, for modification of article 3(e) of the International Load Line Convention signed at London on July 5, 1930.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, as in the case of Executive C, it is agreed that the vote shall not be taken on this proposal today, but that it will be deferred until tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that Executive I be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Executive H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Executive I will be temporarily laid aside.

TREATY OF EXTRADITION WITH BRAZIL

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil (Exec. H, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Rio de Janeiro on January 13, 1961, which was read the second time, as follows:

TREATY OF EXTRADITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

The United States of America and the United States of Brazil, desiring to make more effective the cooperation of their respective countries in the repression of crime, have resolved to conclude a treaty of extradition and for this purpose have appointed the following Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America: His Excellency John Moors Cabot, Ambassador of the United States of America to Brazil, and

The President of the United States of Brazil: His Excellency Horacio Lafer, Minister of State for External Relations,

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Each Contracting State agrees, under the conditions established by the present Treaty and each in accordance with the legal formalities in force in its own country, to deliver up, reciprocally, persons found in its territory who have been charged with or convicted of any of the crimes or offenses specified in Article II of the present Treaty and committed within the territorial jurisdiction of the other, or outside thereof under the conditions specified in Article IV of the present Treaty; provided that such surrender shall take place only upon such evidence of criminality as, according to the laws of the place where the fugitive or person so charged shall be found, would justify his commitment for trial if the crime or offense had been there committed.

ARTICLE II

Persons shall be delivered up according to the provisions of the present Treaty for prosecution when they have been charged with, or to undergo sentence when they have been convicted of, any of the following crimes or offenses:

1. Murder (including crimes designated as parricide, poisoning, and infanticide, when

provided for as separate crimes); manslaughter when voluntary.

2. Rape; abortion; carnal knowledge of (or violation of) a girl under the age specified by law in such cases in both the requesting and requested States.

3. Malicious wounding; willful assault resulting in grievous bodily harm.

4. Abduction, detention, deprivation of liberty, on enslavement of women or girls for immoral purposes.

5. Kidnapping or abduction of minors or adults for the purpose of extorting money from them or their families or any other person or persons, or for any other unlawful end.

6. Bigamy.

7. Arson.

8. The malicious and unlawful damaging of railways, trains, vessels, aircraft, bridges, vehicles and other means of travel or of public or private buildings, or other structures, when the act committed shall endanger human life.

9. Piracy, by the law of nations; mutiny on board a vessel or an aircraft for the purpose of rebelling against the authority of the Captain or Commander of such vessel or aircraft; or by fraud or violence taking possession of such vessel or aircraft.

10. Burglary, defined to be the breaking into or entering either in day or night time, a house, office, or other building of a Government, corporation, or private person, with intent to commit a felony therein; house-breaking.

11. Robbery.

12. Forgery or the utterance of forged papers.

13. The forgery, falsification, theft or destruction of the official acts or public records of the government or public authority, including Courts of Justice, or the uttering or fraudulent use of the same.

14. The fabrication or the utterance, circulation or fraudulent use of any of the following objects: counterfeit money, whether coin or paper; counterfeit titles or coupons of public debt, created by national, state, provincial, territorial, local, or municipal governments; counterfeit bank notes or other instruments of public credit; and counterfeit seals, stamps, dies, and marks of State or public administration.

15. The introduction of instruments for the fabrication of counterfeit coins or bank notes or other paper currency as money.

16. Embezzlement by any person or persons hired, salaried or employed, to the detriment of their employers or principals.

17. Larceny.

18. Obtaining money, valuable securities or other property by false pretenses, or by threats of injury.

19. Receiving any money, valuable securities or other property knowing the same to have been unlawfully obtained.

20. Fraud or breach of trust by a bailee, banker, factor, trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, director or officer of any company or corporation or by anyone in any fiduciary capacity.

21. Willful non-support or willful abandonment of a minor or other dependent person when death or serious bodily injury results therefrom.

22. Perjury (including willfully false expert testimony); subornation of perjury.

23. Soliciting, receiving, or offering bribes.

24. The following offenses when committed by public officials: extortion; embezzlement.

25. Crimes or offenses against the bankruptcy laws.

26. Crimes or offenses against the laws of both countries for the suppression of slavery and slave trading.

27. Crimes or offenses against the laws relating to the traffic in, use of, or production or manufacture of, narcotic drugs or cannabinoids.

28. Crimes or offenses against the laws relating to the illicit manufacture of or traffic

in substances injurious to health, or poisonous chemicals.

29. Smuggling, defined to be the act of willfully and knowingly violating the customs laws with intent to defraud the revenue by international traffic in merchandise subject to duty.

30. Aiding the escape of a prisoner by force of arms.

31. Use of explosives so as to endanger human life or property.

32. Procurement, defined as the procuring or transporting of a woman or girl under age, even with her consent, for immoral purposes, or of a woman or girl over age, by fraud, threats, or compulsion, for such purposes with a view in either case to gratifying the passions of another person; profiting from the prostitution of another.

33. The attempt to commit any of the above crimes or offenses, when such attempt is made a separate offense by the laws of the Contracting States.

34. Participation in any of the above crimes or offenses.

ARTICLE III

Except as otherwise provided in the present Treaty, the requested State shall extradite a person accused or convicted of any crime or offense enumerated in Article II only when both of the following conditions exist:

1. The law of the requesting State, in force when the crime or offense was committed, provides a possible penalty of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than one year; and

2. The law in force in the requested State generally provides a possible penalty of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than one year which would be applicable if the crime or offense were committed in the territory of the requested State.

ARTICLE IV

When the crime or offense has been committed outside the territorial jurisdiction of the requesting State, the request for extradition need not be honored unless the laws of the requesting State and those of the requested State authorize punishment of such crime or offense in this circumstance.

The words "territorial jurisdiction" as used in this Article and in Article I of the present Treaty mean: territory, including territorial waters, and the airspace thereover, belonging to or under the control of one of the Contracting States; and vessels and aircraft belonging to one of the Contracting States or to a citizen or corporation thereof when such vessel is on the high seas or such aircraft is over the high seas.

ARTICLE V

Extradition shall not be granted in any of the following circumstances:

1. When the requested State is competent, according to its laws, to prosecute the person whose surrender is sought for the crime or offense for which that person's extradition is requested and the requested State intends to exercise its jurisdiction.

2. When the person whose surrender is sought has already been or is at the time of the request being prosecuted in the requested State for the crime or offense for which his extradition is requested.

3. When the legal proceedings or the enforcement of the penalty for the crime or offense committed has become barred by limitation according to the laws of either the requesting State or the requested State.

4. When the person sought would have to appear, in the requesting State, before an extraordinary tribunal or court.

5. When the crime or offense for which the person's extradition is requested is purely military.

6. When the crime or offense for which the person's extradition is requested is of a political character. Nevertheless

a. The allegation by the person sought of political purpose or motive for the request for his extradition will not preclude that person's surrender if the crime or offense for which his extradition is requested is primarily an infraction of the ordinary penal law. In such case the delivery of the person being extradited will be dependent on an undertaking on the part of the requesting State that the political purpose or motive will not contribute toward making the penalty more severe.

b. Criminal acts which constitute clear manifestations of anarchism or envisage the overthrow of the bases of all political organizations will not be classed as political crimes or offenses.

c. The determination of the character of the crime or offense will fall exclusively to the authorities of the requested State.

ARTICLE VI

When the commission of the crime or offense for which the extradition of the person is sought is punishable by death under the laws of the requesting State and the laws of the requested State do not permit this punishment, the requested State shall not be obligated to grant the extradition unless the requesting State provides assurances satisfactory to the requested State that the death penalty will not be imposed on such person.

ARTICLE VII

There is no obligation upon the requested State to grant the extradition of a person who is a national of the requested State, but the executive authority of the requested State shall, subject to the appropriate laws of that State, have the power to surrender a national of that State if, in its discretion, it be deemed proper to do so.

ARTICLE VIII

The Contracting States may request, one from the other, through the channel of their respective diplomatic or consular agents, the provisional arrest of a fugitive as well as the seizure of articles relating to the crime or offense.

The request for provisional arrest shall be granted provided that the crime or offense for which the extradition of the fugitive is sought is one for which extradition shall be granted under the present Treaty and provided that the request contains:

1. A statement of the crime or offense of which the fugitive is accused or convicted;

2. A description of the person sought for the purpose of identification;

3. A statement of the probable whereabouts of the fugitive, if known; and

4. A declaration that there exist and will be forthcoming the relevant documents required by Article IX of the present Treaty.

If, within a maximum period of 60 days from the date of the provisional arrest of the fugitive in accordance with this Article, the requesting State does not present the formal request for his extradition, duly supported, the person detained will be set at liberty and a new request for his extradition will be accepted only when accompanied by the relevant documents required by Article IX of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE IX

The request for extradition shall be made through diplomatic channels or, exceptionally, in the absence of diplomatic agents, it may be made by a consular officer, and shall be supported by the following documents:

1. In the case of a person who has been convicted of the crime or offense for which his extradition is sought: a duly certified or authenticated copy of the final sentence of the competent court.

2. In the case of a person who is merely charged with the crime or offense for which his extradition is sought: a duly certified

or authenticated copy of the warrant of arrest or other order of detention issued by the competent authorities of the requesting State, together with the depositions upon which such warrant or order may have been issued and such other evidence or proof as may be deemed competent in the case.

The documents specified in this Article must contain a precise statement of the criminal act of which the person sought is charged or convicted, the place and date of the commission of the criminal act, and they must be accompanied by an authenticated copy of the texts of the applicable laws of the requesting State including the laws relating to the limitation of the legal proceedings or the enforcement of the penalty for the crime or offense for which the extradition of the person is sought and data or records which will prove the identity of the person sought.

The documents in support of the request for extradition shall be accompanied by a duly certified translation thereof into the language of the requested State.

ARTICLE X

When the extradition of a person has been requested by more than one State, action thereon will be taken as follows:

1. If the requests deal with the same criminal act, preference will be given to the request of the State in whose territory the act was performed.

2. If the requests deal with different criminal acts, preference will be given to the request of the State in whose territory the most serious crime or offense, in the opinion of the requested State, has been committed.

3. If the requests deal with different criminal acts, but which the requested State regards as of equal gravity, the preference will be determined by the priority of the requests.

ARTICLE XI

The determination that extradition based upon the request therefor should or should not be granted shall be made in accordance with the domestic law of the requested State, and the person whose extradition is desired shall have the right to use such remedies and recourses as are authorized by such law.

ARTICLE XII

If at the time the appropriate authorities of the requested State shall consider the documents submitted by the requesting State, as required in Article IX of the present Treaty, in support of its request for the extradition of the person sought, it shall appear that such documents do not constitute evidence sufficient to warrant extradition under the provisions of the present Treaty of the person sought, such person shall be set at liberty unless the requested State or the proper tribunal thereof shall, in conformity with its own laws, order an extension of time for the submission by the requesting State of additional evidence.

ARTICLE XIII

Extradition having been granted, the surrendering State shall communicate promptly to the requesting State that the person to be extradited is held at its disposition.

If, within 60 days counting from such communication—except when rendered impossible by force majeure or by some act of the person being extradited or the surrenderer of the person is deferred pursuant to Articles XIV or XV of the present Treaty—such person has been delivered up and conveyed out of the jurisdiction of the requested State, the person shall be set at liberty.

ARTICLE XIV

When the person whose extradition is requested is being prosecuted or is serving a sentence in the requested State, the surrenderer of that person under the provisions of the present Treaty shall be deferred until

the person is entitled to be set at liberty, on account of the crime or offense for which he is being prosecuted or is serving a sentence, for any of the following reasons: dismissal of the prosecution, acquittal, expiration of the term of the sentence or the term to which such sentence may have been commuted, pardon, parole, or amnesty.

ARTICLE XV

When, in the opinion of competent medical authority, duly sworn to, the person whose extradition is requested cannot be transported from the requested State to the requesting State without serious danger to his life due to his grave illness, the surrenderer of the person under the provisions of the present Treaty shall be deferred until such time as the danger, in the opinion of the competent medical authority, has been sufficiently mitigated.

ARTICLE XVI

The requesting State may send to the requested State one or more duly authorized agents, either to aid in the identification of the person sought or to receive his surrender and to convey him out of the territory of the requested State.

Such agents, when in the territory of the requested State, shall be subject to the applicable laws of the requested State, but the expenses which they incur shall be for the account of the State which has sent them.

ARTICLE XVII

Expenses related to the transportation of the person extradited shall be paid by the requesting State. The appropriate legal officers of the country in which the extradition proceedings take place shall, by all legal means within their power, assist the officers of the requesting State before the respective judges and magistrates. No pecuniary claim, arising out of the arrest, detention, examination and surrender of fugitives under the terms of the present Treaty, shall be made by the requested State against the requesting State other than as specified in the second paragraph of this Article and other than for the lodging, maintenance, and board of the person being extradited prior to his surrender.

The legal officers, other officers of the requested State, and court stenographers in the requested State who shall, in the usual course of their duty, give assistance and who receive no salary or compensation other than specific fees for services performed, shall be entitled to receive from the requesting State the usual payment for such acts or services performed by them in the same manner and to the same amount as though such acts or services had been performed in ordinary criminal proceedings under the laws of the country of which they are officers.

ARTICLE XVIII

A person who, after surrender by either of the Contracting States to the other under the terms of the present Treaty, succeeds in escaping from the requesting State and takes refuge in the territory of the State which has surrendered him, or passes through it in transit will be detained, upon simple diplomatic request, and surrendered anew, without other formalities, to the State to which his extradition was granted.

ARTICLE XIX

Transit through the territory of one of the Contracting States of a person in the custody of an agent of the other Contracting State, and surrendered to the latter by a third State, and who is not of the nationality of the country of transit, shall, subject to the provisions of the second paragraph of this Article, be permitted, independently of any judicial formalities, when requested through diplomatic channels and accompanied by the presentation in original or in authenticated copy of the document by which the State of

refuge has granted the extradition. In the United States of America, the authority of the Secretary of State of the United States of America shall be first obtained.

The permission provided for in this Article may nevertheless be refused if the criminal act which has given rise to the extradition does not constitute a crime or offense enumerated in Article II of the present Treaty, or when grave reasons of public order are opposed to the transit.

ARTICLE XX

Subject to the rights of third parties, which shall be duly respected:

1. All articles, valuables, or documents which relate to the crime or offense and, at the time of arrest, have been found in the possession of the person sought or otherwise found in the requested State shall be surrendered, with him, to the requesting State.

2. The articles and valuables which may be found in the possession of third parties and which likewise are related to the crime or offense shall also be seized, but may be surrendered only after the rights with regard thereto asserted by such third parties have been determined.

ARTICLE XXI

A person extradited by virtue of the present Treaty may not be tried or punished by the requesting State for any crime or offense committed prior to the request for his extradition, other than that which gave rise to the request, nor may he be re-extradited by the requesting State to a third country which claims him, unless the surrendering State so agrees or unless the person extradited, having been set at liberty within the requesting State, remains voluntarily in the requesting State for more than 30 days from the date on which he was released. Upon such release, he shall be informed of the consequences to which his stay in the territory of the requesting State would subject him.

ARTICLE XXII

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged at Washington, as soon as possible.

The present Treaty shall enter into force one month after the date of exchange of ratifications. It may be terminated at any time by either Contracting State giving notice of termination to the other Contracting State, and the termination shall be effective six months after the date of such notice.

In Witness Whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed hereunto their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Portuguese languages, both equally authentic, at Rio de Janeiro, this thirteenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred sixty-one.

JOHN M. CABOT.
HORACIO LAFER.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, Executive H was reported only today. However, final action on the treaty will not be taken until tomorrow. I should like to make a statement concerning it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, although the formal report of the committee was filed only today, I hope in view of the routine nature of this extradition treaty that the Senate may be able to vote on it tomorrow. So that Senators who review the RECORD may have notice of the general nature of this convention, I will make a brief statement regarding it at this time.

As Senators may have noted, a number of United States citizens have in recent years fled to Brazil in order to escape prosecution for crimes in the United

States. Although the United States has treaties of extradition with some 65 foreign countries, it does not have such a treaty with Brazil. The principal reason we have not been able to negotiate such a treaty has resulted from the fact that under Brazilian law, capital punishment has been absolutely prohibited. For that reason, Brazil has been reluctant to conclude a treaty with the United States, which in some jurisdictions permits capital punishment.

This difficulty in the negotiation of the convention has been overcome by the provision in article 6 that neither country is bound to extradite an individual charged with crime if the death penalty might be imposed.

Article 2 lists the crimes for which extradition may be sought, and this list of crimes is similar to those included in other extradition treaties.

It will be noted that political offenses are not subject to extradition proceedings. Article 5 describes specific circumstances when extradition is not to be granted.

Brazil is the only country in the hemisphere with which the United States does not have an extradition treaty. Since it is reasonable to believe that various crimes have been planned with the thought that Brazil might be a refuge, the committee, without objection, ordered the convention favorably reported to the Senate on May 9. No objections from any source have been received. I hope the Senate will be able to approve this treaty when it convenes tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does that conclude the discussion and debate on the three treaties?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It concludes my remarks on two of them. I have made a short statement concerning the third one, Executive H. It seems to me that perhaps the further consideration of the treaty may be left open, so that if any Senator desires to discuss it tomorrow, he may do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that all three treaties were reported unanimously.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request: That at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow, and after the unopposed items on the calendar have been disposed of, the Senate proceed to a vote on the three treaties which have been discussed in the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly have no objection to that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or some other member of the committee to request at that time the yeas and nays on each of the three treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection the proposed unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I serve notice that a request for the yeas and nays will be

made on each of the three treaties tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO RESTORE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF THE STATES TO THE RESPECTIVE STATES AND TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, on January 13 last, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALLMADGE] introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which would restore the public school systems of the States to the respective States and to the people. The proposed constitutional amendment reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, every State shall have exclusive control of its public schools, public educational institutions, and public educational systems, whether operated by the State or by political or other subdivisions of the State or by instrumentalities or agencies of the State. Nothing contained in this article shall be construed to authorize any State to deny to any pupil because of race, color, national origin, or religious belief the right to attend schools equal in respect to the quality and ability of the teachers, curriculum, and physical facilities to those attended by other pupils attending schools in the same school system."

Madam President, I am a cosponsor of this proposal, as I have been in the past. I shall speak in support of it now.

In urging the adoption of this amendment, I am making no attack on the Federal courts. Neither is it my major purpose today to make an effort to oppose Federal aid to education.

My plea today is for a public school system of a type that will best serve and effectively serve all of our citizens.

Senate Joint Resolution 30, the Tallmadge proposed constitutional amendment, gives express constitutional language to what had always been, prior to 1954, constitutional principles and Supreme Court law.

I make no legalistic argument. My appeal is to the commonsense of this body and to the commonsense of the rank and file of the people of this Nation.

In large areas of the Nation, we cannot have an effective and efficient school system that serves all of the children unless relief is given from the present demands of the Federal courts that the schools be integrated by force. I propose that we meet this situation in a practical way, and through a method provided by the Constitution itself—an amendment to the Constitution.

I know this question of school integration has become an emotional issue. I

know it is steeped in national politics and also in international politics. It is difficult, indeed, to get the problem considered apart from these side issues.

There is now great agitation for Federal aid to our educational program. I do not attack the motives of those who propose it. Recently, Secretary Ribicoff, an able proponent of the Federal-aid-to-education bill, while defending the bill against a proposed rider calling for integrated schools, said:

I think it is a tragedy to put on the back of education the problems of everything, including the problems of civil rights. We should not block education with side issues.

I do not suggest that Secretary Ribicoff was advocating segregated schools. I assume that he was not. However, his remarks cogently point out, in effect, that the Federal aid bill should not carry the load of the issue of integrated schools.

Madam President, I say with equal emphasis that in large areas of the Nation the public school system should not and cannot carry the burden of enforced school integration.

Let us look at the facts.

Madam President, a school is not a machine; it represents the spirit and the cooperation of a community. It must have the support of the people—of the parents and of the entire community effort.

Although the States are charged with responsibility for maintaining the public schools the local units of government have largely assumed this burden, from the early days of our Nation. The local people have repeatedly voted local taxes on themselves and their property, to build and maintain school buildings. A large part of the entire cost of operations was originally paid from funds which the people themselves paid, through self-imposed taxes. Madam President, in many cases, taxes of this type were, and still are, very, very burdensome. Often they were imposed on a very narrow tax base.

In fact, the story of the development and functions of the local public school is one of the classic sagas of American history.

The governing officials of the schools have been elected by the people at the local level.

As the financial load grew greater, the States have carried more and more of the money load, and also have prescribed requirements both for teacher qualifications and for the curriculums. But the school has remained the pride and the property of the local unit. From this fact has come much of the strength of the public schools.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the able Senator from Mississippi yield at this point?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia, who is the author of this amendment, and has done very fine work on it over the period of years since he has been a Member of this body.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, the able Senator from Mississippi is a cosponsor along with several other Mem-

bers of this body of this proposed constitutional amendment.

I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the cogent point he is making—namely, that the States created our public school system; that the public schools are operated by local officials elected by the people; and that the public schools are financed by the local people. In the entire scheme of American history, there is nothing—unless it be a church—that is as local as is the public school system.

Madam President, will the able Senator from Mississippi yield further to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to make a few remarks, and then to request that certain material be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, during the course of my remarks upon the introduction of my proposed constitutional amendment on this subject, I referred to the fact that Congress, in voting in 1958 to admit Alaska as the 49th State, gave that State exclusive and perpetual control over its public schools and colleges.

The fact that such a grant of authority was made occasioned expressions of great surprise on the part of many Americans—including the then President of the United States, who was quoted by the New York Times as stating at his news conference:

It was a matter that I have not even heard about.

A subsequent check of the admission acts of all other States, made at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, disclosed that 10 other States likewise were granted "exclusive control" over their educational institutions, upon the granting of statehood to them.

Such grants of authority were made to the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, in 1889; to the States of Idaho and Wyoming, in 1890; to the State of Utah, in 1894; to the State of Oklahoma, in 1906; and to the States of New Mexico and Arizona, in 1912.

In each case, Madam President, the term "exclusive control" was used; and, with the one exception of Oklahoma, each such delegation of power was made "forever." In the case of Oklahoma, there was written into the law a further proviso assuring that the act would "not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children."

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the able Senator from Mississippi, the remainder of my remarks, which are based primarily on research work done by the Library of Congress, and contain verbatim quotations from the acts of Con-

gress admitting the respective States to the Union.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I thank the able Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me. I commend him for the ever-diligent fight he has waged, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, to preserve the Constitution of the United States and its principles under which this Nation has become the greatest and freest on the face of the earth.

And if the people of America lose the right to maintain control of the public schools on the State and local level, it will be the greatest entering wedge for an eventual dictatorship that our Government has ever seen.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia very much for his fine contribution to the presentation of this highly important matter. As always, he is well prepared. I think the reference the Senator has given, including the pledges made to the States on their admission, is another conclusive fact relating to the legal situation that has existed in this Nation all these years, and which was, as I have said before, settled law, both under the Constitution and under Supreme Court interpretation, until the year 1954, when the opinion in the noted school integration case was rendered.

As I recall, the Senator pointed out that the State of Alaska was one of the States that had this provision in its Constitution.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct. Since that time we have admitted Hawaii with substantially the same provision.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. While the Senator is on that particular point, may I state that the two last States were admitted after this amendment to the Constitution by the Supreme Court in 1954.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield further.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator, being the able lawyer and scholar that he is, I am sure is aware of the fact that the very same Congress which submitted the 14th amendment for ratification by the respective States created a segregated school system here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STENNIS. I recall that fact.

Mr. TALMADGE. Furthermore, it was the intent of the Congress that the administration of the public schools is something that should be left to the States and local government.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no doubt about it. I thank the Senator again.

I recite further the hard, common-sense facts of life with reference to the public school system.

The local public school in the South has been, and still is, and I hope will continue to be for a long time to come, the major social activity of the community, village, town, or city of its location. That is true throughout most of the length and breadth of this great land. I relate that reference to the

South first because in that section are conditions of which I have absolute, positive, local knowledge.

The local church has its place and makes its contribution, but it is primarily the local public school that serves as principal focal point of activity for the social life of the community. This is true for the children and for many of the adults.

Almost every school has its local PTA organization with its meetings, its parties, its luncheons, its dinners, its dances for both young and old almost the year around. The various school athletic events include interschool rivalry in football, basketball, baseball, tennis, swimming, and other events as weekly affairs with large attendances. The school and many different classes of the school have parties, dances, recitals, class plays, class days, and other social functions during the entire scholastic period, as well as many during the vacation months.

Thus, almost the entire social life of the school area centers around the public school.

The foregoing facts being true, it is clear that it is impossible to separate the educational functions of the public school from the social life of the community or area that the school serves. They go together.

Almost 7 years have passed since the Supreme Court rendered its celebrated school decision that launched the Court's social-educational experiment.

There have been much further litigation and many court battles since that time. Racial bitterness and enmity and strained relations have been aroused where friendliness and cooperation existed before. Military troops and bayonets have been used, and threats and coercion have been applied in many ways. Federal power has been arrayed against State power. Federal courts have been arrayed against State legislatures.

Even with all this effort, confusion, and aroused bitterness, according to a reliable survey made in 11 Southern States in December 1960 by the New York Times, less than 2 percent of the Negro children are attending school classes with whites.

The city of New Orleans underwent weeks and months of racial strife and bitterness heretofore unknown in that fine city. Business there has been seriously hampered and curtailed. The public schools in the city of Atlanta are scheduled for desegregation this fall. According to responsible newspaper reports, business has fallen off in Atlanta due to the sit-in demonstrations, which could be a forerunner of a pattern of more extreme strife this fall. This strife and unrest and litigation and enmity have actually extended to relations between the sharecroppers and the landlords on farms in the South where zealous courts undertake to deny the landowner a choice in selecting the person to work his land.

Recently, the Attorney General of the United States, in my opinion without legal authority, filed a suit in Federal court against the State of Virginia seeking to enjoin the State of Virginia from spending any money raised by State

taxes in any county for school purposes solely because one county has failed to meet Federal demands for integrated schools.

This continuing strife and confusion is dwarfing the lives of the young generations of both white and colored youth in vast areas of our Nation.

The great teaching profession, which is second only to the ministry, is in the high state of uncertainty and a low state of morale due to the future question as to continued strife, in which proper educational methods cannot function.

The opposition has been hard and unyielding. Most of the schools affected have been in a state of turmoil and confusion, and much of this continues. This will not change, because the experiment is an invasion of the social life of the people in these areas.

However, history shows that there is nothing new in this pattern of conduct. Whenever any governing authority has tried to establish patterns of social conduct over the people contrary to their strong desires, the effort has always failed. This is true in the spiritual as well as secular history. The Jews and Arabs, for instance, have lived side by side since prior to Biblical times until now. Chapter after chapter and book after book of the Bible relate the differences, the strife, and the bitterness that existed between these people, each of which has great virtues and has contributed much to civilization, past and present. Until now, though, they have never been successful in finding the formula for a social life together, as witness the refugee camps throughout much of the Middle East today.

I remember that in 1928 ex-President Herbert Hoover called the 18th amendment "a noble experiment." The people had actually voted the 18th amendment on themselves by the direct approval of 36 or more State legislatures. The experiment, though noble, was not practical and it did not work. It led to lawlessness, strife, bootleg wars, and crime wars. The people, including the "drys" using their commonsense, repealed the amendment.

With the same commonsense, we should submit this amendment to the people for ratification.

If adopted, it would pave the way for legislation at the State level in accordance with its powers, and each State could and would enact laws providing for a modern educational program in keeping with the needs and desires of the great majority of the people of that State.

In this way, the educational programs in the most affected areas would promptly take a new start and have renewed vigor and wholesome support.

The alternative is to have the education of our youth bogged down in civil strife and bitterness to the great detriment of all who are directly involved, and to the hurt of the Nation.

Perhaps with this solution to the school integration threat realized, other less serious racial issues could also be resolved.

This school question can well plague the political life of this Nation for

generations unless some remedy is obtained.

What is offered by the proponents of this social-educational experiment except more strife, dissension, bitterness, and uncertainty?

The proponents of this amendment offer a sane, logical, and constitutional course to follow through the proposed constitutional amendment. This is the orderly way to proceed. This is the constitutional way to proceed.

In the Federal aid to education bill which will be considered by the Senate within the next few days, the administration has assured us on the one hand that there is to be no effort of the Federal Government to interfere in our schools. This assurance is contained in the bill itself in section 103, which reads as follows:

Sec. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Further, we are given assurances that the Powell amendment will not be offered to the bill, seeking to deny Federal funds to those schools which have not integrated their classrooms. On the other hand, the Department of Justice has recently filed a proceeding in a Federal Court against the State of Virginia, seeking to enjoin the State of Virginia from spending any money raised by State taxes in any county where the schools have not been integrated. Is this a case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing?

Certainly, if the pattern is to enforce integration through the denial of State funds, it is certain there will be an attempt to enforce integration through the denial of Federal funds.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does it not strike the Senator as being somewhat ludicrous that the Government would tell us, on the one hand, it is not going to interfere in regard to expenditure of Federal funds, while at the same time the same Government goes into the Federal courts to insist that State funds and local funds be spent in accordance with its own peculiar notions?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. With all deference, it is a ridiculous position on its face. At a time when the bill is about to be considered, as the Senator from Mississippi understands, since the bill will be presented for debate in this Chamber tomorrow, the bill has a provision that there shall be no kind of direction, supervision, control, or determination of any kind with reference to any school in any State, yet another branch of the Government, the Department of Justice, is suing the State of Virginia not in regard to Federal money but in regard to money of the State of Virginia, raised from taxes imposed on the people of Virginia by the State legislature. The Federal Government seeks to enjoin the State from

spending money throughout the entire State for all public schools until compliance with enforced integration is had in one county.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would not a good analogy be that I could tell the Senator from Mississippi, "I am going to give you \$1,000. You can spend the \$1,000 in any way you see fit. There are absolutely no strings whatever attached to it. However, I shall insist on directing the expenditure of the funds that you now have."

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Georgia is correct. The last part of the statement, the reference to funds which belong to me and are in my own pocket, emphasizes expenditures in regard to which the Federal Government has no interest or concern.

Madam President, I think this is the most glaring case we have observed in a long time of traveling two ways at once, and of contradiction, in regard to policies on a serious subject.

Madam President, as a show of good faith and as a guarantee of their profession that no Federal control is intended, now or hereafter, these proponents should join us now in pushing for early adoption of this proposed amendment. Thus, with this constitutional amendment in effect—preserving local control—we can keep educational processes on a sound basis of administration.

If the Congress then should decide that education in the States should be given Federal aid, then such assistance could be supplied with assurance to all that local control would be preserved.

The future of liberty in the United States is in no small measure dependent upon the best fundamental education possible under this system of local control.

Now that the door to Federal control has been opened by the courts, other controls in other fields of school administration will surely follow. This is not a southern problem. It is a national problem. I hope that our friends in other sections of the country will recognize the problems we in the South now face as a symptom of a disease which might someday engulf their own schools also.

More and more, we shall be urged to accept offers of Federal aid and, in some measure, Federal control. Federal aid in this field inevitably will be followed by an increased degree of Federal control.

These schemes will be offered not only as the desirable, but, indeed as the only, solution to local school problems.

Through acceptance of these programs, extended under the guise of aid and "raising standards" and "achieving national goals" in education, the balance of power in the control of local school systems is certain to shift from the local school board to some Washington bureau.

The selection of textbooks, testing of students, determination of school curriculums and schedule, and even the licensing of local teachers will become vested in Washington.

Unless and until this amendment, or some other effective measure, is passed

assuring non-Federal control I cannot support a Federal aid to education bill.

UNDERSTANDING

The proponents of Federal aid to education offer promises of money. It is not money that we most need. We need understanding. We need appreciation of our conditions and the problems growing out of these conditions.

Even though the people of my State are not among those with the highest, or even the medium level, per capita income of the Nation, we have been making tremendous progress in our school system for all of our children, both white and Negro. This is entirely at our own expense. During a recent year, no other State paid as high a percent of its total tax income for educational purposes as did Mississippi. We continue to be near the top in this respect. We have trained Negro schoolteachers, more than any other State in the Union. They are paid the same salaries, on a qualification basis, as are the white teachers. I can personally testify that most all of these teachers, the children and the parents favor their present system of segregated schools and do not want to give them up. The school facilities, the lunch-room programs, the transportation systems are supplied to the Negro and white children on an equal basis. In many places, the facilities and services for the colored children exceed those for the whites.

As I said in the beginning, I do not present a legalistic argument. I present my argument as a commonsense, factual statement of the problem as it extends down to the ground level—to the homes, communities, the small towns, and the cities throughout great areas of this country.

No one is a stronger proponent of public school education than is the Senator from Mississippi. The question is not one of money. It is not a theory, but is a very practical, commonsense problem that we are up against. We must consider our educational system on the one hand and the social customs and habits that are engrained in the people over many decades, if not centuries. Today we are flirting with ideas and attempting to destroy or at least impair a sound, vigorous, and effective educational system. We are doing more harm than we could possibly do good, and are leaving areas of the country without an effective way of carrying on an educational program.

The question is not one of financial responsibility. We can carry the load in that way, but we cannot carry the load as it is now presented in an enforced integration pattern. Those who are supporting the bill for Federal aid to education have very high purposes. My plea to them is to join in passing the amendment submitted in order to put at rest the great strife, enmity, and bitterness that is being engendered and is increasing. Let us put it out of the way of our educational system.

As Secretary Ribicoff said, let not the educational problem which is burdening the Nation be encumbered by a side issue that may be connected with civil rights.

I hope that there will be an aroused interest on this subject at a proper time.

I observe also that joining as cosponsors of the amendment are the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG].

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator on the very able and effective speech he has just delivered. I join with him in the hope that Members of Congress will join hands with us now in proposing legislation to carry out the express wishes of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that our schools be recognized as essentially State and local in nature and are to be operated accordingly on the State and local levels.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator again. I wish also to thank him, as one who is affected by the problem, for the very fine work he has done over a period of years in trying to get favorable consideration for and a very practical solution to the present problem.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR TALMADGE

In the statute enacted to enable the admission of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, the following language appeared: "The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said States, respectively, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (Public Law 52, 50th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 180, sec. 14; 25 Stat. 676, 680 (1889)).

Similar language appears in similar context in the enabling act or act of admission for each State admitted to the Union since that time. The specific provisions concerning each of these States are as follows:

Idaho: "Sec. 8. The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (51st Cong., 1st sess., ch. 656, sec. 8, 26 Stat. 215, 216 (1890)).

Wyoming: "Sec. 8. The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college or university" (51st Cong., 1st sess., ch. 664, sec. 8, 26 Stat. 222, 223 (1890)).

Utah: "Sec. 11. The schools, colleges, and university provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes, or of the income thereof, shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (53d Cong., 2d sess., ch. 138, sec. 17, 28 Stat. 107, 110 (1894)).

Oklahoma: "Sec. 8. Such educational institutions shall remain under the exclusive control of said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes, or the income or rentals thereof, shall be used for the support of any religious or sectarian school, college, or university" (59th Cong., 1st sess., ch. 3335, sec. 8, 34 Stat. 267, 273 (1906)).

In this connection, it also is most interesting to note that section 3 of the same act admitting Oklahoma contains the following language:

"Fifth. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control; and said schools shall always be conducted in English: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall preclude the teaching of other languages in said public schools: *And provided further*, That this shall not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children."

New Mexico: "Sec. 8. That the schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (61st Cong., 2d sess., ch. 310, sec. 8, 36 Stat. 557, 563).

Arizona: "Sec. 26. That the schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (61st Cong., 2d sess., ch. 310, sec. 26, 36 Stat. 573, 714).

Alaska: "Sec. 6(j). The schools and colleges provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, or its governmental subdivisions, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college or university" (July 7, 1958 (H.R. 7999), Public Law 85-508, 85th Cong., 2d sess., sec. 6(j)).

Furthermore, the Hawaii Admission Act contains the following language with reference to the schools of that State in section 5(f): "The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands granted under the preceding subsections shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college or university."

The principle of State and local control of public education is well established by both law and precedent.

Our Founding Fathers recognized that education is a local responsibility by leaving it as one of the areas retained for State and local control under the terms of the 9th and 10th amendments.

It is a principle which is supported both by the local nature of school financing and by the findings of responsible Federal study groups.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, after each national election, there has generally been a resurgence of interest in electoral reforms. More often than not, it has been short lived. As other programs and events become prominent, proposals for electoral reform have been displaced.

This is unfortunate; for there are plenty of areas in which reform is badly needed. First and foremost, although it is no easy matter, I believe the electoral college system should be abolished. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has introduced a constitutional amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, that would accomplish this important purpose.

Further action will soon be needed to clarify the role of the mass media in election campaigns.

Many people also feel that the timing of campaigns for President and Vice President should be altered. I recently introduced a bill (S. 1749) to provide for the holding of presidential elections on 2 days, which was introduced not as a final answer to the problem but as something which should be discussed and studied.

Another resolution I introduced, Senate Resolution 141, calls for the scheduling of nominating conventions for national office after Labor Day, instead of in July or August as is the present practice. In this same area, former President Eisenhower last year recommended that the inauguration be moved back to permit a new President sufficient time to develop his budget and programs before Congress convenes in January.

The Privileges and Elections Subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee has just completed 2 days of hearings on campaign financing, particularly on legislation to amend the Corrupt Practices Act as it affects the reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures. The subcommittee is also considering legislation introduced by Senators MANSFIELD and NEUBERGER to provide some measure of financial assistance for Federal election campaigns.

The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee plans comprehensive hearings on electoral reforms in the near future. These hearings will include testimony from former Presidents and prominent political scientists.

Among other electoral reforms which recently have been put forth are: according 4-year nonvoting seats in the Senate to the candidates receiving the second highest number of votes for President and Vice President, setting up a system of national primaries, and establishing a Hoover-type Commission on Electoral Revisions.

Contrary to past experience, there seems to be a genuine enthusiasm for electoral reforms following the 1960 election. This enthusiasm is extremely encouraging. It gives every evidence of continuing and of being translated into meaningful action both at the Federal and State levels.

Today, I want to discuss an electoral problem which I believe is of special significance. I refer to the increasing disenfranchisement of intelligent, active

citizens who move from one area to another shortly prior to an election and are therefore unable to vote. During the last campaign, I received a great many letters from people in this predicament. I know, for example, that the Nixon headquarters received many times this amount.

As an example:

Mr. Candidate, I would like to vote for you. I know your record and I respect your views, but because I have moved across the street (or across the country) I am not eligible. I can't understand this. A national election should be open to everyone. Mobility is no indication that I or anyone else lacks the necessary discernment or convictions to vote intelligently. What can I do to obtain and guarantee my right to vote?

On Washington's Birthday of this year, I addressed the Senate briefly on the plight of the politically disposed. I included in my remarks at that time excerpts from an excellent study by Mr. Walter Kravitz, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I later sent copies of that statement to the 50 State Governors.

I have received replies from more than 30 States. Most were quite informative and sympathetic. I intend to summarize the Governors' comments later in my remarks, but first I want to pose and comment upon the general problem.

Mr. President, the kindest word we can use to describe the current situation is chaos.

Three States, for example, require 2 years' residence within their boundaries before they will permit an elector to cast his ballot. In 35 States the requirement is 1 year; in 12 others it is 6 months.

Three States demand 1 year's residence in the county. Eight others require 6 months; 17 specify anywhere from 2 to 4 months; and 6 others ask 30 to 40 days.

Finally, one State actually requires 1 full year's residence in a precinct, and three others expect 6 months residence in an equivalent locality. Nine States demand from 2 to 4 months, while 23 require from 10 to 40 days.

The situation is not only chaotic. It is unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, and dangerous.

It is unjust because it penalizes the mobile elements of our population.

It is unreasonable because of the great variation in these requirements and because a citizen may be stripped of his vote for a month, or 2 months, or even a year, if by merely moving across the street he also crosses a district or precinct line.

It is discriminatory because the weight of disfranchisement leans most heavily on urban voters.

It is dangerous because it may distort the outcome of a close election, because it alienates responsible segments of our citizenry, and—most frightening of all—because it encourages the fearful cancer of electoral apathy.

How many persons are affected by archaic State residence requirements? According to the American Heritage Foundation, some 8 million potential voters were barred from voting in the

1960 elections because of inability to meet State, county, or locality qualifications.

In other words, some 7½ percent of the total civilian population of voting age were disfranchised by these residence laws. Mr. President, the percentage margin of victory in dozens of elections last year was less than 7½ percent. I refer not only to the popular vote for the Presidency but also to a great many congressional races.

Who are these victims of this anachronism? The tragedy of the whole affair is that they include some of our most intelligent and informed citizens.

The American Heritage Foundation again reports that the disfranchised include many of our better educated and more responsible citizens—people with the initiative and character needed to pull up stakes and seek advancement in a new community. Many are educators, lawyers, clergymen; others are business executives.

A General Electric Co. spokesman reports that 6 percent of its executive personnel were disfranchised in 1960 because of being shifted from State to State.

Oil companies, chainstores, and large corporations frequently transfer engineers, managers, salesmen, and their executives. Each change of residence within a year usually disfranchises two votes and in some cases more.

Mr. President, it is no exaggeration to compare apathy in a democracy to cancer. Like that dread disease, apathy may so consume the body politic as to bring about its death.

We have some expert testimony on the relationship between residence disqualifications and political apathy. Consider how the States ranked in percentage of civilians of voting age who voted in the 1960 election. The eight States with the largest percentage turnout all have laws that encourage voting. The eight States with the smallest percentage turnout all raise formidable legal barriers to voting.

I do not for a moment deny the basic merit of the principles underlying the requirement of residency qualifications of some sort for voters. Fraud is deterred by such requirements. Furthermore, residence provides some assurance that the citizen has acquired a reasonable familiarity with local candidates and issues.

It is the severity and harshness of some of these requirements that trouble me. Is anything really gained by depriving a citizen of his suffrage because he lacks 2 years' State residence? Does that citizen really lose his competence to vote for State officers because he has moved within a State from one county to another less than 6 months before election day? Is movement from one precinct to another sufficient cause for the total loss of voting rights, even though the move may have occurred within 30 days of the election?

I question both the justice and the wisdom of such severity. Nevertheless, as far as State and local issues and State and local elections are concerned, the Congress does not have a direct role to play and the qualifications for voters can and should be left up to the State.

When we turn to national elections, and especially to the election of the President and Vice President, I fail to see the relevance of residence restrictions. State and local residence requirements have absolutely no bearing on the competence of any American citizen to cast a vote in a national election.

How are we to correct this injustice? The situation is admittedly a delicate one. As matters now stand, the Constitution clearly gives the responsibility for setting voters' qualifications to the States. It is something of a paradox that the question of who votes in a presidential and vice presidential election is determined at the State and local level.

A Governor of one of our States and two distinguished political scientists have indicated to me that the solution is to be found in congressional action. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter from Gov. William L. Guy of North Dakota in which he suggests that Federal action is needed to effectively aid the 8 million politically disposed Americans.

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

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 2, 1961.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your letter of February 23, requesting my remarks regarding the residency requirements for voting.

It would seem to me that the only way to obtain uniformity on voting in Federal elections is to have a Federal election law that would permit everyone to vote regardless of his local residence requirements. We have taken steps in North Dakota to attempt to reduce the residency requirements for voting in the national elections. The State legislature is still in session and we do not know how this bill will fare.

We feel that North Dakota's residency requirements are not too stringent, requiring residents in the State for 1 year, in the county for 90 days, and in the precinct for 30 days. Our proposed legislation would pertain to those who come into the State and do not meet the State voting requirements.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include at this point a very forceful and perceptive letter expressing the same viewpoint from Prof. Rhoten A. Smith, professor of politics at the New York University School of Law.

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

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF LAW,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1961.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I appreciate very much your letter of March 27 requesting some amplification of my views concerning residency requirements. I am happy to respond to this request.

My reasons for believing that the method of constitutional amendment, however cum-

bersome, is the only sure cure for the problem, stem largely from the clear language of section 2, article II, of the Constitution: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors."

This seems to me clearly to give plenary power to the State legislatures over the selection of electors, which would include, since they are all now popularly elected, the power to set the qualifications for voting for such electors. This, in turn, includes any residency requirement.

Now it might be argued with considerable logic (in my judgment at least) that the 14th amendment could be so construed as to grant to Congress the right to set voting qualifications insofar as they relate to elections for presidential electors and Members of Congress. But, as is well known, since the time of the civil rights cases (109 U.S. 3 (1883)), the Supreme Court has fairly consistently held to the view that the 14th amendment does not constitute a positive grant of new powers to Congress to legislate in this area so much as it prevents the States from taking certain positive steps which abuse the privileges and immunities of citizens, deprive persons of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny persons equal protection of the laws.

A citizen prevented by the residency requirements of a State from voting for presidential electors might, of course, bring suit under the 14th amendment claiming a denial of the equal protection of the laws. However, so far as I know, no one has brought such a suit, and the decisions in this area of political questions seems to me to offer little hope that the Supreme Court would be likely to find for the plaintiff in such a case.

It is in this context, then, that I should think the most certain approach to the problem lies in constitutional amendment.

My own preference would be for an amendment which approached the problem not only of the voter who loses his right to vote for presidential electors through moving, but also those who lose in this way their right to vote for Members of Congress. To mention a personal note: I was once disfranchised altogether and prevented from voting in a senatorial election in which I had personally worked actively for one of the candidates, because within 10 days of the election I had to move a few miles away and out of the precinct in which I had formerly lived. This must be a fairly common occurrence today.

Since you have invited me to do so, I will be bold enough to suggest one form such an amendment might take:

"The Congress shall have the power to set all requirements and qualifications for voting for electors for President and Vice President of the United States and for Members of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States. Nothing in this section shall be construed, however, to deprive the respective States of the power to provide other and different requirements for voting for officers of the State and of other jurisdictions within and subject to the State: *Provided*, That such other qualifications do not contravene any other provision of this Constitution."

Such language might be considered too broad; politically, such an amendment might encounter opposition from some who fear, for a variety of reasons, such broad control of the National Government over voting requirements for national officers. On the other hand, the problem of disfranchisement through residency requirements, it seems to me, is only part of a larger problem: the need for a right to vote in national elections which is under the jurisdiction of and enforceable by the National Government. This suggested amendment—or some version thereof—would, I think, meet that larger problem.

Under authority of such an amendment, were it adopted, one may hope the Congress would pass legislation setting U.S. citizenship as the sole criterion for voting for presidential electors (or, at the most, requiring in addition thereto, residence within the boundaries of the United States for some minimum period just prior to any presidential election). Qualifications for voting in elections to choose U.S. Senators would perhaps be confined to those who had been a resident of the State concerned for some minimum period, regardless of the period of their residency within any lesser subdivision. The residency requirement for voting for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives might include, in addition to residency with the State, a reasonable minimum period of residency within the congressional district in which one votes.

Let me say again that I appreciate your interest in my views. I hope the foregoing may be of some value to you in your search for a solution to this problem of increasing seriousness.

Sincerely yours,

RHOTEN A. SMITH,
Professor of Politics.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, presumably, Federal action would entail the passage of a constitutional amendment. I am reluctant to advocate such a course for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the practical difficulty of persuading a sufficient number of the States to ratify.

There have been certain small but encouraging trends to liberalize residency requirements in recent years. Some States have lowered their overall requirements. Others have eased the restrictions on intrastate movement.

Even more heartening are the reforms seven States have adopted to safeguard the vote in presidential elections of those who have moved from one State to another.

Connecticut and Vermont permit ex-residents to vote for President by absentee ballot within certain specified time periods. This is referred to as the Connecticut approach.

The Wisconsin approach adopted by Wisconsin, California, Missouri, Ohio, and Oregon waives all or part of the normal residence requirements for new residents who wish to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors.

Gov. Wesley Powell, of New Hampshire, recently called my attention to another encouraging development, the issuance of a memorandum on this subject by the staff of the national Governor's conference. I ask unanimous consent to include his letter in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Concord, N.H., March 13, 1961.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: I very much appreciate the letter which you addressed to me on February 23 and the enclosure from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You are probably aware of the paper which was prepared by the staff of the national Governors' conference at the request of the executive committee, of which I am a member.

It appears doubtful that we shall be able to get action on this subject at the current

session of the legislature, but I do believe we shall succeed in having this issue referred to the legislative counsel for study in preparation for recommendations to be submitted to the legislature in 1963.

I personally agree that sound procedures should be worked out in order that duly qualified citizens shall not be denied the right to vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

WESLEY POWELL,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I had known about an earlier recommendation of the Council of State Governments, made in 1955, for the adoption of a model law patterned after the Connecticut plan. The more recent report, dated January 1961, explores what the States can do on their own initiative to remedy existing inequities and to avert Federal interference in a field traditionally reserved to the jurisdiction of the States.

The study considers both the Wisconsin and Connecticut approaches, the breadth and gaps in their respective coverage, and the encouraging statistics of increased voter participation in the States which have adopted either of these two plans. Both approaches, the report points out, deal solely with presidential elections, but each solves only half the problem. Connecticut's absentee ballot system makes no provision for new residents; the Wisconsin plan takes care of new residents but ignores the plight of former residents. Very sensibly, the report suggests that the States adopt both methods.

Along this line, Gov. John Dempsey of Connecticut, whose State was the first to permit ex-residents to vote for President by absentee ballot, informs me that his secretary of state this year sponsored the introduction of additional legislation. The new bill follows the Wisconsin approach and would reduce the 1-year residence requirement to 60 days for voting in presidential elections. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Dempsey's letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, Conn., March 20, 1961.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you so much for your letter of February 23 and its enclosure, relating to residence requirements for voting in the several States, and the problem of the U.S. citizen who moves from one State to another prior to a presidential election.

This involves a matter of particular interest and concern to us in Connecticut, since Connecticut was one of the first States to enact legislation to cope with this problem. Also, Mrs. Ella T. Grasso, our secretary of state, has been most active in sponsoring action to resolve this problem in Connecticut and, through the conference of secretaries of State, in encouraging action to resolve it in other States.

Connecticut now has a law which permits a former Connecticut elector who has moved to another State within the period of 24

months before a presidential election to vote by special absentee presidential elector ballot in his former Connecticut town provided he has not lived in his new State long enough to meet its State residence requirement for voting.

In the current session of our general assembly, the secretary of state sponsored the introduction of a bill which would permit new residents of the State to vote for presidential electors here provided they are otherwise qualified and provided they do not have this privilege in any other State.

Mrs. Grasso has also been in consultation with the attorney general with regard to the constitutional aspects of this type of legislation.

May I assure you that we are desirous of doing whatever can be done to alleviate this unfortunate situation. For this reason, we should be most appreciative of your sending to us any other materials which you may have with regard to this matter. Moreover, if there is anything which we in Connecticut can do, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, apparently Connecticut can bring about such a reform by legislation. Unfortunately, as the national Governor's conference study notes, most States must amend their constitutions to achieve the same result.

This is the problem, for example, in Delaware, Governor Carvel's office informs me. Governors Rockefeller, of my own State of New York, Quinn, of Hawaii, Kerner of Illinois, Combs of Kentucky, Meyner of New Jersey, Sanford of North Carolina, Lawrence of Pennsylvania, Rossellini of Washington, and Gage of Wyoming have written to me that they face the same obstacle.

To circumvent this difficulty, the Governor's conference report suggests an ingenious legal alternative. I quote from page 5 of the report.

It has been indicated in the preceding discussion that virtually all State constitutions refer specifically to residence requirements for voting—thus proposals to shorten or eliminate the waiting period for voting in presidential elections would apparently have to be accomplished by State constitutional amendment. However, it has been suggested that the qualifications for those voting for presidential electors can be established by State legislative action alone. The line of reasoning used in support of this contention is the assumption that qualifications for voting in presidential elections may be governed by the provisions of the Federal Constitution which says: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors."

The report notes that during the early years of the Republic, State legislatures selected the presidential electors themselves:

It was apparently taken for granted that this was a matter left up to the State legislatures to decide. Only gradually was legislation adopted in the States to provide for popular election of presidential electors.

The report cautions the States not to proceed precipitously in this matter, since there is no thorough study of the constitutional questions involved. Such a study was recently initiated by the Council of State Governments.

Interestingly enough, Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, mentioned this very point last December. In returning a bill to his State's general assembly, the Governor wrote:

At least one case has suggested that this provision (i.e., art. 2, sec. 1, cl. 2) empowers a State legislature to disregard the constitution of the State in determining the manner of appointment of presidential electors (*McPherson v. Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1 (1892)). In the absence of a definitive decision, however, we should not lightly assume that the legislature can override our constitution in this respect.

Governor Meyner also disagrees with another contention of the Governor's conference study. According to that study:

Absentee voting provisions are usually statutory in nature and can be amended by simple enactment of the law. This is the Connecticut approach to preserve voting rights and can in most instances be adopted by the States promptly.

Governor Meyner, in the same message from which I quoted above, applauds the movement toward reducing residence requirements. But he points out, in his veto of Connecticut-type legislation, that his State's constitution specifically limits the vote to residents:

Thus, our constitution gives the legislature no power to extend the vote to persons who are not domiciled in New Jersey and in the county for the requisite periods. It is plain that this bill cannot be sustained under the State constitution.

Presumably, other States may run into the same difficulty.

Another objection to the absentee ballot system raised by Governor Meyner was also cited to me by Governor Hatfield of Oregon:

The State of previous residence has no obligation to the citizen who has moved to another State.

The absentee ballot system, he continues, ignores "both the administrative difficulties and possibility for fraud." The Oregon system, which permits new Oregon residents to vote for President and Vice President after only 30 days' residence, is, according to the Governor, far superior.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the full text of Governor Hatfield's letter at this point.

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

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE CAPITOL,
Salem, Ore., March 13, 1961.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: Your invitation to comment on residency requirements for voting is most welcome. As Secretary of State and as Governor, I urged the constitutional amendment, adopted by Oregon voters last fall, that will permit new Oregon residents to vote for President and Vice President after only 30 days.

Our 30-day requirement is tied to the closing date for voter registration and seems reasonable in minimizing potential fraud. The 30-day period is required for the preparation of poll lists, mailing of voters' pamphlets, and other necessary administrative arrangements.

Two points seem worthy of special mention:

1. The residence requirement for participation in State and local elections (6 months) is necessary. In most instances, it will take about 6 months to gain working familiarity with local issues and candidates.

2. The State of previous residence has no obligation to the citizen who has moved to another State. The suggestion of the National Association of Secretaries of State that a citizen retain residence for voting purposes in his former State until he qualifies elsewhere seems to me to ignore both the administrative difficulties and possibility for fraud. The Oregon system is far superior.

While I would hope that Federal action could be avoided, the States have the responsibility for bringing their residence requirements for presidential voting in line with the current facts of political life.

If I can be of further service, please let me know.

Sincerely,

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, here, then, are the merits and defects of the solution advanced to permit newly moved citizens to retain their right to vote in presidential elections. The Connecticut absentee voter plan covers former residents, but ignores new residents, increases administrative difficulties, widens the possibility of fraud, and may be constitutionally infeasible in some States. The Wisconsin system of waiving the usual requirements for new residents who wish to vote for President and Vice President is simpler and more straightforward, but it omits newly removed residents and adoption usually requires use of the cumbersome, time-consuming, and difficult constitution-amending process.

Mr. President, I am not dismayed by the differences of opinion among the Governors and other officials and persons who deal with this subject. Let the arguments rage, the hotter the better and the louder the better. If nothing else, the noise of the controversy may awaken the people of this country to the serious extent of the basic injustices involved. And the people need rousing, by every kind of publicity, if we are to have effective reform.

I am reassured by the letters I have received from so many Governors. Most of them are fully aware of and concerned about the injustices I have described. Thirty-two Governors have written to me as of this date. All but six emphatically agree that this problem requires serious attention.

As expected, the overwhelming opinion of the chief executives from whom I have heard is that this is most definitely an area of State jurisdiction and responsibility. Only two Governors mentioned Federal action favorably. Governor Guy, of North Dakota, thought uniformity on voting in Federal elections could be achieved only by a Federal election law. Governor Egan, of Alaska, suggested that Congress investigate stringent absentee-voting requirements. I ask unanimous consent to include his letter in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, Alaska, March 6, 1961.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This will acknowledge your letter of February 23 in which you asked for my comments regarding residency requirements for voting for President and Vice President of the United States.

The 1960 Alaska Legislature adopted a revised election law for our State and this law was given its first test in our primary and general elections of last year. While the law generally proved to be satisfactory, experience has demonstrated that it is wanting in some areas.

I have submitted to the legislature now in session two proposed amendments which I believe will improve certain aspects of the basic election law. The amendment provides for preregistration and the second amendment liberalizes the method by which minority parties may place the names of their candidates for President and Vice President of the United States on the Alaska ballot.

As you pointed out in your letter and the related material which you enclosed, there is need for further study regarding the question of abolishing the residency requirement for voting for President and Vice President of the United States.

In our last election there was confusion among the large number of military personnel and their dependents stationed in Alaska as to their voting rights in our State. This is one aspect of the problem which I believe merits consideration by Congress in its deliberations regarding the residency requirement.

In reviewing the Library of Congress study which you enclosed, Alaska's residency requirements appear to be most liberal as compared with those of other States. While this law allows most of our newer residents to vote absentee in the States in which they previously had established residence, our recent election did disclose that some residents who came to Alaska from States having stringent absentee voting requirements were disenfranchised. Here is another area which I believe Congress might investigate in its deliberations on residency requirements.

I appreciate this opportunity to explain my views on this question. If there is anything further you or your committees wish to know concerning Alaska's voting laws or my personal opinions on the subject, I will be most happy to send this information to you.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Governors of three States in which the residence requirements for new residents have been lowered for presidential elections write that they are quite satisfied with the results. The Governors of 12 other States say they also favor the Wisconsin approach. In six of these States, legislation liberalizing residency requirements for new residents was introduced this year.

Only two Governors indicated they favored the Connecticut approach, and one of them favors it in coordination with the other method. Connecticut itself, as I have mentioned, is moving toward adoption of the Wisconsin model.

I was glad to have my belief confirmed that this is a nonpartisan issue. Of the

26 Governors who responded affirmatively, 16 are Democrats and 10 are Republicans. This is roughly the same ratio as there are Democratic and Republican Governors presently in office.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to report that the chief executive of my own State, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, is intensely interested in the matter of residence requirements. In the closing days of the recent session of the New York State Legislature, he recommended a complete revision of the suffrage article in the State's constitution.

The Governor's suggestions are thorough and comprehensive. First, he would bring about a general reduction for the State's newcomers. Requirements for residence in the State would drop from 1 year to 6 months, and in the county from 4 months to 3. The 30-day election district requirements would be unchanged.

Once a citizen has qualified under these regulations, suggests the Governor, he should be permitted to retain his voting right no matter how close to election day he may move, so long as he remains in the State.

In addition, paragraph 3 of the proposed amendment would empower the legislature to provide special procedures that would permit newcomers with at least 30 days' residence in the State to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors.

Finally, the amendment would permit the legislature to make special provision for ex-residents who had moved to another State within 1 year of the election and had not yet met the requirements of their new State. The voting rights of these persons would be limited to a presidential election.

If these proposals are adopted, and I certainly hope they will be, New York will have the most advanced residence requirement law in the Nation. With Governor Rockefeller's support, there is every hope that the measure will be adopted.

I ask unanimous consent to include assembly print No. 5767 at this point in my remarks.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY PROPOSING A NEW ARTICLE 2 OF THE CONSTITUTION, IN RELATION TO SUFFRAGE, AND REPEAL OF THE ARTICLE 2 OF THE CONSTITUTION PRESENTLY IN FORCE

SECTION 1. *Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That article 2 of the constitution as presently in force is hereby repealed and replaced by a new article 2 of the constitution, to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 2

"Suffrage

"SECTION 1. Every citizen of the age of 21 years, who shall have been an inhabitant of this State for 6 months next preceding an election and for the last 3 months a resident of the county, city, or village and for the last 30 days thereof a resident of the election district in which he may offer his vote shall be entitled to vote at such election for all officers that now are or hereafter may be elective by the people and upon all questions which may be submitted to the vote of the people, except that the legislature may establish a reasonable test of

literacy for voters and may exclude from the right of suffrage persons convicted of any felony and persons determined to be mentally incompetent.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the residence requirements imposed by section 1 of this article, no citizen who is registered and otherwise qualified to vote shall be deprived of his right to vote by reason of his removal from the election district in which he is registered to another election district in the State within the 3 months next preceding an election, and every such citizen shall be entitled to vote at such election in the election district in which he is so registered.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the residence requirements imposed by section 1 of this article, the legislature may provide special procedures whereby every citizen of the age of 21 years who shall have been an inhabitant of this State for 30 days next preceding an election in which electors are to be chosen for the Office of President and Vice President of the United States shall be entitled to vote for such electors in this State and special procedures whereby every citizen who is registered and would be qualified to vote at such election but for his removal from this State within 1 year next preceding such election shall be entitled to vote for such electors, provided in both cases that he is not able to qualify to vote for such electors in any other State and that he shall not be entitled to vote for any other officers or upon any question which may be submitted to the vote of the people.

"SEC. 4. The legislature shall define residence for voting purposes, insure secrecy in voting, and provide for the registration of voters and the administration of elections. The legislature shall also provide for absentee registration and absentee voting in cases which it deems appropriate.

"SEC. 5. Except as may be otherwise prescribed by the legislature for village and town elections, all boards or officers registering voters, distributing ballots or receiving, recording or counting votes shall have equal representation from the two political parties which at the gubernatorial election next preceding that for which such boards or officers are to serve cast the highest and next highest statewide vote."

SEC. 2. *Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the foregoing amendment be referred to the first regular legislative session convening after the next general election of members of the assembly and, in conformity with section 1 of article 19 of the constitution, be published for 3 months previous to the time of such election.

(NOTE.—Article 2 of the constitution proposed to be repealed by this concurrent resolution, refers, generally, to suffrage and contains provisions relating to the qualifications of voters, absentee voting, exclusions from the right of suffrage, residency for voting purposes, registration of voters, absentee registration, permanent registration, the manner of voting, identification of voters and bipartisan registration and election boards and officers. This concurrent resolution has been introduced for study purposes only.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in recent years the shibboleth of those who seek to refine our democratic institutions has been the appeal that we must consider the image we present to the world. In the conflict between the Soviet system and our own, so goes the argument, the uncommitted peoples of the world have us under constant scrutiny to see how well we live up to our professions of democracy. If we improve ourselves, we are told, then we shall rise in the estimation of these people; if we lag, we shall lose ground with them.

Naturally, I should like to see our prestige abroad increased. I doubt that the alleviation of injustices caused by stringent residence requirements would have much effect upon opinion abroad, but, frankly, even if it did, I would not want our decisions to depend upon that argument.

The example I would have us set is for ourselves more than for others. I am less concerned with our image abroad than I am with our duty to ourselves, to our political tradition, and to our posterity. The image we present to the world is worthless unless it springs from the depths of our own sincere convictions, unless it is derived from the essence of our beliefs.

Our own well-being and self-interest, the growth of our own liberties, the better and more equitable functioning of our own democracy—this is our first concern.

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.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE W. NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

At the age of 81, and after 40 years as a Representative and Senator from that State—an impressive fact in itself—George W. Norris retired from public life. As would be the case following so remarkable a political career, his colleagues and friends assembled in Washington on December 10, 1942, to give him a testimonial dinner.

Not certain on his plans, several of the speakers at the dinner suggested that upon his retirement Senator Norris might remain in Washington or, perhaps, make his home in the Tennessee Valley. On the face of it, either was a reasonable assumption. Washington was where he had spent so much of his later life, and, on the other hand, the famous Tennessee Valley project had absorbed much of his interest and energy.

But Senator Norris had other thoughts. McCook, in Red Willow County, Nebr., was his home; his duties concluded, this is where he would return.

His career in public life started in that county: First as its county attorney, later as a district judge, and then for 10 years as a Representative in Congress from the Fifth District. In 1912 he was elected to the Senate by the State legislature after having prevailed in the popular primary election held to designate the preferred candidate for that office.

He continued as a Member of the Senate until January 1943.

His proposals for political reform and his record of legislative achievements identify him as a very creative and active individual. We recall his famous resolution which broke the grip of Speaker

Cannon over the House; his anti-injunction legislation cosponsored by Mr. LaGuardia; his constitutional amendment abolishing the so-called lame duck sessions of Congress; and the measures he advocated to establish the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Senator Norris spearheaded the movement for unicameral legislation in our State. The adoption of an amendment by the people of Nebraska in 1934 gave our State the only single-chamber legislature in the Union. Significantly, when it met for the first time on January 5, 1937, Senator Norris visited the assembly, which necessitated his missing on that day the first opening of the new Congress pursuant to the operation of the 20th amendment to the Constitution.

During his service in the Senate, Senator Norris became the chairman of two standing committees, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Judiciary. It is with a great measure of satisfaction that the senior Senator from Nebraska is now a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and works on legislative matters similar to those which concerned and challenged the mind and faith of Senator Norris.

Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, once described Senator Norris as "a living, perambulating declaration of independence in human form." This, I believe, has caught the truth and reflects the meaning of Senator Norris' life. He lived at a time when our Nation was experiencing a period of sweeping social and economic adjustments. He sensed the needs of the Nation and developed and supported programs which helped guide the course of our national progress. But he did so as the spokesman of no particular or provincial interest. His field of activity and concern was wide and varied. He was indifferent to political labels and scorned associations with special groups. It is for his general activity, interest, and achievement for which we pay him honor.

Senator Norris fought economic waste, social injustice, and tyranny as he found it. Usually the cause was unpopular, and mainly he fought alone. His actions, however, were characterized by patience, courage, and integrity; and through them he inspired others. Although individuality was his hallmark, he was accorded general honor and esteem by his colleagues and of the Nation.

July 11, 1961, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Senator Norris. In honor of this great Senator, the State of Nebraska will hold a ceremony later this month in the State capitol at which time a bust sculptured by Mr. Jo Davidson will be presented to the State. Later in the year further celebrations commemorating the centenary of his birth will be held.

The U.S. Senate would be remiss, Mr. President, if it failed to note the occasion. Therefore I submit a resolution providing that when the Senate concludes its business on July 11, or on the first ensuing day when it is in session if it does not meet on July 11, it stand adjourned in further respect to the memory of

George W. Norris, the late Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, in submitting the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered and approved at this time. I may say that this proposal has the concurrence of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 146) for the Senate to adjourn on July 11, 1961, as a mark of further respect to the memory of Hon. George W. Norris.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the late George W. Norris served for ten years as a Member of the House of Representatives and for thirty years as a Member of the United States Senate with dedication, distinction, and untiring concern for the public welfare; and

Whereas he served with distinction as chairman of two standing committees of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on the Judiciary; and

Whereas he sponsored progressive reforms through such proposals as the 20th amendment to the Constitution, anti-injunction legislation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Acts, and the unicameral amendment to the Nebraska State constitution; and

Whereas, he was beloved by his own State of Nebraska and the Nation as a whole for his courage, integrity, and unselfish devotion to the cause of his fellow man; and

Whereas July 11, 1961, will mark the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George W. Norris: Therefore be it

Resolved, That at the conclusion of that day's business, or if the Senate is not in session on that date, then on the next following day on which it will be in session, the Senate stand adjourned as a mark of further respect to the memory of the late Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris.

The preamble was agreed to.

OLD SERIES CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT (S. REPT. NO. 256)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1619, reported today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1619) to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old-series currency, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, S. 1619, of which I am the author, is the old-series currency adjustment bill. It is designed to clean up some old historical statutory relics and, in the process of doing this, to save the Government about \$10,000 a day in interest charges.

Before July 1, 1929, the old large-size bills were issued. There are still a good many of them outstanding on the books of the Treasury, although everyone knows that many have been destroyed by fire, flood, or accidents of one kind or

another, or are in the hands of collectors who value them more for their historical interest than as money. In addition, between June 30, 1929, and January 30, 1934, the date of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, small-size gold certificates were issued to the public. About \$12½ million of these small-size gold certificates are now outstanding.

When one of these old notes is received, it is immediately retired, though, of course, it is still legal tender and in every respect equal to any other bill.

This old-series money is still outstanding on the Treasury's books as currency. S. 1619 would transfer these obligations to the non-interest-bearing public debt, as was previously done with old Federal Reserve banknotes and national banknotes, both now being liquidated, and with U.S. notes. In the future, when any of these old-series notes might be presented to the Treasury, they would be redeemed in full in new issues. In addition, the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, to write off from the books of the Treasury so much of the old-series notes as, in his judgment, he believed had been destroyed or irretrievably lost.

S. 1619 would make available for current use the security now backing up this old-series currency. For instance, some \$30 million in gold is lying in the Treasury vaults as security for \$30 million of gold certificates. There is no reason in the world to tie up this \$30 million of gold. If a gold certificate is presented, the gold cannot be paid out under the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, and, in any event, many of the gold certificates have certainly been irretrievably lost or destroyed. So also some \$31 million standard silver dollars are being held as security for Treasury notes of 1890 and old-series silver certificates. During the 18 months ending December 31, 1960, only \$26,134 of old-series silver certificates were turned in and only \$6 of Treasury notes of 1890. And the Federal Reserve banknotes are required to hold security for some \$36 million of old-series Federal Reserve notes. During the same 18 months only \$469,730 in these old-series Federal Reserve notes were retired. To maintain \$98 million of reserves in gold, silver, and Government bonds against this old-series currency is entirely unnecessary.

Accordingly, S. 1619 would make available \$98.1 million of gold, silver, and other reserves for current use by the Government. This would reduce the Government's borrowing by \$98.1 million. The interest on this borrowing would amount to some \$3 to \$4 million a year at current rates. This would mean a saving of \$10,000 a day.

The bill contains several other supplementary provisions, such as the one authorizing the Treasury to keep an historical collection of notes.

This proposal has been carefully considered and has bipartisan support. Mr. Julian B. Baird, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, testified in favor of the same proposal on June 24, 1960; the Committee on Banking and Currency then reported S. 3714; and the Senate passed the bill on June 28, 1960,

on a calendar call. This year Mr. Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, submitted a favorable report to the committee in which he stated:

Enactment of the bill would be a businesslike step that would result in significant savings, without impairing in the least the redeemability of the old currency.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has again reported the bill unanimously, and Mr. Roosa's letter and accompanying statements are set forth in full in the report. The Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller General have also approved the bill.

It seems to me there is no question of the desirability of taking a businesslike step that would result in saving about \$10,000 a day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for this eminently economical and businesslike proposal. This is an idle and unneeded reserve, which is costly to the Government and to the people to maintain.

During the preceding administration I thought I would have a little fun with the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, so I obtained bills of these various denominations and issues and asked that they be redeemed in gold. The reply was that they could not be redeemed in gold or silver. I was, however, offered bills of identical issue in return for the bills which I offered and for which I demanded redemption.

So I think it is very clear that this reserve is purely a token reserve. It is not needed, it is not necessary, it is costly to the Government. The Senator from Wisconsin, by this measure, has more than earned his keep for his entire period in the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is, it seems to me, the outstanding economist in Congress. There is no one whose support I would rather have on this measure.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. To whom is the interest now paid which will be saved at the rate of \$10,000 a day?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The interest is paid to those who loan the money to the United States by purchasing its securities.

Mr. HRUSKA. Those to whom the interest is paid hold the specific securities, do they?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Actually, this measure will release these funds, which in turn can be used to pay off the outstanding securities against the credit of the U.S. Government, and thereby reduce the debt by \$98 million, and reduce the interest paid on obligations of the U.S. Government by between \$3 million and \$4 million a year.

Mr. HRUSKA. So, in reality, reserves must be set up by law; and the effect of the bill will be to release those reserves. In short, it is a bookkeeping transaction, is it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. And the bill will not necessarily result in the cessation of writing Government checks in the sum of \$10,000 a day, will it? Is not that the actual picture?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. That was my understanding, and I wished to confirm it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But, in my judgment, there will be an actual saving of \$3,500,000.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, indeed; and I think the Senator is to be congratulated upon pursuing this course, because it will give the transaction a businesslike status, which at the present time it does not have. So I wish to add my congratulations to those of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

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. 1619) 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 this Act may be cited as the "Old Series Currency Adjustment Act".

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The term "United States notes" means currency notes issued pursuant to the first section of the Act of February 25, 1862 (12 Stat. 345), the Act of July 11, 1862 (12 Stat. 532), the resolution of January 17, 1863 (12 Stat. 822), section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 709), or section 3571 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C., sec. 401).

(c) The term "Treasury notes of 1890" means currency notes issued pursuant to the Act of July 14, 1890 (26 Stat. 289).

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the general fund of the Treasury, to be credited as a public debt receipt, the following:

(1) Gold held as security for gold certificates issued prior to January 30, 1934.

(2) Standard silver dollars held as security for, or for the redemption of, silver certificates issued prior to July 1, 1929.

(3) Standard silver dollars held as security for, or for the redemption of, Treasury notes of 1890.

SEC. 4. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with the approval of the Secretary, may require any Federal Reserve bank to pay to the Secretary, to be credited as a public debt receipt, an amount equal to the amount of Federal Reserve notes of any series prior to the series of 1928 issued to such bank and outstanding at the time of such payment.

SEC. 5. Any currency the funds for the redemption or security of which have been transferred pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of this Act, and any Federal Reserve notes as to which payment has been made under section 4 of this Act, shall thereafter, upon presentation at the Treasury for redemption, be redeemed by the Secretary from the general fund of the Treasury and thereupon retired.

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, upon completion of the transfers and credits authorized and directed by section 3 of this Act there shall be carried on the books of the Treasury as

public debt bearing no interest the following:

(1) Gold certificates issued prior to January 30, 1934.

(2) Treasury notes of 1890.

(3) United States notes issued prior to July 1, 1929.

(4) Silver certificates issued prior to July 1, 1929.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, there shall be carried on the books of the Treasury as public debt bearing no interest Federal Reserve notes as to which payment has been made to the Secretary under section 4 of this Act and the amount of the payment credited as a public debt receipt in accordance with such section.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to determine, from time to time, the amount of—

(1) outstanding currency of any type designated in subsections (a) and (b) of this section,

(2) circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks, issued prior to July 1, 1929, for which the United States has assumed liability, and

(3) circulating notes of national banking associations, issued prior to July 1, 1929, for which the United States has assumed liability.

which, in his judgment, have been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will never be presented for redemption, and to reduce accordingly the amount or amounts thereof outstanding on the books of the Treasury and to credit such amounts to the appropriate receipt account.

SEC. 7. The first paragraph of the Act of May 31, 1878, entitled "An Act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes" (31 U.S.C., sec. 404), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "And provided further, That in the event of any determination by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 6 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act that an amount of said notes has been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will never be presented for redemption, the amount of said notes required to be kept in circulation shall be reduced by the amount so determined."

SEC. 8. (a) The fifth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C., sec. 415) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The liability of a Federal Reserve bank with respect to its outstanding Federal Reserve notes shall be reduced by any amount paid by such bank to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 4 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act."

(b) The seventh paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C., sec. 416) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any Federal Reserve bank shall further be entitled to receive back the collateral deposited with the Federal Reserve agent for the security of any notes with respect to which such bank has made payment to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 4 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act. Federal Reserve banks shall not be required to maintain the reserve or the redemption fund theretofore provided for against Federal Reserve notes which have been retired, or to which payment has been made to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 4 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act."

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall impair the redeemability of any currency of the United States as now provided by law.

SEC. 10. In order to provide a historical collection of the paper currency issues of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, after redemption, to withhold from cancellation and destruction and to transfer to a special account one piece of

each design, issue, or series of each denomination of each kind of paper currency of the United States, including bank notes, heretofore or hereafter issued, and to make appropriate entries in the redemption accounts and other books of the Treasury to cover any such transfers.

NEEDED: GREATER UTILIZATION OF FREE ENTERPRISE TO SUPPORT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United States and its allies today are locked in a life-or-death struggle against communism—militarily, ideologically, and economically. To win the battle, we need more effectively to marshal our resources and manpower.

International relations could, I believe, be greatly improved if we offered a greater chance to serve the country to employees and management of businesses operating overseas.

Businessmen of the country operating around the globe are ready and willing to assume a larger role in serving U.S. interests, if given the opportunity.

To marshal such cooperation, the President, in my judgment, could profitably schedule a conference of business leaders and industry engaged in operations overseas. The purpose would be to map strategy and enlist support for more effective participation of free enterprise, not only in the development of improved trade programs, but also in furthering foreign policy interests of the United States.

I have suggested to President Kennedy that such a conference could add greater strength to our foreign policy. At this time, I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my letter to the President and a number of additional messages from a cross section of business operating overseas: First, endorsing the idea of such a conference; and second, expressing a willingness to act, in effect, above and beyond the call of duty to further strengthen U.S. foreign policy.

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

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to respectfully suggest a Government-business conference. The purpose would be to map strategy by which U.S. firms operating abroad could better cooperate in serving the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

Currently there are hundreds of American enterprises operating in countries throughout the globe. In my judgment, these represent potential built-in "Voices of America." Recently I contacted firms with overseas operations, suggesting that a business-Government conference could result in finding new avenues for broader support by U.S. enterprises for our foreign policy.

The great majority of responses reflected a real willingness of leaders in the field to more effectively serve our national interests abroad. Overall, the responses reflected the following:

1. Firms now engaging in attempting to improve the global image of the United States almost unanimously felt that efforts could and should be greatly expanded.

2. Greater coordination between Government and business would be mutually bene-

ficial in strengthening our policies and programs in foreign lands; and

3. That U.S. enterprises were willing to dedicate more effort and resources to supporting our foreign policy.

In my judgment, these represented "open offers" by private enterprise that should not be overlooked, and could be an invaluable asset to the United States.

Although I know you are extremely busy, I would appreciate getting your reaction to this suggestion.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of March 29, and the outline of your proposal that businessmen of America now operating around the globe be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in the countries in which they have enterprises.

We have read your recommendations carefully and find them in complete accord with the national chamber's stated policies. Rallying points for this effort have been American chambers of commerce abroad, now established and effectively operating in 22 countries around the world (with more than one branch functioning in Spain, Italy, Germany, and Brazil). The newest member of the Amcham fraternity is the one recently set up in Ireland. There are several others in the planning stage.

The role of the national chamber in connection with these organizations is that of an information clearing house, as most of the Amchams are members of the national chamber. They are not, of course, branches of our organization.

We are passing along your recommendations to the American chamber abroad, asking for their specific suggestions and reactions, which we will be pleased to convey to you when they are received.

We will be happy to cooperate with you in any suitable way possible to put forth your suggestions both here and abroad.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE R. MILES.

INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE AND
TELEGRAPH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., April 7, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Mr. Harold S. Geneen, president of ITT, is away from the office for several days and your March 30 letter, together with your statement on the "Larger Role for Business in U.S. Foreign Policy" has come to me.

I will show it to Mr. Geneen upon his return but, meanwhile, on behalf of ITT, I can say that your proposal strikes us as being sound.

In the first place, responsible U.S. corporations operating overseas are already doing much to win friends for our country. Any company operating outside the U.S. borders quickly becomes aware of its responsibility to be an informal ambassador and a good citizen.

Certainly, any way that this can be harnessed constructively to further foreign policy is worthy of the support of our company, and others operating abroad.

In thinking about such a program it is important to keep in mind that many such companies (ours is a case in point) employ

relatively few Americans overseas. Even our top management in our European companies are all citizens of their own countries. These people, are respected as business leaders in their own countries and as managers of U.S.-owned enterprises, but in many cases might find it awkward to speak for the United States.

We shall be most interested in the reception that your proposal receives and we commend you for it.

Cordially,

WARD B. STEVENSON.

BRANIFF INTERNATIONAL AIRWAYS,
Dallas, Tex., April 7, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In reply to your letter of March 29 addressed to the company and to which was attached your statement on the necessity for and ability of U.S. firms operating overseas furthering U.S. foreign policy aims around the world, it is an excellent statement and we hope that it inspires any such U.S. firms which are not actively participating in a program of this nature to do so.

In our own operations we are not only individually doing whatever we can but we also actively support and cooperate with organizations already set up to encourage doing and to do many of the things listed in your letter.

In our own operations, which are relatively minor in terms of total economy of that portion of Latin America which we serve, we have had in effect certain basic policies for many years all of which we think make their contribution to the objectives you outlined.

We hire locally and train within our organization a great preponderance of local nationals and residents. In fact, in every country we serve which has any governmental regulations concerning the percentage of foreigners who are allowed to hold managerial and technical jobs, the actual proportion of natives is in every instance substantially above the legal requirement. This training is conducted in both Latin America and by bringing Latin Americans to the United States for specific training programs.

Our managers, many of whom are now local citizens, work constructively and cooperatively with our Embassies, consulates, USIS and other governmental agencies toward the objectives you list. The few U.S. citizens we have based in these countries are required to maintain regular social, in addition to the ordinary commercial relationships with the nationals of the country in which they are based.

In at least one country our manager, an American, is chairman of a committee set up with governmental approval to work toward the objectives you list. This is a cooperative activity of the U.S. Inter-American Council, the Embassies, the USIS services, etc.

These are just a few examples because I know your time is limited and valuable.

In short, we quite agree with the objectives you enumerated and are doing everything we can to carry them out.

Cordially,

CHAS. E. BEARD,
President.

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO.,
INC., INTERNATIONAL DEPARTMENT,
Wilmington, Del., April 7, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have in front of me your letter of March 31, addressed to

the Du Pont Co., enclosing a statement recommending that businessmen of America engaged in foreign operations be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in the countries in which they have enterprises.

This is certainly a worthwhile objective and one which we are encouraging our foreign manager to further.

We have recently reviewed the activities in the general areas that you mentioned with the general managers of our principal foreign subsidiary companies and find that in a number of ways all of them are taking an active part in local community relations of various types.

In the capacity of Chairman of the USIAC-USIA Liaison Committee of the U.S. Inter-American Council, I personally have been quite interested in setting up local USIAC-USIA Liaison Committees, consisting of leading local North American business leaders in a number of the Latin American countries. While some of these committees are more active than others, they generally are meeting with the local representatives of the U.S. Information Agency and in some cases with the American Ambassador, in an endeavor to work in the various areas outlined in your letter.

The idea of a general conference of the sort that you suggest undoubtedly has considerable merit, although I would think that it would be desirable to draw up a specific program covering the specific points to be discussed and developed in such a meeting before any final decision is made. Sometimes meetings of this sort are apt to turn into assemblies where businessmen are asked to endorse the pet projects of a wide variety of Government agencies without any real chance of participation in their formulation. Further, I would think that the main objective that you have in mind, being to reach American businessmen living abroad, some sort of program involving co-operation at the local level in the various foreign countries with U.S. Government representatives would be more useful than a meeting in Washington.

Wishing you every success in your endeavor,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN K. JENNY.

W. R. GRACE & Co.,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New York, N.Y., April 4, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you very much for your letter of March 30. Your ideas are challenging as an indication as to how a united United States can work together to advance the causes of democracy in underdeveloped areas.

I sincerely hope that your ideas will be developed and implemented by the present administration.

We in W. R. Grace & Co. stand ready to do our share.

Sincerely,

PETER GRACE.

OTIS ELEVATOR Co.,
New York, N.Y., April 5, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 29 in connection with your recommendation that businessmen of America now operating around the world be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in the countries in which they have enterprises.

During World War II, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, through the Office of Inter-American Affairs, organized in connection with the Embassies in each country a group of local businessmen, all American citizens, into what was known as coordinating committees.

There was one such committee in each of the other American Republics. I believe their contribution to the furtherance of inter-American relations during the period of the war was great, and I believe a revival of this system would be equally effective now.

Whatever is done, in my opinion, must be done within the country and by Americans who know the local customs and problems—it cannot be done in Washington.

I am sure that all Americans abroad would be only too willing to cooperate if given an opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

PERCY L. DOUGLAS,
Executive Vice President.

PENNSALT CHEMICALS CORP.,
INTERNATIONAL DIVISION,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 5, 1961.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily subscribe to the thoughts expressed in the statement attached to your letter of March 31, 1961. There is certainly much good to be accomplished in this area and you are to be congratulated for promoting such a plan. I feel sure you will receive willing support of the program from industry engaged in international trade.

Sincerely yours,

G. T. COLLINS,
General Manager.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1961.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Permit me to offer you my warm endorsement of your recent proposal aimed at enlarging the role of business in U.S. foreign policy.

Insofar as United Fruit Co. is concerned, we have for more than 60 years endeavored to play a role of ever-increasing responsibility toward the host countries of Latin America where we have been privileged to conduct our agricultural operations.

Specifically, we have maintained a program of hospitals, dispensaries, traveling nurses, and sanitation calculated to maintain and improve the health of our employees, their families, and the communities adjacent to areas where we grow our products. The same applies to an extensive system of grade schools which the company has built, has financed and operated. Both the hospital and the school staffs are nationals, practicing their respective professions strictly within the framework of local laws and customs.

Our research programs are also conducted in terms of local national support. Tropical plants are procured from all over the world and wherever we find indications that certain plants have special significance to a specific Latin American country, this information is made known to the government and the extension workers in the area.

Throughout these six decades, we have always respected the dignity of the individual. Increasingly we have developed nationals through training courses to rise to positions of high responsibility. I might cite the instance of a humble Guatemalan who came to our company from the mountains 30 years ago. Our company provided him with a job opportunity. He married and raised his children in company communities where his family worshipped and his children attended our schools. This man saved his money and was able to send his oldest son to the United States for his higher education. That son has recently returned to the same banana community where he grew up, and we are proud to say that he has become medical director of our hospital there.

In general it is the policy of our company today to develop nationals to a point where they can become independent agriculturists. In instances where they take up banana agriculture we call them "associate producers." They grow the fruit on their land (in many cases acquired from our company) and we participate with them in the matter of technology, disease control, land and sea transportation, and the eventual sale of their product in world markets.

I trust that this statement of United Fruit Co.'s performance and attitude toward the role of business in furthering U.S. foreign policy may be helpful to you to underscore your powerful and forward-thinking resolution.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND.

INTERNATIONAL PACKERS, LTD.,
Chicago, Ill., April 10, 1961.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read your letter of March 29 and the attached article expressing your views on the larger role for business in U.S. foreign policy. We were glad to read the statement that was attached to your letter and to have your views on this subject, as it is something that has been of considerable interest to our company and to our employees in the foreign fields for some time.

The American citizens who live in foreign countries do make a substantial contribution to the betterment of international relations, both in their activities as private individuals and through their group efforts. The chamber of commerce in most of these areas is normally made up of American businessmen and local businessmen with interests closely allied to American business who are very active in fostering better relations and in working closely on a wide variety of community projects.

In addition to the chamber of commerce, in most of the larger cities there is an American society whose membership is limited to American citizens. These societies take an active part in political, social, and welfare activities, and during times of emergency, such as during the Second World War, they were a very active media for patriotic activities.

In many cases the relationship between the permanent-resident Americans and the governmental employees and diplomats is not as close as it might be, as the latter are rotated frequently and are in the country for such a short period of service that they seldom make permanent local contacts.

There is room for closer liaison between the Government employees and the permanent-resident Americans for the promotion of American interests in the fields outlined by you, and anything that can be done on the part of our Government to help coordinate the efforts to create the "good image of America" would meet with the frank and enthusiastic support of the business houses and of the permanent American residents in foreign countries.

Yours sincerely,

MARVEN GIBSON

AMERICAN MUTUAL
INSURANCE ALLIANCE,
Chicago, Ill., April 10, 1961.

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

DEAR SIR: Many thanks for your kind letter of March 31 enclosing a copy of your statement recommending that American business and industrial firms operating abroad play a more vital role in furthering U.S. foreign policy aims around the world.

We think that your recommendation is an extremely important one and thank you for calling it to our attention. At present, only a few of our member companies operate abroad, but in recent months we have been studying the possibility of setting up a foreign facility through which the insurance on the foreign operations of policyholders of mutual companies might be placed.

Your recommendation will be brought to the attention of the appropriate committee of our association to determine how our companies may best participate in the suggested program.

Sincerely,

NEWELL R. JOHNSON,
General Manager.

VISION, INC.,
EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
April 14, 1961.

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

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I heartily agree with your proposal for more effective business-government cooperation in our foreign affairs. The only way we can meet the world war of subversion and propaganda we are now involved in (but fall to see) is by a cooperative effort of all segments of our society.

I am encouraged by the number of people today, both in government and business, who are thinking along the lines of your statement. The problem is how to convert this concern into positive action.

We have been working with a number of the major companies on a new program of this type for Latin America.

Congratulations on taking this new initiative. I hope it will bear fruit.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. BARLOW,
President.

SCHOOLS IN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three outstandingly fine editorials published recently in the Washington Post.

First, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the editorial entitled "Schools in Crisis," which was published today in the Washington Post. I desire to say that the editorial could really be the opening statement of the remarks which I shall make tomorrow when the school bill is brought up for Senate consideration and debate. I do not know how anyone could improve on the case the Washington Post makes in this editorial in support of the administration's school bill. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

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

SCHOOLS IN CRISIS

Apart from the constitutional controversy over public support of private schools, apart from scruples respecting support for schools which are segregated, apart from fears that Federal financial aid may lead to Federal encroachment on local control of educational policy—apart from all these subsidiary issues—the inescapable reality is that the American public school system is in a state of crisis.

The crisis in the public schools arises from three decades of failure to give them the kind of support at the local level which they must have if they are to fulfill their indispensable role in preparing Americans for self-

government and survival in an embattled world. This local failure stems in large measure not from any indifference or neglect but from an inability to raise sufficient funds through local powers of taxation.

A crippling shortage of classrooms and of qualified teachers continues—and grows worse year after year. At the close of the Eisenhower administration last fall, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported a shortage of 142,100 classrooms, compared with 135,200 the previous year. There were about 1,868,000 pupils in excess of normal classroom capacity, an increase of 122,000 over the previous fall; 683,000 pupils in 36 States were attending school on curtailed or half-day sessions.

Looking into the immediate future, President Kennedy put it this way in his message to Congress on education:

"An average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already strained by well over a half million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions, a school system financed largely by a property tax incapable of bearing such an increased load in most communities. There are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldy size because there are insufficient teachers available."

It is to combat this crisis that the President has recommended, and the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has approved, a major Federal-aid measure which would help the States to construct new school buildings and employ additional teachers in their public schools. Senate debate on the important measure is scheduled to begin next week. Time and again such legislation has foundered in the past on the shoals of collateral questions.

It would be tragic to let these collateral questions again obscure the fundamental need of the Nation for a revitalized and efficient public school system. Federal aid to the public schools deserves to be debated on its own merits. The program recommended by the President and approved by the Senate Education Committee is sound, practical, and effective. It carefully safeguards the States against Federal control of the schools. Let it pass. Let the collateral questions be debated and decided in their turn. But let the public schools get on with their vital contribution to the national welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this very succinct and short editorial, relatively speaking, the Washington Post has made the case, in my judgment, for the administration's bill. Tomorrow, I shall present the administration's case, in a very brief speech, but along the same lines as those of the editorial published today in the Washington Post.

For quite some time my speech has been ready; and I am glad to find the editors of the Washington Post emphasizing exactly the same major points which I shall emphasize in my speech tomorrow.

WIRETAPPING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appears today in the Washington Post a significant editorial which I think also constitutes superlative journalism. The editorial is entitled "Eavesdropping for Everyone." It is in general opposition to all except a very restricted type of wiretapping legislation.

Again I wish to say that I agree wholeheartedly with what I consider to be the very sound position the Wash-

ington Post takes in this editorial. If I have any reservation, it is in respect to the last paragraph of the editorial. I am not prepared even to vote to give—as the Washington Post would give—to three Federal district court judges authority to issue approval of wiretapping.

The editorial states, in part:

This newspaper believes that for the sake of these freedoms wiretapping should be rigidly restricted to a Federal law enforcement agency in cases involving a grave threat to national security and with the authorization of a panel of three Federal district court judges.

I have not changed the view which I have held during all my years in the Senate. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that even in the first year I was a Member of the Senate I spoke out in defense of protecting the civil liberties of the American people; and basic to the protection of civil liberties is the protection of privacy.

I happen to be one who is convinced that we do not have to adopt Communist tactics to beat communism; that we do not have to adopt police state procedures to beat police state growth in the world.

So far as I am concerned, wiretapping is the device of totalitarians, and cannot be justified in a country that boasts about people being free.

I am satisfied that with sound law enforcement, efficient law enforcement, diligent law enforcement, wiretapping is never needed.

I am also satisfied that wiretapping is the tool of the lazy in law enforcement. It is the tool of the inefficient in law enforcement. It is the tool of those in law enforcement who, in my judgment, have never learned one of the great lessons of this whole free society of ours—that the Government is the servant, and not the master, of the people.

When we give to the Government the unchecked kind of wiretapping that is being proposed by the Department of Justice, we move in on the precious right of privacy and individual liberty in this country; and, in my judgment, that has no place in a free land such as the United States.

I am satisfied we can check up on the Communists, I am satisfied we can check up on the gangsters, I am satisfied we can take care of those who seek to terminate the structure of freedom, without ourselves resorting to the kind of wiretapping legislation that is being proposed by the Kennedy administration.

I hope the Kennedy administration, from the White House, will make it clear to the Department of Justice that it has no intention of supporting this kind of invasion of what I consider to be basic personal rights in this country.

It has been pointed out before, and it is pointed out now in the excellent editorial in the Washington Post, that there we are not dealing with search and seizure. We are not dealing with a warrant for search and seizure in which the court has to specifically point out in the warrant what the police officers are to go into the house to get. We are dealing here with a proposal that opens

up any conversation, during the process of wiretapping, to the ears of law enforcement officers which they have no right to hear.

The argument cannot be made, so far as I am concerned, on the analogy that if the courts can give a warrant for search and seizure, then the courts ought to be able to give a warrant to eavesdrop, as the Washington Post puts it in the editorial. They are not comparable, because, as has been pointed out by the court, when a wiretapper hears a telephone conversation, he hears all.

Furthermore, it opens the way to the wiretapping of conversations that have nothing whatsoever to do with the alleged purpose of granting the right of the wiretapping in the first place.

It is still pretty sound American jurisprudence that it is better to have the guilty go free than to have one innocent person wronged.

I repeat, this right of privacy is so basic to American freedom that I do not intend to sit here in the Senate of the United States and let this administration, or any other administration, put the pressure on, so to speak, in order to accomplish the passage of a wiretapping bill. I may not be able to stop it, but I will do my best; and I serve notice I will do my best to stop any wiretapping legislation from passing at this session of Congress, because when I make that fight, I am making a fight for the very precious guarantee of individual liberty and freedom in this country which has characterized throughout our history the very important principle of protecting the people from their own Government when their own Government proposes to follow a course of action that jeopardizes the individual liberty of any of its citizens.

I think the case against wiretapping legislation is so overwhelmingly in support of those of us who take the position that wiretapping legislation should not be passed that I shall renew my efforts this year, if this administration comes forward with a wiretapping bill, to see to it that it is fully discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Post editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EAVESDROPPING FOR EVERYONE

The Department of Justice has become an advocate of virtually unlimited wiretapping. The statement made the other day to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights by Assistant Attorney General Miller is full of pious obeisances to rights of privacy; it embraces every known cliché on civil liberties. But when all this lipservice has been paid to the Constitution and the free traditions of the American people, what the Department seeks is permission for every police force, Federal, State, and local, to listen in on telephone conversations at their own pleasure.

Mr. Miller wants Congress, in brief, to let the Attorney General authorize wiretapping in any case which he thinks involves national security—and, for good measure, in any case involving kidnaping, too. He wants Congress, in addition, to authorize Justice Department wiretapping in connection with any serious crime on the basis of a court order from any Federal judge. And on top

of all this he wants Congress to allow wiretapping by State authorities for whatever crimes the States consider serious, provided only that some State judge can be persuaded to issue a court order.

One fallacy in this proposal is that a court order to wiretap is in some way analogous to a search warrant. But a valid search warrant specifies what is to be sought and narrowly restricts the range of the search; it forbids rummaging. A wiretap exposes to eavesdropping everything said over a tapped telephone, whether by a particular suspect or by someone wholly unrelated to the crime under investigation.

A great deal of experience in New York State with wiretapping under court order makes it perfectly plain, moreover, that this system affords no protection at all for privacy. Complainant judges issue orders indiscriminately—authorizing the police to tap a telephone for months on end without any restraint whatever. The tapping, moreover, is commonly done in connection with minor racketeering, gambling, prostitution and such offenses, sometimes contributing more to shakedowns and blackmail.

"A right of privacy is essential to a free community," Mr. Miller intoned to the subcommittee just before urging curtailment of the right. "Upon privacy depends freedom of thought, freedom of association, and freedom of expression." How very true. And, as the authors of the Bill of Rights recognized when they forbade unreasonable searches, these freedoms are worth some restraints on police activity, even some sacrifice in police efficiency.

This newspaper believes that for the sake of these freedoms wiretapping should be rigidly restricted to a Federal law enforcement agency in cases involving a grave threat to national security and with the authorization of a panel of three Federal district court judges.

CUBA AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is another Washington Post editorial which I think is so good I would like to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and associate myself with the views expressed. I refer to the editorial in the Washington Post for Sunday, May 14, 1961, entitled "Old School Ties."

The editorial discusses in some detail the problems that have arisen between Cuba and the United States. I particularly point out the comment in the editorial which reads as follows:

Nevertheless, the credibility of the United States has suffered. All nations must be in a position to make diplomatic disavowals. But the various assertions by Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Stevenson, though perhaps true in a narrow technical sense, were substantially belied by the broader facts. Mr. Stevenson's eloquent statements in the United Nations are unlikely now to have quite the same ring of sincerity, for the bloom is off the azalea.

It is my hunch that Ambassador Stevenson never would have made these speeches in the United Nations referred to in the editorial in the Washington Post if he had been fully informed of the part the U.S. Government played in supporting the ill-fated attempted invasion by the Cuban exiles. If my hunch is accurate, then the administration made a grievous mistake by keeping Mr. Stevenson uninformed as to the true facts. After having served 3 months in the United Nations last fall, I know how

important it is for members of the U.S. delegations to be kept in a position so that every word they speak within the United Nations, either in committee, or the Security Council, or the General Assembly, will conform strictly to the facts.

Next, I think the Washington Post was entirely too charitable in its references to both the CIA and the Pentagon, because, in my judgment, the military planning for the ill-fated invasion was inexcusably bad.

However, taking the editorial as a whole, I think it sets forth observations which call for very serious pondering by every Member of Congress, as well as every policymaker in the executive branch of the Government, including President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OLD SCHOOL TIES

One of the worst effects of the Cuban disaster, now seen in more perspective, is the marring of confidence in American policy. This has both domestic and foreign ramifications. The extent of the reaction can be exaggerated, and no doubt in time it will blow over. But in the interim it unquestionably is a check upon the actions of the Kennedy administration.

Both here and abroad the forms of the criticism are substantially the same. Some believe that American assistance to the Cuban invaders was not justified in the circumstances and violated treaty commitments. Others believe that the effort to overthrow the Castro regime was warranted but that the bungling aggravated the problem.

It would be foolish to attempt now to assess the ultimate result. In some places in Latin America the defeat of the operation seems to have served as a tocsin about the degree of Communist domination of Cuba. The emphasis on collective measures and the avoidance of rash steps by the administration, despite several bristling statements, has restored a certain balance.

Nevertheless, the credibility of the United States has suffered. All nations must be in a position to make diplomatic disavowals. But the various assertions by Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Stevenson, though perhaps true in a narrow technical sense, were substantially belied by the broader facts. Mr. Stevenson's eloquent statements in the United Nations are unlikely now to have quite the same ring of sincerity, for the bloom is off the azalea.

Internationally there also has been some damage. Prevailing sentiment has been strongly to rally around the President and the flag; indeed, there was not a little jingoism. Mr. Kennedy has skillfully protected his political position. Moreover, he has taken full responsibility for the disaster, without attempting to pin the blame on individuals or groups. But there has been severe questioning of the proficiency and functions of the Central Intelligence Agency. And there has been a serious loss of faith in the realism of military planning under the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Possibly the various inquiries into intelligence will disclose some structural deficiencies; the objective ought to be to correct them without disrupting the entire system. Possibly some changes will be in order in the Pentagon; naive assumptions and faulty execution are certainly cause for concern. But neither the CIA nor the Pentagon made the final decision in respect of Cuba, and no

additional committees would have been a complete safeguard against miscalculation.

The sobering fact is that many high officials in the administration knew of the plans and gave their approval. President Kennedy himself had vetoed previous plans for direct participation of American Armed Forces. Some few persons, including Senator Fulbright, protested what they thought an unwise course. But there was not enough counsel of skepticism to illuminate the dangers and halt the operation.

Why did this happen? Why did the checks and balances normally associated with the staff system fail to work? Why did most of the intellectuals, the bright young men assembled by Mr. Kennedy, get swept along?

It is possible to hazard several guesses. One is that among the staff people serving the President, many come from essentially the same background and have similar patterns of thinking. If this sort of old school tie operates among those most directly charged with planning, the President's own preference for competition in ideas can be frustrated. Advice can become inbred.

Another possible explanation concerns the difficulty that the intelligent generalist often faces when confronted by the specialist with a mass of details. Sound general judgment, including reservations, sometimes can be overwhelmed by an ultimatum from the expert that it is necessary to move now in a particular way or forever forfeit the chance.

Obviously there are many other explanations. If the chastening experience of Cuba serves to bring an examination in humility of the function of criticism in the formulation of policy, there may indeed be a gain. The whole purpose would be defeated, however, if the administration were to overcompensate to the extent of developing a hypercaution that would paralyze its ability to act.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 15, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1372) to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 15, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15, 1961:

U.S. MARSHALS

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

B. Andrew Potter, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Joseph Peter Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Thomas C. Pexton, assistant minister, Shiloh Congregational Christian Church, Dayton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we call upon Thy name for guidance here, as have many of our forebears before us. Be Thou present in this Legislature, and bless each Member with Thy abiding love. Be Thou our guide, and inspire us to actions that will benefit this Nation and the world about us.

Keep us mindful of those principles of freedom and equality which have made our country great. May they be as mighty beacon lights protecting our Ship of State from the rocky shoals of godless ideologies that would lure it to destruction. Be Thou our helmsman through the rough waters of our day. We pray in the name of Him who was and is "the light of the world." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico.

S. 201. An act to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land.

S. 322. An act to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho.

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinalieit Tribe.

S. 751. An act to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act.

S. 1208. An act to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960.

S. 1215. An act to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

S. 1289. An act to amend sections 337 and 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests.

S. 1719. An act to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LAIRD reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 289

Resolved, That during the 87th Congress, the Committee on Science and Astronautics shall be composed of 26 members.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 290

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Science and Astronautics: JOHN W. McCORMACK, Massachusetts.
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: CATHERINE D. NORRELL, Arkansas.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight

tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 7030.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN STATUTORY AWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 861) to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in any case in which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determined before August 1, 1952, that the loss or the loss of use of a creative organ, or arrested tuberculosis, suffered by any veteran was service connected, and such loss or loss of use, or tuberculosis, would have been compensable under the amendments made by Public Law 427, Eighty-second Congress, if application therefor had been made on August 1, 1952, then the Administrator shall pay to such veteran in a lump sum the total amounts which would have been payable to him on account of such loss or loss of use, or tuberculosis, under (1) such amendments, (2) section 315 (k) or (q), as appropriate, of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957, and (3) section 314 (k) or (q), as appropriate, of title 38, United States Code, before the date of enactment of this Act, if such veteran had applied therefor on August 1, 1952, reduced by the amounts paid to him before such date of enactment under such amendments, such section 315 (k) or (q), and such section 314 (k) or (q).

Sec. 2. An application by the veteran concerned, filed within two years from the date of enactment of this Act, shall be required for benefits under this Act and no payment shall be made under the provisions of section 3021 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the death of any veteran occurring before the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINING THE TERM "ORGANIZE" AS USED IN THE SMITH ACT

The clerk called the bill (H.R. 3247) to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RYAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does anyone else object? It takes three objections. There being no further objection, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

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

America in Congress assembled, That section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"As used in this section, the term 'organize', with respect to any society, group, or assembly of persons, includes the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the term "organize" and substitute the terms "organizes" and "organize".

Page 1, line 7, substitute "include" for "includes".

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice made the suggestion that we offer this amendment since the term "organize" is used in the law both in the plural and in the singular.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Is this a clarifying amendment?

Mr. CELLER. It is purely a clarifying amendment. It does not change the substance. I shall insert the report from the Department of Justice:

MAY 8, 1961.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 3247, a bill "To amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term 'organize' as used in that section."

The Smith Act (18 U.S.C. 2385), among other things, provides that anyone who "organizes or helps or attempts to organize any society" which advocates the overthrow of the U.S. Government shall be fined not more than \$20,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the U.S. Government for 5 years after such conviction.

In *Yates et al. v. United States* (354 U.S. 298), the Supreme Court held the Congress intended that the term "organize" should refer only to those acts entering into the creation of a new organization and not to acts thereafter performed in forming new units or regrouping existing ones. The Court found that within the framework of this legislative intent the Communist Party had been organized in 1945, and that the 3-year statute of limitations had run on the "organized" charge.

This bill would add a new paragraph to section 2385 which would define the term "organize" as used in the section. The term would include "the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

Enactment of this legislation will constitute a direct expression of legislative intent that the Smith Act provisions relating to the organizing of groups is to be applicable to the reorganizing of existing groups and the forming of new units.

The Congress may wish to consider the desirability of amending the text of this bill to read as follows:

"As used in this section, the terms 'organizes' and 'organize', with respect to any

society, group, or assembly of persons, include the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

This suggestion is prompted by the fact that both terms appear in the statute.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

BYRON R. WHITE,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 3247, to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section, which section is part of the Smith Act of 1940, which outlaws conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. Accordingly, my bill amends section 2385 by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph defining the term "organize."

Identical bills passed the House in the 85th and 86th Congresses; however, despite their passage without opposition, the Senate took no action, notwithstanding the fact that this legislation has the approval of the Department of Justice.

The Supreme Court has held previously that the term "organize," as used in the Smith Act, refers only to the original and official organization of the Communist Party in 1945 and does not refer to the party's continuing process of organizing groups for the purpose of overthrowing the Government.

Since its inception, however, the Communist Party has been continually organizing groups and cells for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States, and this continuing process of organization has not, according to the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Smith Act, been declared illegal in construing congressional intent.

If my bill is passed, the term "organize" will mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original national organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States.

In the 85th Congress the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives constituted a special subcommittee to study some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, on which I was ranking minority member. Among the decisions selected by the subcommittee for study was a decision rendered on June 17, 1957, in the case of *Yates v. United States* (354 U.S. 298).

Hearings were conducted on July 17, 1958, at which time a subcommittee heard from those Members of Congress who had introduced legislation designed to affect the decision of the *Yates* case together with other interested witnesses.

At the conclusion of those hearings the subcommittee concluded that legislation was necessary to clarify the meaning of the term "organize" as it is now used in the Smith Act. It was further concluded that the definition as set forth in my previous bills would accomplish that purpose.

In 1940 Congress enacted the so-called Smith Act which made it a crime for a person to commit any of three defined acts. The first was to knowingly or willfully advocate the overthrow by force or violence of any government in the United States; the second was to organize any society or group to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of any such government; the third was to be a member of or affiliated with any such society or group.

The Yates case involved the question of whether 14 known Communists had violated the first two parts of the act. The defendants had been convicted after jury trial on a single count of indictment charging them with conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and with organizing groups for the same purpose. Their convictions had been affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The Supreme Court reversed the convictions and held that as to "advocacy" there must be actual incitement to action, and that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party in 1945 and not to a continuing process of organization.

In the opinion of the Court, the organizing prohibited took place in 1945 when the Communist Political Association was disbanded and reconstituted the Communist Party of the United States. The indictment, returned in 1951, was therefore barred by the 3-year statute of limitations.

From a legislative history of the Smith Act, and as a matter of commonsense, it is my opinion that the term "organize" was intended to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States. The trial court in the Yates case had instructed the jury that the term "organize" included such things "as the recruiting of new members and the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of any society, party, group, or other organization." The House Judiciary Committee concluded that this definition adequately expressed the original intention of Congress when it enacted the Smith Act, and my bill, approved by the committee, contains substantially that language.

The necessity for immediate action to counteract the effects of the Yates decision is born out by a report received by the subcommittee from the Department of Justice outlining the history of Smith Act conspiracy cases since the decision in Yates against United States. The following seven such cases have been reversed by courts of appeals, at least in

part based upon the Yates decision's defining of "organize";

1. *Bary* case, Denver, 10th circuit (248 Fed. 2d 201): Seven defendants; August 23, 1957.

2. *Sentner*, St. Louis, eighth circuit: Five defendants; April 4, 1958.

3. *Brandt*, Cleveland, sixth circuit: Six defendants; May 23, 1958.

4. *Welman*, Detroit, sixth circuit: Six defendants; March 25, 1958.

5. *Kuzma*, Philadelphia, third circuit: Ordered the acquittal of four and authorized retrial of five; November 13, 1957.

6. *Fujimoto*, Hawaii, ninth circuit: All seven defendants ordered acquitted; January 16, 1958.

7. *Huff*, Seattle, ninth circuit: The convictions of all four defendants who had appealed were ordered reversed. One of the defendants in this case did not appeal but served her sentence, and therefore her conviction still stands; January 16, 1958.

The Government was authorized to retry the following 6 cases in which a total of 39 defendants were involved:

Yates.....	10
Bary.....	7
Sentner.....	5
Brandt.....	6
Welman.....	6
Kuzma.....	5

The Department of Justice reports that the Government dismissed the Kuzma and Yates cases, involving a total of 15 defendants, partly on the Yates definition of "organize." Still under consideration are the remaining 4 cases involving 24 defendants. In addition, the Government, since the Yates case, has also dismissed, in part due to the "organize" definition in Yates, two conspiracy cases involving 17 defendants, which had not been tried at the time of the Yates decision.

The House Judiciary Committee has supported me in my opinion that, in view of the definition placed by the Supreme Court upon the term "organize" as it is used in the Smith Act, and its resulting deleterious effect upon the Government's efforts to combat the Communist conspiracy in this country, action should be taken by Congress to assert its intention with respect to organizational activities, particularly of the Communist party.

My bill is a simple, unambiguous measure which affords the necessary solution to the problem and therefore I urge that H.R. 3247 do pass.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3247, a bill introduced by my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CRAMER, to define the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act.

Identical bills passed the House without opposition in both the 85th and 86th Congresses. This bill had the endorsement of the Department of Justice during the Eisenhower administration. In my opinion, and in the opinion of many

of those charged with protecting our country from communist infiltration by those agents intent on teaching the violent overthrow of our Government, this is an essential amendment to the Smith Act.

An amendment is necessary in order to overcome the decision of the Supreme Court in the Yates case, wherein the Court held that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party and not to the continuing process of organization.

In my opinion there can be no clearer example of the Supreme Court misconstruing the original intention of Congress. Therefore, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in voting for the measure in order to restore the original definition intended by Congress of the term "organize."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVE RESTRICTION OF THE NEW MEXICO ENABLING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2551) to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 104, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That those provisions of section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States", approved June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 563), which provides that, in the case of the sale by the State of New Mexico of lands granted or confirmed to the State by such Act, legal title shall not be deemed to have passed until the consideration shall have been paid and any sale not made in substantial conformity with the provisions of such Act shall be null and void, are hereby waived with respect to the following sales by the State of New Mexico of lands which constituted, or constitute, a portion of a tract of land for the sale of which a contract had been previously entered into, but only insofar as such sales would (but for the enactment of this Act) violate the terms and conditions contained in section 10 of such Act because of the fact that the full consideration for the entire tract was not, or is not, paid prior to the time of the

sale of such portion and the issuance of the patent therefor:

(1) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto was issued on or before September 4, 1956;

(2) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto is issued after September 4, 1956, and if the right to purchase such portion is derived from an assignment, made on or before September 4, 1956, under the contract to purchase the entire tract; and

(3) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto is issued after September 4, 1956, and if the right to purchase such portion is derived from the contract to purchase the entire tract or from a contract entered into in substitution of such contract, and if the right or rights to purchase all other portions of such tract were, on or before September 4, 1956, assigned or relinquished by the person who entered into such contract.

Consent is hereby given to the State of New Mexico to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2551) was laid on the table.

LANDS AT NELLIS AIR FORCE RANGE, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6494) to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of Defense of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights, the public lands, and the minerals therein, within the areas described in section 2 of this Act are hereby withdrawn from all appropriations and other forms of disposition under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601-604), except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, and reserved (subject to an agreement which has been approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior for the joint use of the lands for military, grazing, and wildlife purposes), for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of ten years with an option to renew the withdrawal and reservation for a period of five years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the reservation may be terminated at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior. However, this Act does not affect Executive Order Numbered 7373 of May 20, 1936 (1 F.R. 427), establishing the Desert Game Range, except to the extent rendered necessary by the national defense.

(b) Lands and resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to such appropriation and other disposition as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be consistent both with the requirements of Executive Order Numbered 7373 of May 20, 1936 (1 F.R. 427), and, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, with the requirements of the national defense. The Secretary of

the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prohibit applications for further withdrawals and reservations at the time of termination or expiration of any withdrawal or reservation under subsection (a) of this section, under laws and regulations then existing.

Sec. 2. The lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act are those that are now or may hereafter become subject to the public land laws within the areas described as follows: Approximately 81,480 acres of land, more or less, located approximately 27 miles northwest from the eastern boundary of Nellis Air Force Base, adjoining the eastern boundary of Nellis Air Force Range, Clark County, Nevada, and more fully described as follows:

(1) Parcel 1, adjoining the eastern and southern boundaries of the Nellis Air Force Range, Clark County, Nevada, comprised of township 15 south, ranges 57 and 58 east; sections 1 to 6, the northeast quarter of section 7, sections 8 to 16, the northeast quarter of section 17, the northeast quarter of section 21, sections 22 to 26, the northeast quarter of section 27, the northeast quarter of section 35, section 36, all in township 16 south, range 57 east; sections 1 to 7, the south half and the northwest quarter of section 8, the west half of section 16, sections 17 to 21, the southwest quarter of section 22, the southwest quarter of section 26, sections 27 to 35, all in township 16 south, range 58 east; sections 1 to 4, the northeast quarter of section 5, the northeast quarter of section 9, the north half, the southeast quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 10, section 11, 12, the northwest quarter of section 13, the north half and the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 14, the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 15, all in township 17 south, range 58 east; section 6, the northwest quarter of section 7, all in township 17 south, range 59 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Clark County, Nevada, a total of 81,160 acres, more or less.

(2) Parcel 2, the south half of the southeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 20, the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 21, the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 28, the north half of the northeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 29, all in township 16 south, range 57 east; for a total of 320 acres, more or less.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nevada, for defense purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "Defense" and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force".

Page 2, line 10, strike out the word "Defense" and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force".

Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "Defense," and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force".

Page 2, line 24, strike out the word "Defense," and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force".

Page 3, line 3, strike out all of subsection (c) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of final termination of

the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Air Force shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved, or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Air Force at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 225) to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin Compact and to enter into such compact on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMEND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5751) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the registration of certain additional persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign principal, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this bill H.R. 5751 would provide a method of controlling unsolicited foreign propaganda and it in no way isolates citizens of this country from information they desire to receive.

At the present time, we are in effect subsidizing the dissemination of pro-Communist political propaganda, which is not designated as such for general distribution to our citizens of this country, most of whom do not want it nor have ever requested it.

It is estimated that in the year 1959 over 10 million individual propaganda items entered the United States from Soviet-bloc countries. The Foreign Agents Registration Act does not at the present time provide that this material be properly labeled at the time of importation.

H.R. 5751 is designed to correct this weakness and plug up this loophole in the act. It is patently ridiculous for this Government to use the taxpayers' dollars for the purpose of disseminating information for the most part entirely false and directed at the overthrow of our form of government.

May I emphasize that this identical bill passed the House in the 86th Congress under suspension of the rules. Unfortunately, it was not considered in the Senate before adjournment.

Investigations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities disclose the fact that Communist-bloc countries are using the subterfuge of channeling their pro-Communist propaganda through free countries such as Canada, Mexico, and some of the South American countries, thus giving the information an authentic guise.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act requires the registration with the Attorney General of those agents of a foreign power who disseminate political propaganda in the United States. It also requires the labeling of political propaganda so that the American public can be on notice respecting it. The theory underlying H.R. 5751 rejects any concept of censorship. It is based on the same premise which undergirds the labeling provisions commonly found in food and drug laws, which require the producers of poisonous drugs to label them as such.

As a result of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigations and hearings, I am compelled to conclude that the American public is not being given the protection which the law contemplated. Now that the executive branch of the Government has seen fit to discontinue the Government's practice of intercepting Communist propaganda mailed into this country from abroad, the poison will be poured into the veins of our society without restriction and without notice or warning of its nature.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I regret this measure was passed over, and urge early passage because it is desirable legislation.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS AND BAGGAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4321) to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could

have a brief explanation of this bill. I would like to ask particularly whether there is any retroactive provision in this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will yield, his question is whether or not it is retroactive.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. No it is not retroactive.

The amount involved is very small. The situation is this. Under the present law a retired person or his dependents may ship their household effects only to the residence previously designated, even though shipping to a newly selected place would cost less money. This bill permits a redesignation of the destination and if it costs more to ship to the new destination, the individual must pay the increased cost.

Mr. GROSS. It will not require payment for the shipment of goods in excess, or personal effects in excess?

Mr. KILDAY. No; if the gentleman will notice in the report on the first page, the committee has included language which makes it clear, that any additional cost will not be borne by the Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 253(c)), is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Such baggage and household effects may be shipped to a location other than the home selected by him. In any case in which the costs are in excess of those which would have been incurred if shipment had been made to his selected home, the member shall pay that excess cost. If a member authorized to select a home under subsection (a) accrues that right or any entitlement under this subsection but dies before he exercises it, that right or entitlement accrues to and may be exercised by his surviving dependents, or his baggage and household effects may be shipped to the home of the person legally entitled thereto if there are no surviving dependents."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, delete the quotation mark after the period and add the following:

"However, in any case in which the costs are in excess of those which would have been incurred if shipment had been made to the member's selected home, the surviving dependents or the person legally entitled to the baggage and household effects, as the case may be, shall pay that excess cost."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF COSTS BEFORE FOREIGN TRIBUNALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4322) to amend section 1037 of title 10, United

States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain United States nationals before foreign tribunals.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "Under regulations to be prescribed by him, the Secretary concerned may employ counsel, and pay counsel fees, court costs, bail, and other expenses incident to the representation, before the judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation, of—

"(1) personnel subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

"(2) nationals of the United States serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces outside of the United States; and

"(3) the dependents of any person covered by clause (1) or (2)."; and

(2) by striking out the words "persons under its jurisdiction" in subsection (c) and inserting the word "personnel" in place thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL PAY FOR DIVING DUTY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4323) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 236), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 205. (a) Members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and assigned by competent orders to the duty of diving shall be entitled to receive, in addition to basic pay, special pay at a rate not to exceed \$110 per month for periods during which diving duty is actually performed, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

"(b) No member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive the special pay authorized pursuant to this section in addition to incentive pay authorized pursuant to section 204 of this Act.

"(c) The President may, in time of war, suspend the payment of diving-duty pay."

Sec. 2. Section 204(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 235(a)), is further amended—

(1) by striking out clauses (8), (9), and (12), and the word "and" at the end of clause (12);

(2) by redesignating clauses (10), (11), and (13) as "(8)", "(9)", and "(10)", respectively; and

(3) by adding the word "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (9).

Sec. 3. Section 204(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 235(c)), is further amended by striking out "(13)" and inserting "(10)" in lieu thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKE UNIFORM CERTAIN RE-ENLISTMENT BONUS PROVISIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4324) to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 207(e) and 208 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 238(e), 239), are each amended by striking out the words "ninety days" wherever they appear therein and inserting the words "three months" in place thereof.

SEC. 2. Any individual who—

(1) reenlisted in the regular component of the uniformed service concerned after July 15, 1954;

(2) reenlisted within three months but more than ninety days after the date of his discharge or release from active duty; and

(3) received no reenlistment bonus, or received an enlistment allowance, or a reenlistment bonus computed under the provisions of section 207 of the Career Compensation Act,

may be paid a reenlistment bonus under section 208 of such Act if he received no bonus, or may be paid the difference between the amount of the enlistment allowance or reenlistment bonus that he actually received and the amount that he would have received if his reenlistment bonus had been computed under the provisions of section 208 of such Act. To be eligible for payment under this section, an individual must apply for the payment within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Retroactive payments shall be made from appropriations applicable at the date of reenlistment or from appropriations currently available for military pay and allowances.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE PAY OF CERTAIN PROFESSORS AT U.S. ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4325) to increase the pay of certain professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the table for "Commissioned Officers" in section 201(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 232(a)), is amended—

(1) by inserting a footnote 3 after the figure "985.00" in the column relating to commissioned officers with over thirty years of service; and

(2) by adding the following footnote after footnote 2:

"3 While serving as a permanent professor at the United States Military Academy or the United States Air Force Academy, basic pay for this grade is \$1,065.00, if the officer has over 31 cumulative years of service, and \$1,145.00, if the officer has over 36 cumulative years of service."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACADEMIC DEAN, NAVAL POST-GRADUATE SCHOOL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4326) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the Academic Dean of the Naval Postgraduate School.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7043(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall prescribe the compensation of the Academic Dean. However, the compensation may not be more than the maximum rate prescribed for positions covered by section 1113 of title 5."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF PAY ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4327) to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 714(c) of title 32, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Payment under clause (6) of subsection (a) shall be made—

"(1) upon settlement by the General Accounting Office; or

"(2) as otherwise authorized by the Comptroller General."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REASSIGN SUPPLY-DUTY-ONLY OFFICERS OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4328) to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That officers on the active list of the Marine Corps designated for supply duty, except the officer serving as Quartermaster General on the date of enactment of this Act, are hereby reassigned as officers not restricted in the performance of duty. All provisions of law relating to officers on the active list of the Marine Corps not restricted in the performance of duty apply to officers reassigned by this Act, except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

SEC. 2. The numbers of officers authorized to serve in grades above captain in the Marine Corps as set forth in the table in subsection (a) of section 5443 of title 10,

United States Code, are readjusted to the extent necessary to include the numbers of officers authorized for those grades by subsections (g) and (h) of that section as those subsections read before the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Each officer serving in the grade of brigadier general or colonel who is reassigned as an officer not restricted in the performance of duty by this Act, and who is senior to the senior officer in the first promotion zone established for his grade after the enactment of this Act, shall be considered for all purposes to be in that promotion zone.

(b) Within the number of officers not restricted in the performance of duty that may be recommended for promotion to a grade below brigadier general, as determined under section 5756 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy shall allocate a portion thereof for officers on the active list of the Marine Corps who were formerly designated for supply duty and who were reassigned as officers not restricted in the performance of duty by this Act. The portion allocated shall afford at least the same opportunity for promotion to such officers as is afforded other officers not restricted in the performance of duty. These provisions apply only when there is an eligible officer in the promotion zone. For the purpose of the above provisions, "eligible officer" means an officer who is serving in a grade below colonel, who has been reassigned as an officer not restricted in the performance of duty by this Act, and who has not previously been in a promotion zone established for any grade after the enactment of this Act. Reassigned officers in a zone of consideration established for the grade of major shall also be allocated a portion of the number of officers who may be recommended for promotion from within that zone, so as to afford them at least the same promotion opportunity as is afforded other officers not restricted in the performance of duty.

SEC. 4. This Act does not terminate or reduce the four-year term of the officer who is serving as Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps on the date of enactment of this Act or deprive him of the rank, pay, allowances, or retirement privileges to which he became entitled under sections 5204 and 5205 of title 10, United States Code. However, he shall be counted as a major general for the purposes of sections 5443 and 5448 of that title, as amended by this Act. His date of rank as a major general is July 1, 1954. When he ceases to serve as Quartermaster General, he shall be reassigned as an officer not restricted in the performance of duty and he may be reappointed by the President alone to the permanent grade of major general to rank from July 1, 1954.

SEC. 5. Subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5001(a)(8) is amended by striking out the words "supply duty or".

(2) Section 5204 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5204. Quartermaster General: detail

"The Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps shall be detailed by the Commandant from officers of the Marine Corps on active duty."

(3) Section 5205 is repealed.

(4) The analysis of chapter 515 is amended by striking out the following items:

"5204. Quartermaster General: appointment; term, pay and allowances.

"5205. Heads of Staff Departments: retirement."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"5204. Quartermaster General: detail."

(5) Section 5409(c) is amended by striking out the words "excluding officers designated for supply duty."

(6) Section 5443 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade," wherever they occur in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (f); and

(B) by striking out subsections (g) and (h) and redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsections "(g)" and "(h)".

(7) Section 5448 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade," wherever they occur in subsections (a), (b), and (c); and

(B) by striking out subsections (f) and (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections "(f)" and "(g)".

(8) Section 5588 is repealed.

(9) The analysis of chapter 539 is amended by striking out the following item: "5588. Regular Marine Corps: officers designated for supply duty."

(10) Section 5589(e)(3) is amended by striking out the words "be designated for supply duty or".

(11) Section 5703 is amended—

(A) by striking out clause (1) in subsection (a) and renumbering clauses (2), (3), (4), and (5) as clauses "(1)", "(2)", "(3)", and "(4)", and

(B) by striking out subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections "(d)" and "(e)".

(12) Section 5706 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "the number of officers of the Marine Corps designated for supply duty," in clause (3);

(B) by striking out clause (8) and renumbering clauses (9), (10), (11), and (12) as clauses "(8)", "(9)", "(10)", and "(11)"; and

(C) by striking out the words "or colonels in the Marine Corps" in clause (9) as so renumbered.

(13) Section 5707 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "supply duty or" in subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting the words "supply duty," before the words "or duty in any technical specialty" in subsection (f).

(14) Section 5709 is amended—

(A) by amending the catchline to read as follows: "§ 5709. Navy and Marine Corps: retention of rear admirals and major generals on the active list"; and

(B) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection "(c)".

(15) The analysis of chapter 543 is amended by striking out the following item: "5709. Navy and Marine Corps: retention of rear admirals, major generals, and brigadier generals on the active list."

and inserting the following item in place thereof.

"5709. Navy and Marine Corps: retention of rear admirals and major generals on the active list."

(16) Section 5751(a) is amended by striking out the words "not restricted in the performance of duty".

(17) Section 5759 is repealed.

(18) The analysis of chapter 545 is amended by striking out the following item: "5759. Regular Marine Corps; male officers designated for supply duty: numbers that may be recommended."

(19) Section 5765 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "not restricted in the performance of duty" in subsection (a); and

(B) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection "(c)".

(20) Section 5769(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out clauses (4) and (6) and renumbering clause (5) as clause "(4)"; and

(B) by striking out the following words in the last sentence: "and an officer in the grade of captain in the Marine Corps designated for supply duty is not eligible for promotion to the grade of major until there is a vacancy for him among officers of his designation in the combined grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major".

(21) Section 5775 is amended—

(A) by striking out clauses (7) and (8) in subsection (a) and renumbering clauses (9), (10), and (11) as clauses "(7)", "(8)", and "(9)"; and

(B) by striking out the words "and each male officer of the Marine Corps designated for supply duty" in subsection (b).

(22) Section 5776(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "or a male officer of the Marine Corps restricted in the performance of duty serving in the grade of colonel," in the first sentence; and

(B) by striking out the words "or brigadier general" in the second sentence.

(23) Section 6020 is repealed.

(24) The analysis of chapter 555 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6020. Marine Corps officers: detail to duty in Supply Department."

(25) Section 6374 is amended by striking out the words "not restricted in performance of duty" in the catchline and the words "not restricted in the performance of duty" in the text.

(26) Section 6375 is repealed.

(27) Section 6376 is amended by striking out the words "not restricted in performance of duty" after the word "colonels" in the catchline and the words "not restricted in the performance of duty" in the first sentence of the text before the words "serving in the grade of colonel".

(28) Section 6377 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty" in the catchline;

(B) by striking out the words "and each officer designated for supply duty serving in the grade of colonel on the active list of the Marine Corps" in subsection (a); and

(C) by striking out, in subsection (e), the words "or colonel in the Marine Corps" in the first and second sentences and the words "or colonel" in the second sentence.

(29) Section 6378 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty" in the catchline;

(B) by inserting the word "and" after the words "in any staff corps," in the first sentence of subsection (a) and by striking out the words "and each officer designated for supply duty serving in the grade of colonel on the active list of the Marine Corps" in that sentence;

(C) by striking out the word "colonel," in the last sentence of subsection (a); and

(D) by striking out clause (8) in subsection (b).

(30) The analysis of chapter 573 is amended by striking out the following items:

"6374. Regular Marine Corps; brigadier generals not restricted in performance of duty: retirement for failures of selection for promotion.

"6375. Regular Marine Corps; brigadier generals designated for supply duty: retention on active list; retirement.

"6376. Regular Navy, line captains not restricted in performance of duty; Regular Marine Corps, colonels not restricted in performance of duty: retirement for length of service.

"6377. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty: retirement for length of service or for age.

"6378. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine Corps colonels designated for supply duty: continuation on active list; retirement."

and inserting the following items in place thereof:

"6374. Regular Marine Corps; brigadier generals: retirement for failures of selection for promotion.

"6376. Regular Navy, line captains not restricted in performance of duty; Regular Marine Corps, colonels: retirement for length of service.

"6377. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders: retirement for length of service or for age.

"6378. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders: continuation on active list; retirement."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, strike out lines 1 through 7 inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) Section 5448 is amended—

"(A) by striking out the words 'excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade,' wherever they occur in subsection (a), (b), and (c); and

"(B) by substituting the number '36' for the number '32' in the last sentence of subsection (a); and

"(C) by striking out subsections (f) and (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections '(f)' and '(g)'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRED PAY FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4330) to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995).

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That members retired prior to June 1, 1958, pursuant to section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the Act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995), are authorized to include active service performed to the date of retirement as creditable service in the computation of basic pay upon which retired pay is based.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6668) to amend title 10, United States Code,

with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, entitled "Annuities Based on Retired or Retainer Pay" may be cited as the "Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Act".

SEC. 2. Section 1431 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "§ 1431. Election of annuity: members of armed forces

"(a) This section applies to all members of the armed forces except—

"(1) members whose names are on a retired list other than a list maintained under section 1376(a) of this title;

"(2) cadets at the United States Military Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, or the Coast Guard Academy; and

"(3) midshipmen.

"(b) To provide an annuity under section 1434 of this title, a person covered by subsection (a) may elect to receive a reduced amount of the retired or retainer pay to which he may become entitled as a result of service in his armed force. Except as otherwise provided in this section, unless it is made before he completes 18 years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of his basic pay, the election must be made at least three years before he is retired or granted retired or retainer pay. However, if, because of military operations, a member is assigned to an isolated station or is missing, interned in a neutral country, captured by a hostile force, or beleaguered or besieged, and for that reason is unable to make an election before completing 18 years of that service, he may make the election, to become effective immediately, within one year after he ceases to be assigned to that station or returns to the jurisdiction of his armed force, as the case may be. A member to whom retired pay or retainer pay is granted retroactively, and who is otherwise eligible to make an election, may make the election within 90 days after receiving notice that such pay has been granted to him.

"(c) An election may be changed or revoked by the elector before he retires or becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay. However, unless made on the basis of restored mental competency under section 1433 of this title, the change or revocation is not effective if the member is retired or becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay within three years after making the change or revocation.

"(d) If an election made under this section is found to be void for any reason except fraud or willful intent of the member making the election, he may make a corrected election at any time within 90 days after he is notified in writing that the election is void. A corrected election made under this subsection is effective as of the date of the voided election it replaces."

SEC. 3. Section 1434 of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows: "(b) A person may elect to provide both the annuity provided in clause (1) of subsection (a) and that provided in clause (2) of subsection (a), but he may elect only 25 or 12½ percent of his reduced retired or retainer pay for each annuity. The reduction in his retired or retainer pay on account of each annuity, and the amount of each annuity, shall be determined in the same manner that it would be determined if the other annuity had not been elected."; and

(2) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Under regulations prescribed under section 1444(a) of this title, a person may, before or after becoming entitled to retired or retainer pay, provide for allocating, during the period of the surviving spouse's eligibility, a part of the annuity under subsection (a) (3) for payment to those of his surviving children who are not children of that spouse."

SEC. 4. Section 1436 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following at the end of the catchline: "; withdrawal for severe financial hardship";

(2) by inserting the designation "(a)" before the words "The reduction" at the beginning; and

(3) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(b) Under regulations prescribed under section 1444 (a) of this title, the Secretary concerned may, whenever he considers it necessary because of the member's severe financial hardship, allow him to withdraw from participation in an annuity program under this chapter, when requiring the member to continue to participate in the program would violate equity and good conscience. The absence of an eligible beneficiary shall not of itself be a basis for such action. However, no deductions from his retired or retainer pay may be refunded to him under this subsection."

SEC. 5. Section 1444(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new sentences at the end thereof: "In addition to a report on the administration of this chapter, the report shall also contain a detailed account, including an actuarial analysis, of those cases in which relief is granted under sections 1436(b) and 1552 of this title, or any other statutory or administrative procedure. This subsection does not apply to actions taken under section 1445 of this title."

SEC. 6. Chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"§ 1445. Correction of administrative deficiencies

"Whenever he considers it necessary, the Secretary concerned may, under regulations prescribed under section 1444(a) of this title, correct any election, or any change or revocation of an election, under this chapter when he considers it necessary to correct an administrative error. Except when procured by fraud, a correction under this section is final and conclusive on all officers of the United States.

"§ 1446. Restriction on participation

"(a) Notwithstanding section 1441 of this title, if a person—

"(1) has made an election under this chapter;

"(2) is retired for physical disability before he completes 18 years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of his basic pay; and thereafter dies, his beneficiaries are not entitled to the annuities provided under this chapter until they give proof to the department concerned that they are not eligible for benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38. If the beneficiaries are not eligible for benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, the annuity shall begin on the first day of the month in which the death occurs.

"(b) Whenever the beneficiaries on whose behalf the election was made are restricted, under subsection (a), from participating in the annuities provided under this chapter, the amount withheld from the elector's retired or retainer pay as a result of an election under this chapter shall be refunded to the beneficiaries, less the value of any an-

nuities to be paid under this chapter, and in either case without interest."; and

(2) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"1436. Computation of reduction in retired pay."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"1436. Computation of reduction in retired pay; withdrawal for severe financial hardship."; and

(3) by adding the following new items at the end of the analysis:

"1445. Correction of administrative deficiencies.

"1446. Restriction on participation."

SEC. 7. Any person who, before the date of enactment of this Act, has filed a change or revocation, subject to section 1431(c) of title 10, United States Code, of an election made under section 1431(b) of that title, which change or revocation would be ineffective if he were to retire upon the date of enactment of this Act, shall have that change or revocation become effective on that date, or three years after the date upon which it was filed, whichever is later.

SEC. 8. Any person who—

(1) made an election before the date of this Act which would be effective if he retired on the day before such date; and

(2) hereafter retires for physical disability before completing 18 years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of his basic pay— shall be considered as having applicable to him all of the provisions of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, existing on the date preceding the date of enactment of this Act, except that any revocation or change of an election is not effective until three years after the date of filing such revocation or change, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING SECTION REQUIRING BONDING OF OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2554) to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employes of the Federal Government.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code (which requires the submission to the Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury of an annual report with respect to the bonding of officers and employes of the Federal Government) is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCOTTS BLUFF NATIONAL MONUMENT, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5760) to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve the scenic and historic integrity of Scotts Bluff and adjacent features, the Secretary of the Interior may revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument so as to exclude from it certain private and Federal lands and substitute other private lands more essential to the purposes of the monument: *Provided,* That the revised boundaries shall encompass an area which is about three hundred and fifty acres less than the acreage of the monument as of the date of this Act. Notice of the designation of the revised boundaries pursuant to this section shall be given by publication in the Federal Register.

Sec. 2. The Secretary, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, may procure, in such manner as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands within the revised boundaries designated pursuant to section 1 of this Act. To avoid the undesirable severance of parcels in private ownership which extend beyond the revised boundaries, the Secretary may, in his discretion and with the consent of the owners, acquire lands or interests in lands that are in private ownership but which lie outside the revised boundary. Property so acquired outside the revised boundary and federally owned lands excluded from the monument pursuant to section 1 of this Act may be exchanged by the Secretary of the Interior for any land of approximately equal value within the revised boundaries. Nothing in this section shall be construed as repealing or limiting the existing jurisdiction, power, or authority of the Secretary prescribed by the public land laws.

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 20, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$15,000, as may be necessary for the acquisition of lands newly included within the boundaries of the monument as revised pursuant to this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INCLUDE TWO MONUMENTS IN THE NACHEZ TRACE PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6346) to include Ackia Battleground National Monument, Miss., and Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tenn., in the Natchez Trace Parkway, and to provide appropriate designations for them, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to facilitate the administration of two areas of the national park system, known as Ackia Battleground National Monument, Mississippi, and Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tennessee, those areas are included in the Natchez Trace Parkway, which they adjoin; and they shall be administered as a part of the parkway. In order to provide continued

recognition of the significance of these portions of the parkway, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide them with appropriate designations in accordance with the historical events which occurred on them.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEDAR BREAKS NATIONAL MONUMENT, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6422) to add Federally owned lands to, and exclude Federally owned lands from, the Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to further the administration, enhance the setting, and promote the public appreciation and enjoyment of the Cedar Breaks National Monument, in the State of Utah, the lands in the State of Utah, particularly described as follows, to-wit: west half northwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southwest quarter, northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, all situated in section 36, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, northeast quarter lot 8, section 36, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, west half northeast quarter northwest quarter, and northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, both situated in section 12, township 37 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, consisting of 111.4 acres, more or less, are excluded from Dixie National Forest and added to the monument.

Sec. 2. The lands in the State of Utah particularly described as follows, to-wit: south half southeast quarter, section 15, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, north half lot 2, and south half lot 4, both in section 22, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, consisting of 129 acres, more or less, are excluded from the monument and added to Dixie National Forest.

Sec. 3. Lands added to the Cedar Breaks National Monument pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be administered in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916, chapter 408 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-4), as amended and supplemented, and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the monument. The lands added to the Dixie National Forest shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the national forest.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "quarter, northeast" and insert in lieu thereof "quarter northeast".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUPELO NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD SITE, MISSISSIPPI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6519) to provide additional lands for the Tupelo National Battlefield site, Mississippi, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to further the purposes of the Act of February 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1254), the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation or with donated funds not to exceed one-half acre of land and interests in land for addition to the adjoining Tupelo National Battlefield site.

Sec. 2. The Tupelo National Battlefield site is hereby redesignated the Tupelo National Battlefield which shall continue to be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUPLICATES OF ROBERT FROST MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 712) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet", approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 883), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after the word "That", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this subsection shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale."

The bill was ordered read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. THOMAS ANTHONY DOOLEY III, MEDAL

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 306) to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III.

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

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the gallant and unselfish public service rendered by Doctor Thomas Anthony Dooley III in serving the medical needs of the people of Laos living in the remote areas of the Laotian jungles, and of peoples in other newly developing countries, the President of the United States is authorized to award posthumously to Doctor Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal

with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500 for this purpose.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 306, to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in recognition of his gallant and unselfish public service in providing medical care for the underprivileged peoples of the world, particularly the people of Laos living in the remote areas of the Lao jungles.

I am sure all Members of the House are thoroughly familiar with the tremendous and unselfish accomplishments of Dr. Dooley before he passed away as a cancer victim on January 18, 1961, 1 day after his 34th birthday. In his short lifespan, Dr. Dooley worked tirelessly and with true Christian zeal to halt or cure preventable disease among peoples of southeast Asia who previously had scant hope of any medical care in their lifetime.

Dr. Dooley's initial interest in these peoples in relatively unknown and hitherto untouched areas of the world began when, as a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy Medical Corps, he administered to the refugees seeking freedom and asylum from the Communists of North Vietnam. In 1956 he obtained permission from the new Government of Laos to establish a small village hospital in Nam Tha, 5 miles from the border of Communist-held China, to assist the underprivileged of the area. In late 1957, Dr. Dooley and Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, a Washington specialist and medical professor, began their plans for the establishment of Medico—Medical International Cooperation Organization. This voluntary, non-political, nonsectarian organization was at first under the auspices of the International Rescue Committee but in late 1959 became a separate entity, incorporated as Medical, Inc.

DR. DOOLEY'S LAOS HUMANITY CONTRASTED TO COMMUNIST INHUMANITY

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dooley returned to Laos in 1959 and established another hospital in the remote village of Muong Sing and the first under Medico auspices. By the end of 1960, Medico had 17 projects in operation in 12 countries, including 7 hospitals in Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Malaya. Dr. Dooley played an important role in getting all of them started. The cancer condition that claimed Dr. Dooley's life earlier this year resulted from an injury he received while serving his medical mission in Laos. It is very sad to note that the very people Dr. Dooley worked and gave his life for

in the cause of humanity are now being slaughtered and trampled over by the inhuman brutality and infiltrating tactics of Communist rebels.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House passes this resolution overwhelmingly as a tribute to Dr. Dooley's humanity, and let the world know what the Dr. Dooleys have done and are doing for underprivileged peoples in contrast to what the Communists are doing today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 306, a bill which calls upon the Nation to award, posthumously, to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, a token of the affection, the esteem, and the admiration which his fellow citizens hold for him. Last session when I introduced H.R. 9404 and at the beginning of this session, when I introduced a joint resolution similar to that being considered, to make an award to Dr. Dooley, a number of people asked me just why I wanted to see this man singled out among the other brave and dedicated people who are serving humanity in faraway places. Frankly, I found it a little difficult to enunciate my precise sentiments. I have been trying, in the months since, to put into words just why I felt this gallant doctor should be an object of special consideration.

The reasons for my admiration for Dr. Dooley—for the Nation's admiration and respect for him—are manifold.

First, it is customary and proper for a grateful country to decorate those men who have, at the risk of their lives and safety, gone forth to do battle against our enemies. We most often give medals to men who do this in the uniform of their country. Dr. Dooley wore that uniform with distinction, when he served as medical officer during the evacuation of the thousands of freedom-loving Vietnamese who fled south after the partition of that unhappy country. I suspect most of the Members of this House have read with incredulous wonder of the harrowing experiences which that young man underwent during that evacuation. This, in itself, would be ample excuse for some token of his country's esteem. In helping give to thousands of Vietnamese relief from pain and sickness—in helping men, women, and children to escape from the encroachments of the unfree world, Dr. Dooley adequately and more than adequately performed his duty to his country, and to mankind.

But for this young man it was not enough to put in his years in the Navy, do his work creditably and courageously, and retire to a civilian life in which, judging by the prophecies of his medical professors, he could have had a remunerative and not particularly wearing medical practice as a "society doctor." Tom Dooley was not content to count his years in the Navy as the payoff to his country and to the spark of love of humanity which illumined him so brilliantly. Like most other great men, Tom Dooley was a little unreasonable, a little impractical, somewhat unused to balancing credits against debts and closing the books as soon as possible. Tom Dooley had to go back, because he had

looked upon the naked face of pain and disease and found it unbearable. He was not content with returning to the United States and telling people about what he had seen, hoping to inspire other young men to go forth and emulate what he had done. Instead he had to go himself. He had to throw his own not-very-sturdy body and his steel-tough soul into the fight against mankind's oldest and most implacable enemy—disease. Tom Dooley had to go back to the steaming and disease-ridden jungles of southeast Asia, to the border settlement of Nam Tha. Why? He had to do it, I think, for the same reason mountain climbers have to climb mountains—for the same reasons country doctors have to answer 2 a.m. calls at homes where they know they won't get paid—for the same reason saints have to march singing into the arenas and the concentration camps. Tom Dooley had to do what he did because he believed in the highest of religious dictates—"That Ye Love One Another." To Tom Dooley this was not a once-a-week text, to be trotted out on Sunday, admired, and put back in its case until next Sunday. It is a commandment—a requirement—a price we must pay, in a way, for being human beings. Tom Dooley, like a few other outstanding human beings in every country and every age, did not begrudge that price, or try to keep his bill low, or to pay it in easy installments.

So, for his devotion to his duty—to a higher and more difficult duty than simply serving his Nation in its uniform, Tom Dooley deserves our respect and our appreciation.

But mere devotion to duty is not enough, I suspect, to merit the medal which we are about to give to Dr. Dooley. What else was there in this man's life and work that merits such an accolade?

Tom Dooley was a dedicated fighter against disease and against pain. In his own books, he quoted the great Albert Schweitzer to the effect that there is a worldwide brotherhood of those who have known pain—that there is an empathy possible among those whose lives and health have been threatened. Tom Dooley belonged to this brotherhood—to this international conspiracy against death. In the course of his own selfless work, Tom Dooley incurred a dangerous cancer. He returned to the United States to have it removed, and then, without knowing whether he had five decades or 5 months to live, he returned to Laos, to give whatever time his Maker had allotted to him, to the continuing fight. At the risk of his life, in sublimed disregard for his own pain and his own welfare, Tom Dooley returned to the task which his own compulsions drove him to. We all know the story—and the ending. Here, indeed, was devotion to duty, above and beyond the call of duty, at the risk of life and limb.

But what, Mr. Speaker, does this all add up to? Does the fact that a human being may be dying of cancer earn for him anything beyond the sympathy of us all? Does the simple fact of physical

courage entitle a man to special recognition by the Congress? Perhaps not. But, Mr. Speaker, there is more meaning than this to Tom Dooley.

In going into Laos, this dedicated physician was not acting as a symbol of American foreign policy. He didn't go to Laos to convert the heathen, or to make good little pro-Americans out of them. Tom Dooley went back to Laos, up to the border village of Nam Tha, a few miles from Communist China, in country where few white men had ever gone, and fewer still were wanted, to heal the sick. He went there, not as one American spreading a newfangled kind of foreign aid, but as a man seeking to serve his brothers in God's family. Tom Dooley's medicine has been criticized as 19th century medicine. It has been defended, on that very basis, as a vast improvement over the 14th century medicine available, and as the kind of thing the people of the area could most effectively utilize and continue when Dooley was gone.

In doing this, Tom Dooley has done something for us all. He has, no doubt, made friends for America in Laos. That is very desirable, and very laudable. But he has done more—and for his fellow Americans. He has shown them a vision of the kind of faith that moves mountains and conquers worlds. He has shown us a better way to win men's hearts than by giving them bombs and bullets to shoot at our enemies. He has shown us a new glimpse into an old reality—into the kind of power that brotherhood can have.

But let me say it in Tom Dooley's own words:

Let us stop all this blather and bleat about the beatitudes of democracy. Let us get out and show, with simple spontaneity and love, our ability to work at the level of the people we aim to aid. Let us stop proclaiming ourselves as the world standard. Democracy, as championed by the United States, does not translate well into Lao. Not yet. We evolved it from 1776 to 1958. Let us be patient with the Asian. The Lao need only time, education, and stimulation.

I believe that we would gain more for our own country (and this is certainly part of the incentive behind our foreign aid) if we emphasized the connections that exist between peoples. Let us show that we believe these connections to be greater than the differences. The cables binding humanity around the world are stronger than national rivalries. Let us reaffirm, and then live, our belief in the family of man. Let us prove again that America understands that "God hath made of one blood all men for to dwell upon the earth."

For his personal courage, for his devotion to his duty, for the gift, not the loss of his life, for the lesson in the stimulation of humility and the power of love that he has given to all the world, but mostly to us, Tom Dooley deserves the gratitude of our Nation.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AVIATION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 398) authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

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

Whereas the city of Pensacola proposes to celebrate with appropriate ceremonies the fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation during the period June 6 through June 11, 1961; and

Whereas, while there was limited naval aviation activity prior to the establishment of a school for training of naval aviators at Pensacola, the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, is regarded as the first home for naval aviators; and

Whereas the training programs of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, have significantly contributed to the defense of the United States and through its training programs for friendly governments, has contributed to the defense of the free world; and

Whereas all naval aviators who have trained at Pensacola are being extended an invitation to attend their class reunion and participate in the gala and significant events associated with this outstanding occasion; and

Whereas naval dignitaries not only from the United States, but from the Governments of Canada and Great Britain, have been invited to send representatives; and

Whereas this fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation has great national and international significance in that military training of great historical importance has been carried on for fifty years; and

Whereas a celebration of the character planned will contribute greatly to the educational and cultural welfare and to the defense of the people of the United States by highlighting the great traditions of naval aviation which have been handed down through the years and which must be kept intact in today's troubled world; and

Whereas appropriate recognition is taken of the contributions, the interest, and the warm friendship shown by the people of Pensacola and Escambia County for naval personnel and/or naval aviation through these fifty years; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States recognizes the tremendous significance of fifty years of devoted labor and sacrifice that has gone into the compiling of this record which has been established by naval aviation and by the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to design and manufacture and to accept payment therefor from private sources, a galvano of appropriate design commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation. The payment of such cost, if any, to the Government shall be reimbursed to the appropriation of the Bureau of the Mint, by the Fiesta of Five Flags and Naval Aviators Homecoming Celebration, 330 Brent Building, Pensacola, Florida.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to present such galvano to the Secretary of the Navy in connection with this celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation at Pensacola, Florida.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUITIES FROM CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5432) to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide increases in certain annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 219; Public Law 85-465), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the annuities and increases in annuities provided by the preceding sections of this Act, shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

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

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6611) to amend paragraph 1798(c) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 1798(c) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201, par. 1798(c) (2)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$200, if such person" in subdivision (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100 if such person arrives before July 1, 1963 (or \$200 if such person arrives on or after July 1, 1963), and he either", and

(2) by striking out "\$300 in addition, if such person" in subdivision (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300 in addition, if such person arrives on or after July 1, 1963, and he".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to persons arriving in the United States on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. In applying paragraph 1798(c) (2) (A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to

articles acquired in the Virgin Islands of the United States by any person—

(1) who arrives in the United States (as defined in section 401(k) of such Act) during the period beginning on the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on June 30, 1963, and

(2) who has remained outside the United States (as so defined) for less than 48 hours, the 48-hour requirement in such paragraph 1798(c) (2) (A) shall be treated as satisfied.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6611 provides a temporary reduction from \$500 to \$100 in the amount of purchases abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring into this country free of duty. The bill was introduced by me following the recommendation of the President contained in a letter to the Speaker dated February 24, 1961, wherein the President asked that such action be taken as a part of his overall program to counter our present unfavorable balance-of-payments position.

The Members will recall that we passed earlier another proposal that was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means on this same subject matter, our balance-of-payments position.

Since 1799 it has been customary for the United States to permit free entry into the United States of what we refer to commonly as personal effects. In 1897, however, the Congress deemed it advisable to place some limit upon the amount of personal purchases that could be brought back to the United States by an American returning from some visit abroad. So a limit of \$100 was placed on duty-free items a tourist could bring back. That remained the law until 1948. In 1948 the Congress raised this \$100 exemption of goods that could be brought back by the returning tourist free of duty to \$400. Following that the Congress, in 1949, took another look at the situation and raised the \$400 exemption to \$500.

Under existing law, a returning U.S. resident is allowed the following personal exemptions from duty on articles he has purchased abroad:

1. If the returning resident remains outside the territorial limits of the United States for at least 48 hours, he may claim an exemption from duty for \$200 worth of articles acquired abroad. If, however, he returns through a port of entry on the Mexican border, he need only have been absent from the United States for such time (not to exceed 24 hours) as the Secretary of the Treasury has by regulation provided with respect to such port. At present, these regulations require an absence of at least 24 hours (the maximum requirement permitted under the law) in the case of residents returning through one of the southern California ports below Los Angeles. In the case of other ports along the United States-Mexican border, there is no period of absence provided for. This \$200 exemption from duty may be claimed once every 30 days.

2. If the returning resident remains outside the territorial limits of the United States for 12 or more days, he may claim an

additional exemption from duty for \$300 worth of articles acquired abroad. This additional exemption, which may be claimed together with the basic exemption described above, can be utilized only once in every 6-month period.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us differs slightly from the President's recommendation in that it provides for a temporary 2-year reduction rather than a 4-year reduction, which he suggested initially. This provision would remain in effect until the close of June 30, 1963, when the Congress could have another look to see whether or not this lower duty-free exemption should be permitted to continue.

Mr. Speaker, there is a second provision in the bill which was not recommended in the President's message, but which was agreed to in committee. It deals with the waiver of the 48-hour requirement with respect to tourist purchases in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who have raised some question about this proposition on the ground that it is a step backward; that it should not be taken. Mr. Speaker, it should be borne in mind that the action by the Congress in 1948, and the second action in 1949, raising this ceiling to \$500, was taken at a time when it was desirable for us to promote the expenditure abroad of dollars by tourists going to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, maybe this does not have as much effect on balance of payments as some other actions that could be suggested or recommended. It is thought that, perhaps, this will have an effect to the extent of maybe \$150 million and, perhaps, produce some additional revenues of \$5 million or \$10 million in payment of duties. But, Mr. Speaker, the main purpose that the Congress had in mind, in my opinion, in increasing this limitation from \$100 to \$400, and then later to \$500, has been attained, and it is not necessary any longer for us to permit this type of exemption from duty on the part of American citizens who travel abroad for that basic reason. I see no reason why we should deal more liberally in this area than any other country in the world deals today when we have a balance-of-payments problem of our own. No other tourist-conscious country permits its people to return home from a visit and bring with them as much as would be provided even under the program set forth in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, some have also raised a question as to whether or not some countries may retaliate should this proposal be adopted. I would like to include at this point a letter I received from Assistant Secretary of State Hays on this point:

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLS: It may be of value to you and your committee to know that the State Department has reviewed the situation and attitudes of the various countries likely to be most affected by the action proposed in H.R. 5191 to reduce the duty-free entry privilege for certain American tourists abroad from a maximum of \$500 to a maximum of \$100. In view of the fact that in nearly all cases the new U.S. regulations would be more favorable than those

now applied by other countries to their own tourists visiting the United States, and taking account of the reactions which have been received thus far to the U.S. proposal, the Department of State does not anticipate any other government will institute retaliatory or punitive action which would further restrict the expenditures of their own nationals in the United States or their ability to bring items purchased in the United States back into their own country free of duty.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. You propose to limit what the average citizen can buy abroad. Are you doing anything about a corporation like the Ford Motor Co. sending \$350 million abroad in one check to buy a company over there?

Mr. MILLS. That is an investment over there—yes; we have some recommendations before the committee at the moment that deal with matters in the area of tax treatment of these investments abroad on which hearings are now being conducted.

Mr. HAYS. Would the gentleman be willing to give us any assurance that there will be more than hearings on that question?

Mr. MILLS. I am not ever in a position, as my good friend knows, to predict what the committee may do, but certainly this is a matter that will be considered in executive session.

Mr. HAYS. Yes; and, on the past record, I think I can make a prediction.

Mr. MILLS. You think we will report it out then?

Mr. HAYS. No; I do not.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman whether the committee gave any consideration to exempt Canada from the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MILLS. We have never provided in areas of this sort for any distinction with respect to tariff duties and application of rates of duty except over the years we always had a preferential tariff rate of duty for Cuba and the Philippines and special treatment for products of Communist-dominated countries or areas. But, as a general rule, we have never differentiated or distinguished between countries in the application of our duties. We follow the most-favored-nation policy under which we treat all alike. It would be discriminatory and, I think, contrary to all of the basic policy that this country has pursued over the years, if we were to do so.

Mr. LAIRD. This exemption was really granted for the purpose of increasing trade and cutting down on aid; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. We did it as a vehicle to try to increase the dollar balances of some of these European countries that were encouraging American tourism. I think it has done a great deal to accomplish that. We are at a point now

where we are disturbed by our own imbalance in these payments. I think we should begin to think in terms of restricting some of these things since the initial basic reason for liberalizing this provision has been fruitful.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. SCRANTON. I notice that you estimate the dollar curb will probably amount to \$150 million approximately.

Mr. MILLS. That is a Treasury estimate. They cannot estimate with any degree of accuracy in this field.

Mr. SCRANTON. Exactly how do they arrive at their estimate?

Mr. MILL. We interrogated them in the committee. It is their best guess. That is about all we can say.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Would Members of Congress come under the provisions of this law?

Mr. MILLS. It is my understanding that we are subject to the same rules that are applicable to any other traveling American; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Do the customs officials actually inspect these MATS planes when Members of Congress travel?

Mr. MILLS. You will have to ask somebody who has been abroad under those conditions. I myself do not know from experience, as a matter of fact.

Mr. GROSS. So this is designed to cover Members of Congress as well as the ordinary citizen?

Mr. MILLS. Any returning American citizen is covered.

Mr. GROSS. What about the 48-hour provision?

Mr. MILLS. The 48-hour provision is with respect to how long a person must remain out of the United States in order to avail himself of this duty-free entry of the basic \$200 under existing law or \$100 under the bill we are now considering. There are certain exceptions, with respect to the Virgin Islands and to Mexico, for example.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. What about our neighbor to the north? Will there be any reciprocal action?

Mr. MILLS. No, we are assured by the Department of State that there will not. This applies only to American citizens. Canada does not extend to her citizens any such liberality as we extend to ours, even under the terms of this bill. Besides, this is an action of our own Government affecting our own citizens. Canada would have to legislate with respect to their own.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Iowa asked whether this applied to Members of Congress. Would the gentleman tell us whether this would apply to officials and employees of the United Nations?

Mr. MILLS. It applies to American tourists coming back from foreign countries.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But how about someone visiting the United Nations?

Mr. MILLS. We always permit them to bring their personal effects with them; we have always done that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But that would be when they came from outside the country.

Mr. MILLS. They bring with them their personal effects when they represent a foreign government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How about when they come from Iowa to the United Nations?

Mr. MILLS. I thought the gentleman asked about someone coming in from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. For the information of the gentleman from Michigan, they are not giving anything away to Iowa at the United Nations, as I found out last Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And Sunday, too.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Very soon we will have before us a bill to encourage tourism. What are other nations doing for their nationals?

Mr. MILLS. Other nations do not treat their own nationals in this respect as liberally as we treat our citizens even under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] to extend his remarks.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, no one is more concerned than I with the balance-of-payments position of the United States. I admire the vigor with which the present administration has approached this very serious matter and I am certain that their efforts will ultimately be rewarded. In fact, we are already noting a reverse in the previous gold flow pattern which I am sure everyone here is glad to see.

We are asked to approve H.R. 6611 in the interest of contributing toward a solution of our balance-of-payments problem. I think we should all recognize that the estimated saving in gold outflow of about \$150 million will not carry us too far along this path. I have deep reservations that the pending proposal will save that much money. But that is another matter.

What concerns me most is that in taking this measure, which, as I have said, will do little to balance our payments position, we will unquestionably unbalance the deep friendly ties we have painstakingly built up over the years with our neighbors to the north and south—Canada and Mexico. This result is inevitable. And this action will be taken at a time when we need these ties of friendship more than ever be-

fore. We should be striving to solidify and strengthen these ties in the interest of the long-range challenge now presented to nations of the Western Hemisphere by the establishment of a Communist regime at our doorstep in Cuba. But, I submit, the pending proposal will serve to weaken these bonds and might prove to be much more disastrous than any imbalance in our payments position.

There is a further point which must not be overlooked in the case of our contiguous neighbors. Over the years, in the field of tourist trade, we have continuously enjoyed a favorable balance with our northern neighbor. In 1959, for instance, Canadian tourists spent some \$100 million more in the United States than our citizens spent in Canada on tourism. The figures for 1960 are not as yet compiled but it is certain that much the same balance in our favor persisted. Should the Canadian Government retaliate, and who would blame her, this might very well serve to cut down on Canadian tourist purchases in the United States and negative this attempted move to assist our balance-of-payments position.

While tourist trade with Mexico shows, in 1959, a balance in favor of Mexico of some \$190 million, we cannot overlook the effect this measure is certain to have on the sizable quantities of money which our tourists spend on lodgings and meals in the border States. As you know, the special absence requirements applicable to tourists who would claim present U.S. exemptions are waived, in large part, for travel to Mexico. The reason for this is that the greater number of U.S. border tourists visit Mexico by day and spend the evening and night in one of the border States. Many hotel and dining facilities have been constructed for this purpose. If we discourage this tourist trade, which we no doubt will if this proposal becomes law, then many of these border interests will be severely hurt.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, can we ignore the fact that on overall trade, we sell about twice as much to Mexico as we buy from her. In 1960, U.S. exports were \$806.8 million while our imports from Mexico were some \$443 million. Here again, any retaliation on the part of Mexico could serve to cut down the very large favorable balance of trade we now enjoy to the ultimate detriment of our balance-of-payments position.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an area of New York State which has fostered and built up a large part of the world-renowned friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Canada. We have played a major role in nurturing these ties of amicable and peaceful, side-by-side existence with the people of the great dominion to the north. The people in my district look upon our Canadian friends as their brothers in democracy. I urge this great body not to disturb these links which have been forged over the years by mutual trust, understanding, and respect.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this legislative proposal would have the effect of temporarily reducing the present \$500 to \$100 duty-free exemption on goods

brought into the United States by returning U.S. residents. The bill would also amend present law with respect to the Virgin Islands so that the 48-hour period of absence from the United States required for certain exemptions would be waived.

Mr. Speaker, the President has recommended the reduction in the duty-free allowance as a measure to correct the balance-of-payments problems and the gold outflow problem confronting our country. Frankly, I am doubtful of the efficacy of this recommendation. I personally believe that we are going to have to look to some of the more basic things affecting our balance-of-payments posture such as foreign aid and off-shore procurement as well as to insist that foreign countries remove their discriminatory trade barriers against American-produced goods. However, if the President says this is what he needs to meet the problems of balance of payments and gold outflow, then I am willing that he should have the changes contained in this legislative proposal.

Therefore, I join in urging my colleagues to vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6611.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the remedial proposal of the President to assist in solving the balance-of-payments problem by lowering the customs exemption from \$500 to \$100, seems to me an overconcentration on trivia.

There are two distinct factors involved. One, the small amount of money as compared to the sums contributing to an unfavorable balance. Two, a factor which far outweighs this particular financial solution—the good human relations established abroad.

In the first sense, let me make some reasonable financial comparisons. Our imports last year amounted to about \$15 billion. Duty and taxes on this amount were approximately \$1,500 million. The estimated value of articles brought into the United States under \$500 exemption and over \$200 in value, was \$140 million. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that about \$100 million will be gained from lowering the exemption. Compared to the revenue from imports, this amount seems like nickels and dimes.

But what is even more important than this purely monetary consideration, and a small amount at that, is the all-important fact of human relations.

Americans traveling abroad, by their immediate contacts with the citizenry wherever they happen to be, have been engaged in a vast person-to-person program of inestimable benefit. Americans, by talking to shopkeepers and vendors, large and small, buying their wares, have created a great amount of good will and rapport.

Everywhere our citizens go, large cities or villages, this effective type of public relations is established and spread. This is an immediate type of contact, more intimate in nature, and one which I be-

lieve in its effectiveness is far superior to the propaganda efforts on an official and planned basis. In fact, this type of relations supplements and assists our official efforts.

There is no substitute for personal contact in the great good it can do. Each American citizen who goes abroad is described as an "ambassador of good will." If this type of good will costs our Nation but \$100 million a year, then I say it is worth it. To achieve the same results as do the American travelers, through official means, would cost maybe 10 times that amount.

This is why I believe that such a so-called saving or remedial measure to help solve the balance-of-payments problem, is neither practical nor of any great merit when compared to the intangible values which I have listed. It smacks of that old adage, that you cannot cut off your nose to spite your face.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about this bill, H.R. 6611, mainly because I fear the damage it might do can far outweigh any possible advantages to be gained. I note that we shall vote on the bill on Wednesday next. I am glad that we shall have this additional time to reflect more deeply on this subject. Like everyone else, I am deeply troubled by our balance-of-payments problems. It was in part for this reason that I have been working so hard on the international travel bill. Almost one-third of the current dollar gap is attributable to the tourist gap. I am sure all of us realize that the way to offset this is to encourage spending of hard currency in this country by nationals of other countries.

What troubles me about this bill—reducing the duty-free allowance—is that the dollar advantage to be gained is so little compared to the possible loss of good will with other countries. I am also concerned that we are acting on the basis of insufficient facts.

On March 9 I wrote the Acting Commissioner of Customs and asked specific questions. I wanted advice chiefly as to the percentage of Americans who use their full \$500 allowance, the average amount brought in by tourists, the projections for differences in these figures that would be brought about by the reduction, and advice as to problems relating to enforceability. The Commissioner was not able to answer the first three questions. Based, however, on a 1959 survey, it was stated that 4.5 percent of returning residents' declarations covered articles valued at more than \$500. However, declarations may include more than one person entitled to an exemption. The Commissioner indicated that the maximum potential reduction in tourist purchases under proposed legislation would be about \$175 million annually.

I wonder what the medium would be.

I also wrote the Secretary of State and asked to be advised about the impact of

this proposed legislation on foreign policy. I specifically asked about press reports that the Canadian and Mexican Governments had protested the proposal. Beyond this I was concerned about the general impact in other areas as well.

The reply of the Assistant Secretary, the Honorable Brooks Hays, indicated that official representations against the proposed reduction were received from the Netherlands Embassy and from the Haitian Embassy. The Canadians expressed the hope that nothing would be done to further aggravate an unfavorable balance of trade that Canada has with the United States, but apparently there was no official protest or requested exemption. The Government of Mexico did not make an official representation either. There was, perhaps pointedly, no general comment about the impact of the bill.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the full text of my letters to the Secretary of State and the Acting Commissioner of Customs and their replies to me:

MARCH 23, 1961.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently the President in a message to the Congress requested legislation to reduce the duty-free allowance applicable to American tourists returning to the United States from \$500 to \$100.

For a long time I have been interested in ways and means to promote the flow of tourist travel in both directions, and I have introduced in the Congress legislation to establish an Office of Tourism in the Department of Commerce, plus basic amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to temporary travel of visitors to and in the United States.

It was reported in the press recently that the Canadian and Mexican Governments had protested the proposal to reduce the duty-free allowance for Americans reentering the United States. In view of the fact that the proposal undoubtedly has foreign policy implications, I should like to have your views as to any possible adverse effect that the proposed legislation might have should it pass the Congress. The President stated that the legislation is designed to correct in some part the present deficit in balance of payments. While the objective is undoubtedly commendable, I am concerned lest possible adverse effects abroad might outweigh the potential benefits to this country. I would be interested in knowing further whether the Department of State has made an analysis of the extent to which a change in the duty-free allowance would reduce the balance-of-payments deficit.

I am considering also a suggestion that rather than lose the negotiating power of our present \$500 duty-free allowance, we might adopt a policy of reciprocity with respect to the duty-free allowances of other countries from which foreign students and tourists come to the United States, and also with respect to the monetary restrictions of those countries.

In view of the fact that the House Committee on Ways and Means is currently considering the proposed legislation, I would appreciate advice on the foregoing at the earliest possible date. The subject is of great importance and I should like to have all pertinent facts in front of me before arriving at conclusions on the legislation.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1961.

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: Thank you for your letter of March 23, 1961, concerning the proposed reduction in the customs exemption for returning U.S. residents. The Department is happy to provide you with the following information on the points you raised in your letter.

The Department has made no analysis of the extent to which a change in the duty-free allowance would reduce the balance-of-payments deficit. However, a Department of the Treasury study has indicated that the proposed reduction in the allowance would reduce the deficit by \$140 to \$175 million.

Official representations against the proposed reduction have been limited to notes from the Netherlands Embassy on behalf of the Netherlands Antilles and from the Haitian Embassy. The proposed reduction was touched upon at the Joint United States-Canadian Trade Committee meeting held in Washington, D.C., on March 13 and 14. At this meeting attended by Ministers of the Canadian Government and Cabinet members of our Government, the Canadian delegation pointed out that their country had an unfavorable balance of trade with the United States and that Canadian tourists spend \$100 million more per year in this country than U.S. citizens spend in Canada. The Canadians did express the hope that nothing would be done further to aggravate the unfavorable balance, but at no time has the Canadian Government formally requested a specific exemption from the proposed reduction. No official representation has been received on this subject from the Government of Mexico.

The Department wishes to call to your attention two points which will be of interest to you in your consideration of a suggestion that the United States might adopt a policy of reciprocity with respect to the duty-free allowances of other countries. The first point is that the U.S. duty-free allowance is presently more generous than that of most other countries having a similar allowance. In December 1960 the Department requested American missions and consular posts to review local regulations on the quantity of goods which may be imported duty free by returning residents. The review showed that the level of the duty-free allowance is generally well below that of the United States. In reducing its duty-free allowance from \$500 to \$100 the United States would be moving closer to the levels maintained by other countries permitting a similar allowance.

A second point of still greater importance is that a policy of reciprocity would run contrary to our traditional policy of most-favored-nation treatment as embodied in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, bilateral trade agreements, and treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Under this policy we have since 1923, with few exceptions such as our treatment of Philippine products, unconditionally extended to all countries entitled to such treatment the benefits accorded to products of any country. Action on our part inconsistent with this policy, embodied in so many international commitments, could readily constitute the basis for similar action by other countries detrimental to our exports. It would appear in our own best interests not to encourage other countries by our own actions to disregard policies and commitments which protect and benefit our trade.

If the Department can be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

MARCH 9, 1961.

MR. DAVID B. STRUBINGER,
Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Customs,
Department of the Treasury, Washing-
ton, D.C.

DEAR MR. STRUBINGER: As you know, we shall soon have in the House for legislative action the President's proposal to reduce the duty-free tourist allowance from \$500 to \$100.

I would appreciate having an analysis of the impact that this proposed reduction would have on the dollar gap. Here are some of the questions I have in mind:

What percentage of Americans use their full allowance? What is the average amount brought in by tourists?

What are the projections for differences in the above figures that would be brought about by a reduction?

What are your problems relating to enforceability?

I should like to have any other thoughts you may have on this general subject which will be helpful to me as a legislator in making an intelligent decision on this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 24, 1961.

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: I am pleased to supply you with background information concerning the proposed amendment to paragraph 1798, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which would reduce returning resident exemptions to \$100.

Returning residents entering the United States across our Canadian and Mexican borders may bring in articles acquired abroad valued up to \$200 per person on an oral declaration. No record is maintained of the value of the merchandise brought in under such exemptions.

At our sea and air ports, while a written declaration is required of every overseas passenger, a listing of articles acquired and their value is required only when the value exceeds \$200 per person. No information is available concerning the amount or value of purchases valued at less than \$200 per person.

The basic exemption of \$200 per person is available to a returning resident once every 30 days, provided he has been out of the country at least 48 hours. The additional exemption of \$300 is available to a returning resident once every 6 months provided he has been out of the country 12 days or more.

Early in January 1960, we obtained information from a number of our principal field offices to determine what the impact of such legislation would be on the volume of tourist purchases abroad. This survey covered calendar year 1959. A similar survey was recently completed to secure 1960 information. As indicated above, the only information available covered purchases abroad valued at more than \$200 per person.

Projecting these data, we have estimated that the total value of returning residents' purchases abroad in 1960 was approximately \$415 million and that the maximum potential reduction in tourist purchases under the proposed legislation would be about \$175 million annually. These are the only estimates which we have developed in connection with the proposed legislation.

We regret that specific answers to your first three questions of March 9, 1961, are not available. Our 1959 survey indicated that 4.5 percent of the returning residents' declarations covered articles valued at more than \$500, but a declaration may include more than one person entitled to an exemption.

With respect to problems of enforcement, we foresee the need for intensifying our examination of passengers' baggage, because

many more returning residents will have made purchases approaching or exceeding their allowable exemptions. There undoubtedly will also be an increased number of attempts to smuggle merchandise into the country, but we believe that entirely adequate countermeasures can be taken and are economically feasible.

Sincerely yours,

D. B. STRUBINGER,
Acting Commissioner of Customs.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6611.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DULSKI) there were—yeas 74, nays 6.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement of last Thursday, further proceedings will go over until next Wednesday.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN ORGANIZATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 384 providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

The Clerk read House Joint Resolution 384 as follows:

Whereas representatives of the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America signed at Washington on June 21, 1960, the "Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization" to replace the agreement signed at Washington on October 30, 1946, establishing the Caribbean Commission in which the Government of the United States of America participates by authority of the joint resolution of March 4, 1948 (62 Stat. 65; 22 U.S.C. 280h); and

Whereas these four Governments have reviewed the work of the Caribbean Commission, have recognized that the Commission has rendered valuable services to the Caribbean area, and have considered statements from the local governments calling for a review of the Caribbean Commission Agreement in the light of new constitutional relationships; and

Whereas the purposes and functions of the Caribbean Organization are similar to those of the Caribbean Commission, that is, to consult and to advise with respect to social, cultural, and economic cooperation in the area; and

Whereas since the establishment of the Caribbean Commission significant constitutional and economic changes have taken place in the area, and the Governments of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have indicated their willingness to accept increased responsibility in consulting and advising with respect to social, cultural, and economic problems in the area: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the Government of the United States of America the "Agreement for the Establishment of the

Caribbean Organization" signed at Washington on June 21, 1960, by representatives of the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America; that the participation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands of the United States in the Caribbean Organization is hereby authorized; that the Caribbean Organization shall, upon promulgation by the President of an Executive order to this effect, be entitled to the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669; 22 U.S.C. 288); and that the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to appoint or designate a United States observer to the Caribbean Organization.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us authorizes the President to accept on behalf of the Government of the United States the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization which was signed in Washington on June 21, 1960, by representatives of France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. It also authorizes the participation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Organization, and further authorizes the United States to have an observer at the meetings.

Although the United States has always had an interest in the Caribbean, it had no possessions in that area until it acquired Puerto Rico as a result of the war with Spain and in 1917 purchased from Denmark the Virgin Islands.

The events of World War II brought home to us very forcibly the importance not only of our own dependencies but those of our allies in the Caribbean. Of course, we had common problems, the human problems, in all of these areas. To deal with all of these problems, there was established the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission in 1942. When the war was over, the French and the Netherlands, each of whom had territorial possessions in the Caribbean, joined the United States and Great Britain in the establishment of a new international body, the Caribbean Commission, to deal on a reasonable basis with the problems common to all the islands.

The Caribbean Commission has been in operation for about 12 years. It has accomplished many important tasks in agriculture, housing, public health, education, and tourism.

Now it is proposed that the Commission be terminated and there be established the Caribbean Organization. The principal point is that the major powers recognize that a great measure of self-government has been achieved by the territories in the area. We feel that these areas should have responsibility

commensurate with their larger measure of self-government.

The United States now contributes about \$140,000 a year to the Caribbean Commission. I am very happy to tell my distinguished friend from Iowa that upon the acceptance of this agreement and the establishment of the Caribbean Organization, the United States will be relieved of this contribution. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands will, on entry, contribute to its budget.

Our committee believes the creation of the Caribbean Organization with a membership made up of the nonindependent countries is a very important move—one that is very vital to the United States and to the area. It shows to the whole world how the United States feels about placing people on a self-reliant basis.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida who is now speaking for sponsoring this particular piece of legislation before the House. This, of course, is an area in which the committee, which I have the honor to chairman, is very much involved. I think the legislation is most timely. I support it most heartily, and I think it will go a long way in supporting a favorable position which we desire in the Caribbean.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have for the past 12 years followed the activities of the Caribbean Commission and have been sympathetic to its program and appreciative of its accomplishments. It is my understanding that the purposes of the Commission will be continued in the new Caribbean Organization and for the most part its machinery will be retained.

It is my belief that a Caribbean Organization, through broad participation by the island areas of the Caribbean, can take some giant steps toward bringing about economic and social development throughout the island area. Of particular importance for the future, I believe, is the research council, whose members will concern themselves with advisory matters relating to agriculture, fishing, wildlife, forestry, economics, statistics, medicine, public health, sanitation, nutrition, social problems, education, and the fastest growing industry in the Caribbean—tourism.

I am especially pleased with the roles the Virgin Islanders and Puerto Ricans will play in the Caribbean Organization and the manner in which they have accepted increased responsibilities. This is one of the ways in which the citizens of our own insular areas can gain the political maturity which is a necessary first step toward greater autonomy.

It is my understanding that the U.S. Government will make no direct contribution to the Organization, but that the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico will contribute \$25,200 and \$140,000, respectively. I believe that these funds will be well spent and the benefits derived from our participation will be worthwhile.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs for those remarks.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now, let me see if I have it straight and clear that this legislation is going to save us some money; that the resolution is not going to cost us any money.

Mr. FASCELL. Let me say that it will not.

Mr. GROSS. Where are they going to have the headquarters of this outfit?

Mr. FASCELL. In Puerto Rico.

Mr. GROSS. When it comes to establishing and maintaining the headquarters, does the gentleman know of any international organization today that does not cost American taxpayers plenty of money?

Mr. FASCELL. The United States will not be a member, if we adopt this resolution and approve the agreement which has heretofore been entered into. By this joint resolution we authorize the participation of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. They will pay their share of the budget out of the funds available to them. You can interpret that any way you want, but it sounds pretty good to me.

Mr. GROSS. This is most amazing, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thought the gentleman would be interested and pleased.

Mr. GROSS. Only last Friday I saw Mr. Stevenson in the United Nations new mission building just completed. He was ankle deep in wall-to-wall carpeting, with figurative tears running down his cheeks. The U.N. is broke, he said, and must have millions of dollars. I never saw a man stand any deeper in wall-to-wall carpeting, pleading poverty, than did Adlai Stevenson last Friday afternoon. And, so it is utterly amazing that we have a resolution today that deals with an international organization that is going to save the people of this country some money. I hope the gentleman is right. I fervently hope he is right.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is it anticipated that in this new Nation that has just been established, including Trinidad, will become a member of it? How is that designated: Barbadoes, Trinidad, and others.

Mr. FASCELL. In the report there is a list.

Mr. BOW. I could not find it, and that is what I was interested in.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman have page 13 of the staff memorandum before him?

There are 12.

Mr. BOW. I was looking at page 14 "Eligibility for Membership of the Organization."

Mr. JUDD. There are just four countries entering into this agreement: The French, the Dutch, the British, and our-

selves. Those nonindependent areas eligible to join the Caribbean Organization are 12. The Republic of France has three departments: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, and Martinique. The Netherlands has two: Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The United Kingdom has five: The Bahamas, British Guiana, British Honduras, the British Virgin Islands, and the West Indies. The West Indies is a group of islands which the British have organized into a federation, and it comes in as one group.

Mr. BOW. As I understand, Trinidad and Barbados and some of the other islands are not a part of the British Virgin Islands.

Mr. JUDD. They are not; that is right.

Mr. BOW. Under article 3 on page 14, how do these new nations come in? The gentleman from Puerto Rico indicates that he might have the answer.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Jamaica, Trinidad, and the other islands that are in the chain; from Puerto Rico to Trinidad all come within the West Indies Federation.

Mr. BOW. What about the new federation?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. That is the new federation.

Mr. BOW. Where on page 14 are they designated as eligible for membership in the organization?

Mr. JUDD. As the West Indies.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. The West Indies.

Mr. JUDD. The West Indies is the federation.

Mr. BOW. I am glad they are included. We all wish them well, I am sure; and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is one of the best steps the United States can take at this time, not only because of the impact in the Caribbean area which, as everybody knows, is very troubled just now, but because it demonstrates to the world that the United States is continuing its leadership in dealing in the right way with its possessions or former semi-colonial areas. On the one hand some governments and groups are insisting that all colonial peoples be given their full independence right now even though their economy is not viable, even though their agriculture, their industry, their educational and health measures, their communications, and their governmental machinery are not sufficiently developed to enable them to handle their affairs successfully. On the other hand there are some countries that are not willing to take any steps whatsoever in the direction of giving greater autonomy and self-government, or preparation for it, to peoples under their control.

The procedure followed in this resolution is the sensible middle ground. We started out during the war and went further in 1948 to pull together these semicolonial areas which, in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, are possessions of the United States, and in the case of the other 10 areas possessions of 3 metropolitan powers, Britain,

France, and the Netherlands. This joint effort has worked very well. But it has been the four controlling powers that are members of the Caribbean Commission and not the areas themselves. While they are not fully independent now, they manage successfully most of their affairs under local self-government. Under this resolution the four powers agree to establish a successor, the Caribbean Organization, which these areas will join on their own. It will be they, not we, who are members. It will give them greater stature. They will operate the Organization. Its headquarters will be in Puerto Rico. Each of the four metropolitan powers will have observers at the meetings of the Organization. And there is a safeguard, that if at any time any one of the four powers thinks something is going wrong it has the right under the agreement to withdraw after 1 year's notice.

So there is no possible danger in this arrangement. It is a real step forward for peoples and governments that are making a constructive effort to handle wisely their economic, social, and cultural problems and relationships. It will enable them to move ahead in developing a strength and unity in that part of the world which obviously needs such strength and unity among the peoples themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, there should be no opposition to this measure.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this time to say that I believe this legislation before us today is good and I think it should be adopted. There is the possibility that we will be saving some money. But in addition to that it seems to me that this is a great tribute to a great people. These are the people of Puerto Rico who are fine Americans and who are fine citizens of our country. Throughout the years that I have been a Member of this body, and even before that time, I have been close to the people of Puerto Rico. I have seen them progress under able leadership. It seems to me that this is a great answer to the world as to our feeling in the United States toward areas such as Puerto Rico.

We now see them taking their place as full-fledged members of our society, and beginning to handle in this Caribbean area this very important work. The headquarters of this organization instead of being in Washington will be in Puerto Rico. To me this is a great tribute to the people of Puerto Rico and a great tribute to our colleague, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, who has so well and ably over the years represented the people of Puerto Rico in this body.

I just would like to take this opportunity to say how I admire him and how pleased I am that this step is being taken for those fine people of a very beautiful island.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Nothing, I think, could underline more sharply than our action

here the difference between the way the United States and the three Western European countries are moving in this difficult problem, and in contrast, the way the Soviet Union moves. This joint resolution extends greater authority and autonomy to areas not yet fully independent by authorizing their direct participation in the Caribbean Organization, while in Cuba, another island in the same part of the world, the people are losing their freedom to the cruelest colonial power in history, the Soviet Union.

Mr. BOW. The Cuban people came into the United States at the same time and were given independence while Puerto Rico has become a Commonwealth, but communism has made slaves of the peoples of Cuba, whereas the people in Puerto Rico have freedom. I hope the U.S. Information Agency will tell the world of this situation so that the entire world will know that in one area of the Caribbean there is communism and slavery and the loss of freedom, while in another, under our flag, there is the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, where the people have freedom and advancement, and a situation of living such as has never been known before in that area, brought about not because of us particularly but because of the people of Puerto Rico desiring freedom and working with us and we with them.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank my colleagues for being so generous in their praise for the people of Puerto Rico. We have done nothing else than take advantage of freedom. When people have freedom they always find a way to progress.

I support this joint resolution wholeheartedly. I may say in the name of the people of Puerto Rico that we are very happy to undertake these responsibilities. It will cost us a certain amount of money, but we think it is worth it. We have developed in these years of existence of the Caribbean Commission an experience of good neighborliness, of togetherness. We have compared notes, we have compared programs. I am proud to say that Operation Bootstrap originated in Puerto Rico, has extended to Trinidad and Jamaica, with the same good results. We have seen some things in the other islands that we have tried in our own. This is the way we want to live, in peace with our neighbors, each one with his own responsibilities and sharing our experiences.

I may say that the Caribbean Organization as authorized by this joint resolution is only advisory and consultative. There is nothing executive about it. There are no commitments that can be made by one area or another for joint action of a political or such other nature.

I am happy to say that the offices of the Caribbean Commission, which heretofore had been in Trinidad, are now located in Puerto Rico. The Caribbean Organization, therefore, will have its offices in San Juan, P.R., where they are

very welcome. We in Puerto Rico feel very proud that we have been given that distinction. We do not feel that we are the head of the Caribbean Organization, but we think we with the rest of the members of the Organization are ahead in the Caribbean.

Mr. Speaker, the Caribbean Commission, which the Caribbean Organization will replace, has proved throughout the years the worth of the Caribbean governments' gathering at the counsel table for the exchange of ideas and for the promotion of cooperation between the areas. Considerable good has already emerged from these meetings, and the prospects are in the future for the Caribbean Organization to operate for the benefit of the people of the Caribbean islands.

Political changes have taken place in parts of the area, and the new Caribbean Organization will reflect political change, with the Caribbean governments taking over the functions within the Caribbean Organization which were previously undertaken by the metropolitan governments. The constitutional relationships of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico with the United States and of the Virgin Islands with the United States would in no way be altered by virtue of the authorization in the resolution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to participate in the Caribbean Organization.

As the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the only representative in the Congress from the area of the Caribbean, I fully endorse House Joint Resolution 384. I have participated in and witnessed the accomplishments of the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission and later of the Caribbean Commission, which the Caribbean Organization will replace. There is an enthusiastic response of the people represented and a spirit of helpfulness from one to the other. Here there is borrowing of ideas and not of money; there is exchange of understanding, not of misunderstanding; there is an established dignity. There is a sharing of information instead of a hiding of it behind a drop curtain of isolation.

Principally, from the interest of the United States in its position of limelight, there is provided within the Organization an opportunity for the United States to allow the Puerto Rican example of progress, dignity, and hope to be used to the advantage of the participating governments and their people and to the great advantage of the free world.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 384 which authorizes the President to accept for the United States the agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization. This Organization would replace the present Caribbean Commission and would include in its membership French Guiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Netherlands Antilles, Surinam, British Guiana, the West Indies, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The Caribbean Organization is the next logical step in the evolution of this

region, placing more responsibility directly on the peoples of this area in an organization directly representing them and in which they themselves will make the decisions. The establishment of the Caribbean Organization in place of the existing Caribbean Commission will reflect the large measure of self-government that has been granted these countries since 1946. The principal function of this Organization will be to study, formulate, and recommend programs and courses of action in economic matters which will contribute to the well-being of the Caribbean area.

Because the participating members are not sovereign and independent states, they cannot belong to the Organization of American States. In view of the increasing problems in the Latin American area that are the result of accelerated activities by the international Communist movement, every effort should be made to grant more opportunities for the peoples of this area to participate actively in cooperative undertakings that will contribute to their economic and social advancement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to answer a question by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What, if any, additional obligation does this impose upon the United States?

Mr. JUDD. This imposes not one single additional obligation on the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, what is all this talk of the whereases here and all this money on page 2? What does that mean?

Mr. JUDD. To which provision is the gentleman referring?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, for instance, here on page 1, there are these whereases here—one, two, three, and then the fourth paragraph you begin and then on all of page 2—what is the significance of all of that?

Mr. JUDD. The significance of the joint resolution is that the Caribbean Commission was established in 1948 and the United States joined by joint resolution of the Congress. It has worked primarily to improve the economic, educational, social, and cultural development and relations of the peoples in these various areas. It has been very successful. They are all highly pleased with it. This resolution replaces the Caribbean Commission with the Caribbean Organization in which the areas will participate more actively on their own instead of through the parent governments. The United States will send observers. It could withdraw Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands from the Commission if we decided the Organization was acting improperly; for example, embarking upon military or political activities. The agreement does not authorize the Organization to get into those fields. Authority in them remains with the four metropolitan powers. So there is no additional obligation. The peoples affected consider it so valuable that they have offered to underwrite the budget. We will not have to pay \$140,000 directly for its support hereafter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have paid about how much?

Mr. JUDD. About \$140,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A year?

Mr. JUDD. That is right—a year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that all?

Mr. JUDD. That is all.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the meaning of the provision referring to international organizations immunities? To whom do they give immunity and why?

Mr. JUDD. They are the same immunities that the International Organizations Immunities Act now confers on diplomatic officials of other governments and the representatives of international organizations. It gives them the right to own property in our country and to enter our country free from the usual restrictions and requirements for immigrants or visitors. This new Organization plans to have its headquarters in Puerto Rico, and representatives of the French, the British, and the Netherlands areas need to have the same immunities as they come into Puerto Rico that they would have if they came to Washington now. It does not extend any immunities that do not already exist under the present Caribbean Commission; it merely transfers them to the successor organization, and its personnel.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H.J. Res. 384).

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this measure, and that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I made previously.

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

There was no objection.

ROLE OF CUBA IN INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to re-evaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties; and

Whereas Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activity throughout the hemisphere; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty, economic development, and social progress through all the Republics of the hemisphere; and

Whereas the Declaration of Havana of September 2, 1960, was an open attack on the Organization of American States clearly showing that the present Government of Cuba stands in defiance of every proclaimed principle of the Inter-American system; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs; and

Whereas representatives of the present Government of Cuba continue to participate in the councils of the Organization of American States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to urge immediate recognition by the Organization of American States of the dangers posed by the international Communist movement in the Western Hemisphere. It specifically indicates congressional support for the use of collective measures under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance against the present Government of Cuba, and it urges the exclusion of Cuba's representatives from attendance at all meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

Under the Rio Pact, the American Republics may resort jointly to the use of sanctions and/or armed force in eliminating a threat to the hemisphere. The Declaration of Caracas, agreed to in 1954 when communism had infiltrated the Guatemalan regime, specifically names communism as an extracontinental threat to the hemisphere.

The Communist-dominated Government of Cuba has indicated unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on in-

ternational affairs, and it is intervening daily in the internal affairs of other Latin American countries. Increasing quantities of military assistance from the Sino-Soviet bloc are being received by the Castro government, including weapons more advanced than any held by its Latin American neighbors. This flow of arms has been accompanied by Sino-Soviet military advisers and technicians.

Cuba today is a base and staging area for Communist subversive activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. Cuban diplomats in almost every country in Latin America have encouraged local opposition groups, harangued political rallies, distributed inflammatory propaganda, and indulged in a multitude of political assignments beyond the usual call of diplomatic duty. Such activities require careful scrutiny by the Organization of American States.

The countries of Latin America have as great a stake as the United States in countering communism in the Western Hemisphere, and we should work together to meet this threat. The resolution now under consideration urges the use of collective measures against the Cuban regime.

This resolution deals also with another issue which is of grave concern and that is the continued attendance of representatives of the Cuban Government at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board. Partial action concerning this situation was taken recently by the Board itself when it voted to deny the Cuban delegation access to classified material and classified sessions. As a temporary measure, while the present and evident military alliance exists between Cuba and the Soviet bloc, the Board's action fails to deal with the more important problem of a country's membership on the Board when its position has been altered due to political realignments or other reasons. The resolution would support action by the foreign ministers to change or clarify the terms of membership on the Board.

Failure to take collective action against a regime which has defied the principles of the Organization of American States would be a travesty of the collective security system. I am fully aware of the fears some Latin American leaders harbor regarding possible domestic reaction in their countries should they support sanctions against Castro. Nevertheless, I am deeply convinced that failure to deal effectively by means of the Organization of American States with a Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere weakens the inter-American system by undermining confidence in the principle of collective security and by permitting the source of infection to continue. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 226.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is very much I can add to the excellent explanation of this resolution that has been given by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, chairman of our subcommittee.

Unanimously, we felt that the time had come to express the sense of the Congress, and we believe the sense of the people of the United States, that our hemispheric defense measures and our collective security measures through the Organization of American States become meaningless if we permit participation by a government which is clearly bringing the Soviet Union within the Western Hemisphere.

I hope that we will have a rollcall on this measure so that it can be clearly demonstrated this is the will of the Congress who speaks for the American people.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I feel we should underline for the attention of the whole country what commitments the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of 1954 contained. It is being said in some quarters that the United States is trying to coerce the Latin American countries, that it is departing from the principle of nonintervention in dealing with Cuba.

The fact is that the principle of nonintervention was based on the understanding and the commitment that all the American countries in the OAS would act whenever there is a threat to our hemisphere because of the "domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power." The declaration specifically declares that such a situation would "constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

That is plain language, and we should make it clear that the obligation is equally on all of the American states party to the Caracas agreement. The United States is living up to its commitments when it presses for prompt, decisive action by the OAS before this cancerous process in Cuba spreads still further to the other countries, as it certainly will otherwise do.

I hope the Kremlin will take notice of this action today, I hope Castro will take notice, I hope all of our friends and colleagues in the Western Hemisphere as well as our own people will take notice. The Caracas mechanism was devised to deal with this kind of threat, the threat is real and present. It is time for the mechanism to operate. We are ready to go ahead with our part, and we call on the others to do the same.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would just like to underscore the fact that by this action we are showing congressional approval of collective action expected to be taken by the Organization of American States.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman feel that this resolution complies with sections 14, 15, and 17 of the articles of the Organization of American States?

Mr. MAILLIARD. It was the feeling of the subcommittee that it definitely did.

Mr. BOW. By this action are we endorsing and reaffirming our position in supporting articles 14, 15, and 17 of the Organization of American States?

Mr. MAILLIARD. It is my belief that we definitely are.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman feel that it is in the best interests of our country that we do that?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I believe that if we subscribe to the principles which we have done, certainly we ought to take this action to be consistent with our support of those principles.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman feel that these particular articles I refer to—I am sorry I do not have them with me so that I can read them, but I will put them in the RECORD—that those provisions of the Organization of American States are in the best interests of our Nation in view of what has happened in Cuba; that these provisions are in the best interests of our country?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to comment on the questions raised by the gentleman from Ohio. If the member countries of the Organization of American States will all, including the United States, carry out in good faith the commitments that were made, then I do not see dangers in the articles to which the gentleman refers. The gentleman is concerned—and we discussed it here the other day—that we will consider ourselves bound under these particular articles not to take unilateral action, that others may not do what they have undertaken the obligation to do, and so we may be denied the opportunity to act in our own self-defense. It is my strong belief that if the other countries do not follow through with their obligations, we are released from our obligations under the articles the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BOW. It would seem to me that under the articles I have referred to none of the members of the Organization of American States can do anything so far as Communist Cuba is concerned. Does the gentleman agree with that? I am talking about the provisions that we are now endorsing. But, there is a prohibition against the Organization of American States or any of the individual countries from doing anything to try to stop the growth of communism in Cuba.

Mr. JUDD. The Caracas Agreement, which this concurrent resolution deals with, calls upon all the countries in the Organization of American States to meet and to consider the adoption of appropriate action. We are now estopped from any unilateral action, unless and until the Organization of American States should fail to meet and act in accordance with the commitments

contained therein. In the event of such a failure, the United States must be free to act. As the gentleman knows, in the resolving clause of this concurrent resolution, a meeting should be called or such steps should be taken as may be necessary to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. It is to get all the states to work out policies and plans on what the hemisphere should do with respect to Cuba that this resolution should be passed today.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we have arrived at a point today when we can ask ourselves this question: Is collective security in the Western Hemisphere gone forever? What must we do now that communism exists in Cuba and it is a threat to the whole Western Hemisphere? This resolution is not the only answer, but it is a predicate to it, whatever may be required. I certainly think that we should emphasize our belief in collective action first, and that is the way I read this resolution. The OAS is the oldest organization of its kind in the world. It has done some mighty good things. I do not think that we want to snap our fingers and eliminate it as an effective organization. The United States took a long time to recognize the value and the benefit of the Organization of American States. Not until 1933 with the establishment of the "good neighbor" policy and the enunciation of the general principle of nonintervention did we think the OAS was important to our security and to that of the Western Hemisphere. I say that for the United States and all American countries the time has now come to act quickly when this whole system is challenged, challenged clearly by the Communists. The United States should be clear and unmistakable in its efforts and in its desire to take collective action first. And this, as I see it, is the purpose of the resolution.

In Costa Rica in 1960 the American countries took collective action.

However, the resolution adopted did not condemn Castro and the Communist government in Cuba. The OAS has shown through the course of its history that it can act effectively if it wants. Now I think this is what Congress is saying: "It is time for Latin American countries to stand up and be counted; we have too long delayed affirmative action against communism in Cuba, and in this hemisphere."

I said so many months ago, as has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], others in this House, some in the other body, and many voices throughout the whole Western Hemisphere. Yet we have not been able to obtain an affirmative plan of concerted action. I feel that we should make this final request by way of this congressional expression and within a reasonable time seek to get the commitment from the Latin American countries to meet affirmatively and with action the threat of communism in Cuba

and the Western Hemisphere. Failing that, I think we ought to give careful attention to the words spoken by President Kennedy when he said recently:

Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our Nation.

I think this is the light by which today's action by this Congress should be cast on this resolution. I am certain this House will support President Kennedy in whatever steps he deems essential to our security.

But first let the United States be on record by the voice of this Congress urging and requesting the joint action of the countries of the Western Hemisphere against communism in Cuba and its further infiltration in this hemisphere.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I should like to ask this question. The gentleman has referred to the articles of the Organization of American States. My question is this: Does not the gentleman think that by entering into the articles of the Organization of American States we have in effect repealed the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. FASCELL. No, sir.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. These South American countries understand perfectly this Caracas Agreement, this agreement of solidarity. Why does it take this sort of thing, our further going on record to convince them that they ought to do something, if that is what the purpose of this resolution is?

Mr. FASCELL. That is true; the gentleman raises a very pertinent point. But because of the leadership and the responsibility which is cast upon this Government I believe it is necessary and wise in our discretion at this point to make this one last, final appeal.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. I should like to point out that this resolution leaves out a most important element; and that is that Cuba was one of 80-some nations that met in Moscow last December, at the meeting of the 21st Communist International. It was a party to the resolutions passed by that group of associated nations aimed, of course, at the destruction, primarily, of the United States. I simply think that that should have been placed in the "whereas" clauses of this concurrent resolution so that we could identify the situation correctly in an overall, worldwide sense, rather than in the narrow, limited sense as contained in this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. I would say to the gentleman that the resolution has that in it. It is unquestioned that the Government of Cuba has accepted the "Commie line"; the puppet leader has so stated; the resolution says so. So I think it is adequately clear.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address this question to the gentleman from Florida with reference to article 15 of the Organization of American States. I should like to read it for the benefit of the Members so that they may know exactly how our hands are tied:

No state—

That refers to the United States—
or group of states—

That would be this type of resolution—
has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic and cultural elements.

It would seem to me that under article 15, this very article of the Organization of American States, this resolution is a violation of that, because it says no state or group of states shall in any manner whatsoever intervene, in any manner interfere. I think our hands are tied. I think that article 15 has repealed the Monroe Doctrine. I think we are at the mercy now of this particular event.

Mr. FASCELL. I would not engage in any legalistic discussion on that point, but we can change, as we did with the Declaration of Caracas, in any other way to determine what course of action we shall take. As far as this is concerned, I do not believe it is breaking the Monroe Doctrine at all.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would answer to the gentleman from Ohio that by our subscribing to the articles which the gentleman has been describing the Monroe Doctrine has not been repealed. The agreement in effect invites other countries to join us in a hemisphere Monroe Doctrine; but if they do not, we still have our own Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, during the height of the Korean conflict, a meeting of the Organization of American States was called in Washington to consider the undermining influence of international communism. This meeting resulted in the 21-member Organization of American States adopting a pledge of united resistance against any Communist encroachment in this hemisphere.

This pledge was reaffirmed in the Caracas Agreement of 1954.

Yet today Communist encroachment in this hemisphere is a fact. Unofficially, this has long been established.

It was rumored when Castro and his small band of guerrillas were operating in the Oriente Province of Cuba in 1958. The whispers of Castro's Communist leanings grew louder when he marched triumphantly into Havana. However, the fears of the free people of this hemisphere were quelled when Castro's early television tirades denied Communist affiliations.

Suddenly bitter attacks on the United States were heard over the endless cracking of the firing squads. U.S. enterprises in Cuba were seized without a hint of payment, and U.S. citizens were harassed, even jailed.

The United States justifiably broke diplomatic relations with the Castro government, and the State Department's white paper entitled "Cuba" officially established the fact that Communist encroachment in this hemisphere presented a clear and present danger to the security of the Americas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in support of this resolution. For a long time I have called for concerted action of this nature against Cuba.

In the 87th Congress I introduced a resolution calling for a meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States, and I urged that it adopt a four-point plan of action which included:

First. A resolution indicting the Castro government for subverting the principles of freedom in this hemisphere and thereby constituting a threat to hemispheric security.

Second. A resolution against Cuba calling for the strongest sanctions possible under the OAS charter.

Third. A resolution calling for diplomatic isolation of Castro by the OAS.

Fourth. A reaffirmation of the Caracas Agreement of 1954 condemning Communist infiltration in this hemisphere.

In this Congress, I have supported measures ranging from the severance of diplomatic relations with Cuba by all American Nations, complete economic boycott, and the establishment of an OAS military force.

Yet we have so far met the Cuban-Communist threat only halfway. Though diplomatic relations are no more, we have not stopped Cuban imports into this country. For example, Castro's plantations sell over \$2 million of tobacco a month in the United States. In addition to tobacco, fruit and vegetables are imported and sold in the United States. These imports total an annual volume of \$60 million for Castro, who uses this money to expand and perfect his Communist domination of the Cuban people. This fact is particularly shameful when we reflect on recent events.

Each time I have urged the State Department to take action, I received the answer that the matter was "under consideration."

The introduction of a resolution in Congress has become necessary, and I am hopeful that its passage will correct this specific situation.

Mr. Speaker, our leadership in the free world is now being questioned. The free people in this hemisphere alone are waiting expectantly for our next step. I believe a resolution such as the one before us today is a necessary step of leadership, and for that reason I urge all Members to give an overwhelming voice to this call for action.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, but I would like to ask a couple of questions. The first is, Is one of the sanctions included that could be put into effect by the Organization of American States that of a military blockade to prevent the shipment to this hemisphere and to Cuba of such things as rocketry, for which I understand pads are in existence and bases are being constructed to make it an armed arsenal that could endanger this country, or at least the State of Florida?

Mr. SELDEN. The measures that can be decided upon by a meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs convoked under the Rio Pact are those detailed in article 8 of the Rio Pact. They are: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, it is your construction that the Organization of American States could impose a military blockade by sea and air?

Mr. SELDEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAMER. Let me ask the gentleman one additional question. Has your subcommittee or the Committee on Foreign Affairs looked into, what I understand to be, the fact that in Guantanamo Bay the Cuban workers there are being paid in American dollars and the minute they get outside the gate, they go through a Cuban bank run by Castro and they are robbed of the American dollars which are replaced by one unit of Cuban currency for one American dollar, with the pre-Castro exchange rate 4 pesos to \$1 and the result is that Castro gets at least 75 percent of the payroll on Guantanamo Bay and 100 percent of the American dollars by taking it from the workers there, and in that manner we are subsidizing Castro?

Mr. SELDEN. The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs is keeping as closely informed of that situation as we can, and we do know that we have problems in Guantanamo Bay insofar as the Cuban workers are concerned.

Mr. CRAMER. Is that not a correct statement of fact, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. SELDEN. I do not know.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to suggest that is a matter the committee should certainly investigate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this resolution is considered to be of far-reaching importance, may vitally affect our national security, some think it should not have been brought up under suspension where debate is limited to 40 minutes and in this case unfortunately, the time wholly controlled by those who support the measure.

During the last 10 minutes on 3 occasions I have requested time, twice for just 30 seconds so that I might call attention to the situation now confronting the committee—less than 100 Members on the floor—and to my reasons for opposing the resolution. Will later get permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point and to ask for a quorum, for apparently only by such tactics will one be able to even register a silent protest.

The press and statements by those in the executive as well as in the legislative branches of government, tend to convince some that Russia is establishing a military base in Cuba, furnishing Castro with munitions of war, actions which, if continued, will ultimately force us to take some positive action.

If my understanding of the Monroe Doctrine is correct, in substance it was that we would not permit the establishment by any government of a military base in the Western Hemisphere which might endanger our existence as a nation. If present-day information is to be accepted at its face value, that is just what Russia, with Castro's acquiescence, is now doing in Cuba. If we condone this policy is there any reason to believe that ultimately a missile base will not be there established?

By the adoption of this resolution we refuse to meet our responsibility.

Over the years we have spent billions, taken unprecedented action to contain communism, to prevent its spread to our part of the world. Now the danger the enemy is on our doorstep, apparently establishing a beachhead from which we might ultimately be destroyed.

Unfortunately, because of the many one-world and international organizations which we have joined, we now find ourselves where we must either repudiate and disregard our solemn pledges to avoid any independent actions for our self-preservation or go along with whatever course of conduct these international organizations may advocate. This though it means our destruction.

None is so dumb that he does not realize that always when it comes to a question of self-preservation other considerations must yield.

Because the State Department, backed by the House and Senate Committees on Foreign Affairs, has committed us to submit to the direction of these one-world or international organizations, we now find ourselves in a situation where we must either ignore or repudiate our solemn promises or entrust our future to their decision.

Throughout my service here it has often been with deep regret that I found myself unable to agree with our Committee on Foreign Affairs, with our State Department, and vote to surrender at least a part of our sovereignty to

some international organization or group.

So it is today that instead of doing whatever may be necessary to protect this country of ours, I find that this resolution is now asking that the Organization of American States take over the decision as to whether we shall or shall not adhere to the Monroe Doctrine, assert our own independence and right to act for the preservation of our Government, or whether we leave that issue to the Organization of American States.

We are no longer free to declare or avoid war. This resolution asks a group of nations or states as they are called to determine our foreign policy.

Will the proponents of this resolution kindly spread somewhere in the record their views as to what it may be necessary for us to pay or do for the other governments belonging to this Organization in order to secure their cooperation for any measure which may be necessary for our defense.

Just how long do the advocates of this measure think we should stand with our hands tied behind us while the other so-called American states determine what should be done?

Where is the independence for which the forefathers fought and which we always asserted until the coming of the internationalists?

Twenty-one nations signed the charter of the Organization of American States. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] said, what about article 15 of that charter, which he quoted and which I repeat:

No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

Are we not asking the 20 other nations which signed that charter to disregard article 15?

Are we or are we not, by the adoption of this resolution, advocating intervention in the internal and external affairs of Cuba, which signed the charter on April 30, 1948?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

[Roll No. 56]

Addabbo	Boykin	Coak
Addonizio	Brewster	Colmer
Alger	Broomfield	Cook
Anfuso	Bruce	Corbett
Arends	Buckley	Curtis, Mass.
Auchincloss	Byrne, Pa.	Curtis, Mo.
Ayres	Cahill	Daddario
Barrett	Cannon	Dague
Bass, N.H.	Carey	Daniels
Bass, Tenn.	Celler	Davis, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Ciancy	Dawson
Blitch	Clark	Delaney

Dent	Holtzman	Philbin
Derwinski	Ichord, Mo.	Powell
Devine	Jennings	Rabaut
Diggs	Joelson	Rains
Dole	Karsh	Randall
Donohue	Kearns	Riley
Dooley	Kee	Rivers, S.C.
Durno	Kelly	Roberts
Dwyer	Keogh	Rodino
Edmondson	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Elliott	King, Calif.	Rousselot
Ellsworth	King, N.Y.	St. George
Evins	Kirwan	St. Germain
Fallon	Kluczynski	Stantangelo
Farbstein	Landrum	Saylor
Fenton	Lesinski	Scherer
Findley	McDowell	Schweiker
Fino	Macdonald	Seely-Brown
Flood	Madden	Shelley
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Forrester	May	Smith, Miss.
Frelinghuysen	Merrow	Smith, Va.
Fulton	Miller, N.Y.	Spence
Garmatz	Milliken	Staggers
Gary	Minshall	Stephens
Gavin	Monagan	Stratton
Giaino	Montoya	Teague, Tex.
Gilbert	Moorehead,	Thompson, La.
Glenn	Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Granahan	Morgan	Tuck
Grant	Morris	Van Pelt
Gray	Morrison	Wallhauser
Green, Pa.	Mosher	Walter
Hagan, Ga.	Moss	Whalley
Hagen, Calif.	Moulder	Wharton
Hall	Multer	Wickersham
Halleck	Nix	Willis
Harvey, Mich.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Healey	O'Neill	Wilson, Ind.
Hébert	Osmer	Winstead
Hoffman, Ill.	Patman	Wright
Holland	Peterson	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ROLE OF CUBA IN INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I can say in 3 minutes. I had hoped that there might be several hours of debate on this very important step we are taking. Under the present legislative situation, debate is limited and there can be no amendments.

First, let me make it plain that I believe that anything we do should be done through the Organization of American States. That is the proper instrumentality for the attainment of hemisphere solidarity.

I do not think that we will have the support of all the American States unless the governments in those countries feel that they have the support of their respective electorates. The language in the preamble of the resolution under consideration will make it more difficult for some of these governments to get that support.

What we are doing here in the resolution itself, expressing the sentiment of the Congress that the Cuban situation should be handled by the Organization of American States to preserve hemisphere solidarity as a matter of common interest and security cannot be questioned.

But when we say, "Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty," and so forth, are we not

passing judgment on and interfering in the internal affairs of another nation?

I do not know. I would avoid the risk of that interpretation by removing language that is unnecessary. I know that among the Latin Americans there is a strong feeling that there should be no outside interference in the internal affairs of any of the American Republics. The recent statement by the Government of Brazil made that clear.

In the subcommittee I voted against this resolution, stating that my purpose in doing so was that I did not want the full committee to have it come out unanimously, and possibly not give it the same consideration. I stated that if the full committee approve the resolution and if the House seemed to approve it, and there was a rollcall, I thought it would be the patriotic duty of everybody to vote for the resolution, even though some might have mental reservations on the language in the preamble.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped we might have had a fuller discussion and the opportunity of offering amendments, but, the resolution having been brought up this way under suspension of the rules the presumption must be that it has been approved. So, while I have great reservations as to the wisdom and propriety of the action in its present framing I shall vote for the resolution, and I ask all my colleagues, certainly those on my side of the aisle, to remember that this is a matter of patriotism to show national unity. I have voted on similar occasions where I might have had reservations, but whether it was from a Republican or a Democratic administration when it came to a vote of the House I felt that we in the Congress must show to the world national unity. So I shall vote with reservations for the resolution and hope it will be passed on a rollcall unanimously.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, for it is headed in the right direction. There are, however, some questions that leave me with the feeling that we are again talking one way and acting another. For example, this resolution is directed at taking sanctions against Cuba with the aid of the Organization of American States. Yet in March of 1961 Paul Hoffman, in his capacity as managing director of the United Nations Special Fund—of which we contribute 40 percent of the annual budget—signed an agreement with Cuba to help Castro's government diversify his farm production and thus lessen the island's dependence on a sugar crop.

If we are to hold our head high in the field of foreign affairs I submit it is time to take a course and follow it to completion and not change every time the Russian bear makes a noise.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] such time as he may require.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and feel that it is long overdue. I congratulate the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FAS-

CELL] on their leadership in bringing this before us. I feel that this resolution expressing the sense of Congress to initiate steps within the Organization of American States to protect this hemisphere from Russian imperialism is a step in the right direction, in that it demonstrates determination against a Communist takeover. I personally feel that it would be a still more useful and realistic move to pass the resolution that I introduced on our first day of business in 1960; and more recently on the first day of business in the current session of Congress. It is House Concurrent Resolution 5 and reads as follows:

Whereas the intervention of international communism directly or indirectly in an American republic would constitute a fact or situation threatening the sovereignty and political independence of the states of the entire New World; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, have long since ceased to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power or powers; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, would be in effect such a colonization by a non-American power or powers, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American state; and

Whereas such a fact or situation extended to any portions of this hemisphere would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and the American continents; and

Whereas the American republics have condemned intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, from any extrahemispheric power and have rejected the attempt of the Sino-Soviet conspiracy in its attempt to destroy hemispheric unity and security; and

Whereas in the rapidly developing contingencies of the atomic age there might not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That if such a fact or situation should present a sudden emergency, then any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World.

In case of such defensive measures having been taken by the defending state or states, it or they should report to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, after the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, be set up for the provisional administration of the state thus defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am very much in favor of a strong, vigorous, and decisive action against the Cuban Communists and their leader, Fidel Castro. From the very moment this man began to come to power, I felt the need for a strong policy against this Communist leader. In fact, I believe everywhere commu-

nism rears its ugly head, it should be fought. "Faint heart never won fair lady," they say, and certainly a faint heart is not going to win confidence, support, and the conquest of the minds of men—freemen—all over the world in our fight against communism.

It is true that Cuba was ruled by a dictator when Batista was in power. I did not like Batista then. Batista, however, was our friend, and certainly it is better to have a dictator opposed to communism than to have the present pro-Communist dictator.

It is obvious Fidel Castro has taken advantage of the interim since his rise to power to build up his armament. The fiasco resulting from the premature invasion of Cuba by exiled patriots shows only too well the fact that the Communists have furnished leadership, military organization, equipment of an advanced design and large amounts of materiel and supplies to Castro. All of these things under skilled direction made it relatively easy for the Cuban dictator to crush the last spark of opposition to the freedom-loving invading patriots.

With this invasion threat out of the way, the bearded Castro is working to make his island even more of a military bastion. He is now building more military roads, unpacking Russian MIG planes shipped to him from behind the Iron Curtain, unloading more tanks and stocking up his arsenals of arms and ammunition.

Our people sit aloof, 90 miles from the coast of Cuba, waiting for something favorable to develop. During all of this time, the "bearded one" goes about his business of extending the tentacles of communism into every nook of Cuban life. Our people may appear patient at present, but they are greatly disturbed. Should Castro's plans encompass the building of a launching pad for ballistic missiles, our people will not seem so patient. On the contrary, they will reach the point that they will not tolerate communism in this offshore island. The beginning of the actual construction of a missile base in Cuba will demand immediate action from us.

I do not believe anything we have done denies us the right today to apply and enforce the Monroe Doctrine. The time for colonization by the European powers in the New World has ceased. Our Nation first announced over 100 years ago the principle of the Monroe Doctrine and now we should step in and affirmatively show the world that communism is going to be stamped out in the Western Hemisphere as many years ago were the European efforts to colonize Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, we need a blockade of the ports of Cuba. We need to give active support to the freedom-loving elements operating against Castro. We need to move forward on a line that will show the Cuban people clearly what a monster they have in Fidel Castro as dictator of their country, and we should give support, help, and inspiration to those patriotic Cuban people who want to see their land free, wanting to stamp out the last vestige of communism in the island which America freed from the Old World in 1898.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Has the administration issued any kind of statement either favoring or opposing this resolution?

Mr. SELDEN. This resolution was originally introduced as House Concurrent Resolution 218 on the 13th of April. The executive branch made several recommendations to the committee, and the subcommittee rewrote the resolution in line with those recommendations. The resolution was then reintroduced, and that is the resolution before the House today.

Mr. YATES. Has there been a statement by the administration on the resolution before the House?

Mr. SELDEN. There is no objection on the part of the administration.

Mr. YATES. Has there been a statement by the administration? Ordinarily, the report on a bill would contain a statement by an executive branch agency. Has there been such a statement?

Mr. SELDEN. There has been no written statement as far as the present resolution is concerned. There was one on the first resolution, however.

Mr. YATES. But, as far as the House is concerned there is no information before the House as to whether the administration favors this program.

Mr. SELDEN. That is correct.

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

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the general rule with respect to concurrent resolutions is that the administration is not asked for a report or to give its approval or disapproval? This is an advisory statement by the Congress of its estimate of what is the wise course for the administration to follow in this field, and of course is based also on its estimate of public opinion in the country.

Mr. YATES. In earlier Congresses I remember, for example, when the Middle East resolution was before us, a statement was definitely made that the administration favors the Middle East resolution. That was a sense resolution. There was also an earlier resolution pertaining to the Far Eastern situation, but the attitude of the administration at that time was made known to the House. There is no statement before the House at the present time as to what the attitude of this administration is on this resolution.

Mr. JUDD. It is true that on various occasions an administration has suggested to the Congress that it would be helpful to it for Congress to pass a concurrent resolution on a given subject, and we have done that.

Mr. YATES. Has such a statement been made by this administration?

Mr. JUDD. The executive branch did not initiate this resolution. It was initiated in the Congress. When the Congress initiates a sense resolution like this, it is its prerogative to go ahead on its own. Generally it consults informally with the administration to make

sure that it will not interfere with or frustrate any of its policies. The present administration raised no objections to this resolution.

Mr. SELDEN. I can add that the committee had a verbal assurance from this administration that there is no objection to the resolution as far as the administration is concerned.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield to me, speaking for myself, I certainly think at this critical time and in the delicate situation we are in at present, I would want to have an affirmative statement from the administration rather than a verbal assurance that it has no objections.

Mr. JUDD. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois call up the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs and get his reaction rather than ask for a public statement from the executive branch. In certain circumstances, we are sometimes better off if the administration does not have to commit itself to the position stated in a resolution of this sort. It has more freedom in negotiations.

Mr. YATES. It seems to me, if I may reply to the gentleman, that on a matter as great and as important as this, we should have a statement from the executive branch.

Mr. JUDD. But not necessarily a public statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 226?

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on this vote, I ask for the yeas and nays and request that further proceedings on the resolution go over until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement of last Thursday, further proceedings will go over until next Wednesday.

UNIVERSITY FREE CUBA PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO CUBAN REFUGEE STUDENTS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 209) requesting the President to exercise his authority to operate a program, to be known as University Free Cuba, to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Whereas there has long been a bond of friendship between the people of Cuba and the people of the United States dating from the years when the American people did battle for Cuba's freedom; and

Whereas these bonds of friendship, woven in the history of our two countries, and strengthened by our close association as neighbors of similar interest and aspirations, should and will continue as a shield against any alien assault to render these bonds asunder by the propaganda of suspicion and hate; and

Whereas the great goals of freedom set by the patriot Jose Marti, envisioning a happy and free people governing themselves by the decisions of the ballot box and enjoying unhampered the rights of free speech and press, are just as revered today by the Cuban and American people, for they are the eternal goals of democracy; and

Whereas many thousands of Cubans are now residing in the United States in order to enjoy the individual freedoms which do not exist in their homeland; and

Whereas among these guests in the United States are many students whose education has been interrupted, and many professors from the University of Havana who have fled the tyranny and suppression which have replaced once again the sovereign right of the university to teach and maintain the hard-won freedoms of Jose Marti; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States recognize and esteem education at all levels, particularly the university level where international educational exchange programs have been operated for many years with great success; and

Whereas the aforementioned students, even if able to locate employment in order to continue their studies, will still need additional financial assistance to accomplish this: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to exercise his authority under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to operate a program to be known as "University Free Cuba", under which assistance in the pursuit of education will be furnished to college students in the United States from Cuba in need of such assistance because of the authoritarian restrictions placed upon the activities of its citizens by the Cuban regime, or because they are refugees in the United States from the present Government of Cuba. It is the sense of the Congress that existing college and university facilities, public or private, be utilized for this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to encourage the Organization of American States to undertake a study of all possible inter-American educational programs at the university level which might contribute to improved knowledge of inter-American affairs including an examination of the feasibility and desirability of establishing on a permanent basis a "University of the Americas".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is before us expresses the sense of Congress that the President exercise his authority under acts which are named to expend funds for assistance to certain Cuban refugees, namely students who need this assistance because of the authoritarian restrictions placed on the activities of those citizens by the Cuban Government or because they are refugees in the United States from the present Government of Cuba.

In a discussion of the importance of this resolution I would like to go back just a moment in order to bring us up to date. When Castro took over the Government of Cuba we had a transition period there for a while in which some of us said: "Let's wait and see." Others were happy, and others were sad. I was one of those who said, "Let's wait and see what happens."

Being from Miami, a point close to Cuba, the wait and see attitude was not

too long in evolving into "Now you know what the answer is" because refugees started streaming into Miami and other areas of the country at a very high rate.

It was not too long after the Castro regime took over that we in Florida and other areas of the country had the Batista refugees and also the Castro refugees. They were both seeking haven in the United States, and we got a tremendous number of them in Miami; but other areas of the country also received Cuban refugees.

These people came in seeking shelter, seeking homes, seeking freedom, running from threats of destruction, personal and otherwise. The local citizens tried to do all that it was possible to assist the refugees. The local Cuban community, the Latin community, took them into their homes, and local welfare organizations tried to provide for the refugees. The church, both Catholic and Protestant, did everything they possibly could to take care of these people. We had various citizens committees assisting in this problem. It was not too long before it became very obvious to those people who worked very, very hard in trying to solve the problem, that it was beyond the capability of the citizens of the local area. Under the leadership of the great newspaper, the Miami Herald a citizens group was formed to alert the people of the United States to the fact that this was really a national problem and not a problem for Miami and Florida, for New Orleans, New York, or other cities where they had communities of these Cuban refugees. That was the situation under the leadership and under the efforts of the local people whose resources were exhausted, when President Eisenhower, in November of 1960 appointed Tracy Voorhees who had great experience in refugee problems, to study it and report. Mr. Voorhees took over the job as the President's personal representative, and in a very short time it became obvious to him that this, indeed, was not a local problem but a national one.

The President said in appointing Mr. Voorhees to this task:

In appointing Mr. Voorhees for this task last November, and in giving him funds and added powers on December 2, I sought to express by effective action the interest which, as President of the United States, I felt in these troubled people, as well as my deep sympathy for them and desire to be of help to them.

This latest exodus of persons fleeing from Communist oppression is the first time in many years in which our Nation has become the country of first asylum for any such number of refugees. To grant such asylum is in accordance with the long-standing traditions of the United States. Our people opened their homes and hearts to the Hungarian refugees 4 years ago. I am sure we will do no less for these distressed Cubans.

The Voorhees' report was mainly to the point that the Cuban problem was a national problem, not a local problem. It focused the attention of the country on this problem and focused the utilization of our resources more effectively on the problem. In addition to pointing out in his report that this was a national problem, Mr. Voorhees urged certain things that were necessary: Housing, food,

clothing, and health facilities. Education was one of the areas that he dealt with specifically, and this is the main purpose of the present resolution.

At below college level in our area alone—I do not know what it was in other areas—there were 6,500 students who had to be taken into our schools. This created a difficult problem, but we were able to assimilate them and finally get some help for that purpose.

This resolution, however, deals specifically with education at the higher level. It has to do with those students who are already attending universities in the United States or those who are refugees and seek to continue their education in the United States. It was estimated that there were approximately 900 college students in the United States.

In January, after Mr. Voorhees made his final report, the suggestion was made to the administration that funds should be made available in the way of loans to assist these students to continue their education.

On January 20, President Kennedy appointed Mr. Abe Ribicoff the Secretary of HEW to continue as this Government's representative concerning the problems of the Cuban refugees. President Kennedy said at that time:

I want you to make concrete my concern and sympathy for those who have been forced from their homes in Cuba, and to assure them that we shall seek to expedite their voluntary return as soon as conditions there facilitate that. I believe that the present program can best be strengthened by directly bringing to bear your personal leadership and the vast welfare, health, and other skills of your Department. I am anxious that you make use of private services available for the refugees to the greatest extent possible.

Both here at home and abroad, I want to reemphasize most strongly the tradition of the United States as a humanitarian sanctuary, and the many times it has extended its hand and material help to those who are "exiles for conscience's sake." In the presently troubled world, we cannot be a peacemaker if we are not also the protector of those individuals as well as nations who cast with us their personal liberty and hopes for the future.

Subsequent to the appointment, Secretary Ribicoff went to Miami and made a personal investigation. He came back and reported to President Kennedy that urgent action was necessary. He acted very promptly. Part of his report to the President of the United States dealt with the areas of this resolution. The President then authorized the making of loans totaling \$100,000 to 328 Cuban students attending 15 colleges and universities throughout the country: Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.; Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.; Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.; Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, La.; New York University, New York, N.Y.; North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, Raleigh, N.C.; Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.; University of Alabama, University, Ala.; University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.; University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.; University of

Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, P.R.; University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, La.; and Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.

The interest-free loans made under this program make it possible for the students to continue their education.

We in the Committee on Foreign Affairs feel this is a very, very important thing that has to be done. The assistance program known as University Free Cuba makes it possible for the students who choose to come to the United States in the first instance to continue their education; it makes it possible for those who were driven away from Cuba to become educated in our universities.

To sum it up, Congress in expressing its approval of the President's program, is doing a thing of major importance. There are a lot of good people who come into the schools. They can be fine ambassadors when they return home to Cuba. If they decide to cast their lot with us, we are laying the foundation for their becoming good U.S. citizens.

In addition, the resolution recommends that action be taken to study education at university levels in the Western Hemisphere, to determine what improvements can be made, if any, in the inter-American effort at higher education. This overall study to include the feasibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas. This concept has been talked about for a long time, but we have never had the facts upon which to base a decision.

In full accord with that recommendation, the President offered, out of funds available to him, \$25,000 to the Organization of American States, to help defray the cost of this inter-American higher education survey. The resolution before you expresses the sense of the Congress in support of the President's program in that regard.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. May I ask, Is there any direct suggestion here that the United States immediately undertake an educational program of its own, in other words, even in existing universities or otherwise, for Cuban refugees?

Mr. FASCELL. The resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the President out of funds already available to him for this purpose make loans to those students to attend universities in the United States which they are now attending.

Mr. LINDSAY. Is this an authorization bill?

Mr. FASCELL. No, it is not.

Mr. LINDSAY. Will an authorization bill be coming to the Congress?

Mr. FASCELL. That I do not know. It depends on the extent of the problem in the next fiscal year.

Mr. LINDSAY. Is there any discretionary power in the Executive at the present time to find funds to make loans immediately for this purpose?

Mr. FASCELL. Certainly.

Mr. LINDSAY. To what extent, financially, does our Government intend to obligate itself in this regard?

Mr. FASCELL. I am advised that loans have been made so far to the extent of \$100,000.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. No further authorization is needed. The President has the authority under the Information and Educational Exchange Act. He might have to get more money to make the additional loans, but he has the authorization, if he desires to make them.

Mr. FASCELL. I thought I made that clear.

Mr. LINDSAY. I simply support this resolution and I am trying to clarify some aspects of it, because I am interested in the subject of these Cuban refugees and their welfare. Does the gentleman know the number of Cuban refugees in this country at the present time, and what are their age groups; that is to say, how many are of primary or secondary or college school level?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not have the exact figures, but the best estimates are available, and I will be glad to furnish them. It has been estimated that there are over 60,000 Cuban refugees in the United States. In the Miami area alone there are about 6,500 attending public school and private elementary and secondary schools, and there are approximately 900 Cuban refugee college students in the United States.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are not all attending public schools.

Mr. FASCELL. Oh, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, 3,000 are attending public schools and between 2,500 and 3,000 are attending parochial schools.

Mr. FASCELL. That is true. The impact has been absorbed not only by the public schools but by the parochial schools.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, have there been a certain number of universities that have come forward dealing with this problem?

Mr. FASCELL. I just read the whole list of the universities, and I would not want to do it again, but I would point out to the gentleman that the list of universities participating in this program is in the RECORD. I believe the only one in New York is NYU.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, what is the purpose of this resolution? If we have already spent \$100,000 on 328 students, what is the purpose of this resolution, to legalize something that has already been done?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman knows perfectly well that you cannot legalize anything by a sense resolution. At the time the resolution was introduced by me there was no such program. I might say to the distinguished gentleman, we

feel that it is important at this point and time to express the difference, that is, that Congress express a difference in our feelings and our treatment between the Cuban people as such and the Cuban Government as such; and that we emphasize to the world what happens under our way of life and what happens under the Communist way of life. That is one of the purposes of this resolution and why the resolution came up immediately after the preceding resolution which I cosponsored with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and which asks for OAS sanctions against Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. Could this be considered an invitation for them to come over here in greater and greater numbers for free education in this country?

Mr. FASCELL. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa knows that refugees from the tyranny of communism in Cuba do not need any greater invitation than that to live, and they are coming over here by rowboats and other means, and I imagine they would swim if they could. So, I do not think this resolution is going to add unduly to the burden we already have as a free country, which is that we for one of the few times in history have become the primary sanctuary of a people who are fleeing Communist tyranny. In other words, to be specific and to answer the gentleman's question, I do not believe the resolution is an open-door invitation which would make Cubans flee their country. Their primary motive will be to escape tyranny and live in freedom.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is there any control over the choice of universities if this program continues, or is that a choice to be freely made?

Mr. FASCELL. That is a choice to be freely made. As the gentleman can see from the list of those universities, they are scattered all over the country.

Mr. ADAIR. As long as the university qualifies and the student wishes to go there, he would be permitted under this program?

Mr. FASCELL. That is right. The loan is made to the institution or in conjunction with the institution.

Mr. ADAIR. Secondly, are we to understand that these loans are to be repaid?

Mr. FASCELL. That is right; they are non-interest-bearing loans which will require repayment starting the first year after graduation. I think that is the only way to do it.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. As he knows, he and I have discussed this problem which is of great concern to my own alma mater, the University of Florida. I am particularly pleased to note that the resolution calls for a more detailed study of the future educational needs of our Latin Ameri-

can neighbors. The gentleman will recall that I introduced legislation that would be, I think, of particular interest in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], because I know he is going to give me a hearing on my bill, which I hope will be helpful in this matter.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank my colleague from Florida for those comments. I know he has long been a leader in this area and I am very appreciative of his support of this resolution.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida for bringing this resolution to the House, and also to our colleague from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], the chairman of this subcommittee. I think this is one of the ways to proceed to show the people of these oppressed countries that the people of the United States are friendly and that the Congress of the United States has a real interest in their destiny. I think there has been probably too little of this done in the past and I am hoping there can be more done in the future. I say that as a result of a trip I made to the Soviet Union in 1957 and my observations there. I saw literally hundreds of delegations that were brought to Moscow and conducted through the university. I visited the University of Moscow one day to see what was going on and while I was there delegation after delegation from these foreign countries was being conducted through the university. I understand many of them are brought over there and are educated and go back to their respective countries and become subversive tools for the Communist doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a real step forward. It is, you might say, a formalizing of something I know we are doing. But I am particularly interested in the suggestion here that a University of the Americas be established. We know of the university that is being established in Hawaii and the one in Beirut, which has been in existence for many years and of the tremendous impact that these American-type universities have in making friends for America. I think for too long we have overlooked South America and I am glad to see this step being taken now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, and I make that demand to keep the record straight. The gentleman did not qualify.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California demanded a second and it has been already ordered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman did not qualify. He did not say he was opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I demand

that the Chair ask if the gentleman is opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized. Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is the ruling on my demand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's demand is too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say the Speaker does not need to ask one who demands a second to qualify; that is, whether he is opposed to the bill.

I had assumed that one who demanded a second would not do so unless he could qualify. I was not advised the gentleman who demanded a second favored the resolution until I just asked him.

It is true, under rule XXVII, that it is not the duty of the Chair on a motion to suspend to call for a second, but it is the custom of the Speaker to ask whether a second is demanded. The precedents show that, when a second is demanded, an opponent of the bill is entitled to recognition, and it is true that, when so opposed, a member of the committee reporting the bill is entitled to preference, but he is not entitled to preference unless he is opposed to the bill.

It has also been held that the right to demand a second is not necessarily precluded by preliminary debate. Anyone interested in precedents will find some in 5 Hinds, sections 6799 to 6808.

Even though it has been customary for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to monopolize the time given for debate, I had not anticipated that any member of that committee would hog the debate on a bill as important as House Concurrent Resolution 226 or on House Concurrent Resolution 209, which, while not as important or far reaching, is, nevertheless, a continuation of the administration's program to spend more and more money, though it is true that on 209 the idea seems to have originated with the Committee on Foreign Affairs rather than with the administration.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I do not think there is any need to add to what has been said here, except to say I am in support of the resolution. I was hoping to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Is there any limitation as to the amount of a loan given to any individual student?

Mr. MAILLIARD. There is nothing in this that would put on a limitation. It requests the President to exercise powers he already has. I do not know whether under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 or under the Mutual Security Act of 1954 there were any such restrictions. I cannot answer that.

Mr. HOEVEN. What guarantee do we have that the loan will be repaid?

Mr. MAILLIARD. The same guarantee that anyone makes when he agrees to repay a loan.

Mr. HOEVEN. That does not afford much of a guarantee for repayment when you consider that these students will likely return to Cuba once a stable government is reestablished.

Mr. SELDEN. I doubt that under stable circumstances the loans would not be repaid.

Mr. HOEVEN. If and when they go back to Cuba without paying off their loans, what guarantee do you have that the loans will ever be repaid?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the majority leader and several Members on this side, and for the convenience of the Members, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the answer is, At the present time loans are made to institutions, and the institutions in turn make the loans to the students. This is the type of control we are trying to maintain.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would like to pursue the inquiry a bit further. Assuming some of the students do not repay their loans before they return to Cuba, after a stable government is established on the island, what guarantee do we have that such loans will ever be repaid?

Mr. FASCELL. Personally, as I explained, promissory notes will be signed. I do not think we would deny them the right to an exit permit just because they have not paid, but I would say it is improbable.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield; if the situation in Cuba becomes stabilized with a free government there, a free society, so that these students can go back and make available to their own people the skills and, I hope, the favorable attitudes they have received from their experiences in our American colleges, I would be glad to introduce a resolution to forgive those loans, if necessary, because we would save more every day from stabilization of the situation in Cuba than all the loans would amount to.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want any time.

Mr. FASCELL. I yield the 3 minutes then to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. In reply to the gentleman from Minnesota, we should fully understand that the number of students getting loans can be increased. There is no limitation as to the number of student refugees coming into this country from Cuba. Who would not want to enter the United States as a refugee, or otherwise, to get a free education at American taxpayers' expense?

Furthermore, there is no guarantee that any of the loans will ever be repaid. The minute a stable government is reestablished in Cuba, it is only natural that the beneficiaries of our generous loan program will return to Cuba and if they have not repaid their loans before they depart our shores, the American

taxpayer will be holding the proverbial sack. That is nothing new for Uncle Sam.

Mr. GROSS. I have listened to the gentleman from Minnesota making the same old tired statement that if we just educate some more people and send them back to their countries, everything will be perfection.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. That was not my statement. I said that if the situation in Cuba were stabilized in such a way that these students could go back, we would save money by forgiving the loans.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, would you?

Mr. JUDD. Rather than spending the amounts of money we have to spend now for hemisphere defense because of Communist forces in Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me how you would save any money in that way.

Mr. JUDD. If the situation in Cuba were stable, the savings in the defense budget of the United States would be very great, indeed.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows we are not going to stabilize the situation in Cuba in that way.

Mr. JUDD. That is why the gentleman's question, I thought, was somewhat hypothetical.

Mr. GROSS. And the answer that the gentleman from Minnesota gives is a thousand percent hypothetical.

Mr. JUDD. I never suggested sending these students back to stabilize the situation. I said that if and when it is stabilized so that they can go back, that will be so much better a situation, that it will cost us less money.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, sure, and you know what happens if the dog stops while chasing the rabbit. We are now asked to put our stamp of approval on the establishment of another—what is it—still another university? Is that what you are out to do, I ask the gentleman from Florida? Is this University of the Americas another foot in the door?

Mr. FASCELL. The answer is "No." The Organization of American States is being asked to make a study to find out whether or not anybody is interested.

Mr. GROSS. Plenty of people are interested in foreign countries in getting a free education at the expense of American taxpayers. They are already coming over here by the hundreds in the student exchange program. They are being paid \$6 and \$7 a day plus tuition, plus transportation and everything else. How far in God's name do you want to go with this business? How much of this can the taxpayers of this country stand? Incidentally, I noticed a story in a newspaper last week, I believe it was the Washington Post, where a fellow, a resident of the District of Columbia went down to Richmond, Va., and recruited a 19-year-old girl for immoral purposes. This fellow was charged with violation of the Mann Act. His mother was operating a house of assignation in the District of Columbia—and she testified in court that she was catering to foreign exchange students.

Why another program when the foreign student exchange program is in operation? Let us not spread this all over the country so that no one will know what is taking place. I doubt if many Members of the House or of the other body know now what is being done in all facets of this business of educating foreigners. Let us keep this thing within bounds. I see no reason for this resolution. In my opinion, it is just another foot in the door looking to the establishment of still another program to be paid for by our people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, there are presently in the United States many Cuban citizens who have fled their homeland in the face of Castro's oppressions. Included among these refugees are a number of Cubans attending colleges and universities who need assistance in order to continue their studies. President Kennedy in March of this year announced the extension of loans to these students to enable them to pursue their education at the colleges or universities they are presently attending.

House Concurrent Resolution 209 simply endorses the action of the President and asks that the operation of this program be continued and that it be known as University Free Cuba.

The resolution further requests that the President encourage the Organization of American States to undertake a study of the possible inter-American educational programs at the university level which might contribute to improved knowledge of inter-American affairs. This the President has done with a \$25,000 grant to the OAS to help finance the cost of the study. This resolution provides further that in the carrying out of the study by the OAS an examination be included of the feasibility and desirability of establishing on a permanent basis a University of the Americas.

There is a definite need for improved knowledge of inter-American affairs as a means of creating closer cultural ties among the peoples of the Americas. Therefore, I urge the support of this legislation which is designed to provide an effective exchange of inter-American knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, House Resolution 209.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that two-thirds appeared to have voted in favor of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement, the vote goes over until Wednesday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 209.

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

There was no objection.

CLARIFICATION OF THE TERM "ORGANIZE"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the Consent Calendar today is H.R. 3247, a bill to clarify the meaning of the term "organize" as it is used in section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code. This section is part of the Smith Act of 1940 which outlaws conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Because a number of groups and individuals interested in civil liberties have expressed concern over the legislative treatment which this bill has received, including its consideration on the Consent Calendar, I would like to take a moment to go into its background.

In 1940 Congress enacted the so-called Smith Act making it a crime for a person to commit any of three defined acts. The first was to knowingly or willfully advocate the overthrow, by force or violence, of the Government of the United States; the second was to organize any society or group to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of our Government; the third was to be a member of or be affiliated with any such society or group.

This statutory language was subjected to judicial interpretation in the case of *Yates v. United States* (354 U.S. 298) decided by the Supreme Court in 1957. In this case the defendants had been convicted after jury trial on a single count of indictment charging them with conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and with organizing groups for the same purpose. The Supreme Court reversed the convictions, holding that as to "advocacy" there must be actual indictment to action, and that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party, which took place in 1945, and not to a continuing process of organization.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 3247 seeks to counteract the effect of the Yates decision by defining the term "organize" to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members, rather than merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States. Many Members of this body, including my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who has asked that he be associated with my remarks, are keenly aware of legislative efforts to rebuke the Supreme Court, especially after Court decisions in cases involving civil liberties. On many occasions I have voted against such legislation and

I would do so today, by interposing my objection to the bill before us, if I regarded this measure as simply a slap at the Supreme Court of the United States.

I think, however, that a broader definition of the term "organize" is justified. Although the Department of Justice of the present administration does not appear to have been called on for its position, which is unfortunate, enactment of identical legislation was favored by the previous administration and presumably this same sentiment prevails. My personal view, which I know is shared by a number of my colleagues, is that legislation which limits individual activity, regardless of the extent or justification in terms of national security, should be the product of current hearings and should be accorded something other than the perfunctory consideration afforded by the Consent Calendar procedure.

A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. NORRIS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us from the western reclamation States and my colleagues from the Tennessee Valley will always be deeply grateful to George W. Norris. For as we know, the late great Senator from Nebraska contributed mightily to the program of wise and proper development and conservation of our natural resources during his 40 years in Congress.

He is known as the father of TVA, and he coauthored, with our distinguished Speaker of the House, the Rural Electrification Act.

Senator Norris was also concerned with that other vital resource—people, our human resources. The Norris-La Guardia Anti-Injunction Act—considered by labor as its magna carta—stands as another of his major contributions, freeing workingmen from tyrannical injunctions and outlawing the evil "yellow dog" contract.

It was President Franklin D. Roosevelt who described Senator Norris as "the very perfect, gentle knight of American progressive ideals," whose life was an "able and heroic fight on behalf of the average citizen."

It is thus fitting indeed that in this year of the 100th anniversary of the birth of George W. Norris, there will be a centennial observance to pay tribute to his memory. And it is also fitting that a major event in this observance will be held here in the Nation's Capital, where Senator George Norris made so many lasting contributions to the benefit of the people of our Nation.

The event will be the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference, to be held May 16 and 17 at the Willard Hotel. The letterhead of the group

sponsoring the conference lists 10 prominent individuals as initial sponsors of the Norris centennial. They are Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Speaker Sam Rayburn; Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky; Senator Lister Hill of Alabama; Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Murray Lincoln, president of Nationwide Insurance Companies; George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association; and Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers.

These initial sponsors have been joined by some 200 others, including Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Chief Justice Earl E. Warren, many Members of Congress from both parties, and other prominent individuals in government and across the Nation in various fields of endeavor.

The enthusiastic response to news of the Norris centennial observance is an indicator of the great esteem in which Norris is held by our Nation. So, too, is the splendid gathering of speakers who will join in the tribute to the memory of Senator Norris on May 16 and 17.

The list includes Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Gov. Frank Morrison of Nebraska, and Theodore C. Sorensen, Special Counsel to the President, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Special Assistant to the President.

They and other speakers will pay deserved tribute to the late Senator from Nebraska, will honor his name, and, at the same time, will focus needed attention on the principles for which George W. Norris fought throughout his long and magnificent public life.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Roscoe Fleming entitled "George W. Norris—Great Man in Politics," from the November 21, 1960, issue of Union News, official publication of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union; as well as excerpts of statements by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on Senator George W. Norris:

GEORGE W. NORRIS: GREAT MAN IN POLITICS
(By Roscoe Fleming)

America's greatest political man of the 20th century, saving only Presidents, was a plain-featured, stocky, old-shoe sort of fellow from the Nebraska prairies. Certainly he was the Nation's most useful U.S. Senator of the century.

He was George William Norris, and he spent 40 years in Congress working for the interest of the Nation's plain people. Though he never gave an inch for political approbation, a half dozen great achievements bear his name, any one of them enough to make a man's lasting reputation.

In the labor field he's best known as the principal sponsor of the Norris-La Guardia Act, sometimes known as labor's magna carta.

Norris also fought almost alone through a dozen heartbreaking years for what became the great Tennessee Valley Authority, America's most magnificent conservation achievement both as respects people and

other natural resources; now a monument and a model throughout the world as a high point of democratic achievement. Finally, after saving the project again and again, he got the pen with which Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the TVA Act.

He also did more than any other Congressman in establishing the Rural Electrification Administration that brought light and lightened labor to 2 million farm households.

This man ended the absurdity of a possibly repudiated Congress and President holding on to office for a full 4 months after an election. Now the new Congress and President, bearing the mandate of the people, go into office in January.

Again, he created the first one-house State legislature in the United States, that of Nebraska; and it is largely due to him that Nebraska is, so far, the only State that is also a complete public-power province.

He did his best to strike the shackles of the poll tax off people who wish to register and vote for President and Vice President. This reform hasn't come yet.

Perhaps his achievement which accomplished least is his earliest—striking down the rules by which the Speaker of the House was the absolute czar of the House.

In the long half-century since, the "power elite" of the House have merely retreated to a previously prepared position in the Rules Committee, as we've been poignantly reminded the past few months. This one of Norris' battles—that of full democratization of the House rules—is yet to win.

Why all this at this time?

Because the new year will be Norris' centenary year, and unless the people and the peoples' organizations get busy, it will go almost unremarked. Certainly those he fought all his life, hope it will.

He was born July 11, 1861, in the clan-gorous beginning of the Civil War, of poor, hard-working farm parents in Sandusky County, Ohio. His father died of a farm accident when the little boy was not quite 4 years old.

He never knew anything but hard work, lightened only by a loving mother and sisters. He literally fought his way through school ending by working his way through a law course at Valparaiso University, Indiana, a "poor boy" school where room and board were \$1.60 a week—but you got the \$1.60 at a dime an hour or less, for the hardest kind of work.

He spent a year teaching in raw new Washington State, sleeping in a big box filled with straw, in an abandoned section hands' bunkhouse. Later he settled in Nebraska and slowly worked up to a 7 year's judgeship, then to 10 years in the House, the scene of his historic battle with "Czar" Cannon; then to the Senate.

In early years an ardent standpat Republican, he grew so far out of that mold that the national Republican power elite sought by crooked means to beat him; finally he went all-out independent and ran that way. He supported more of F.D.R.'s New Deal than many Democrats.

The way he got interested in labor's plight and became one of its stoutest champions is told in a fine new book of labor history, "The Lean Years," by Irving Bernstein.

The lean years were those of 1920-33, when the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover triumvirate reigned supreme for the "power elite," and working people took the short end of the stick.

Norris, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, went to Pennsylvania in 1926 to investigate the corrupt Republican primary in which "Boss" Vare, later unseated, had beaten Gifford Pinchot. Norris stumped the State for William B. Wilson, the Democratic candidate, who almost won.

In the course of the campaign he got a thorough education in woes of the coal

miners: "16 tons and what do you get? One day older and deeper in debt."

One of his guides through the coal country was a man who'd been so thoroughly wrecked by a mine explosion that he'd become a cripple, dependent on charity and his relatives. The latter's son jalloped the two to a weed-grown graveyard where they saw an epitaph, self-written, so it was said, by the man beneath the stone:

"For 40 years beneath the sod with pick and spade I did my task. The coal king's slave, but now, thank God, I'm free at last."

The more Norris found out about the conditions in which working people existed, the more furious he got. Labor organization was fought by every means from blacklisting to starvation to beating.

The great weapon of the operator was the injunction, granted at every request by complacent judges, State and Federal.

Bernstein relates that there were injunctions forbidding persons to pray on the roadside or to sing in groups; that required pickets to be American citizens or to speak the English language; that denied the rights of free assembly.

Most significant perhaps were the injunctions granted to enforce yellow-dog contracts—contracts of employment which compelled the worker to swear, as a condition of employment, never to join a labor organization. This was known as the American plan.

Norris went back to Washington. The fight took him nearly 7 years, amid discouragements too long to detail here. But he got the act through the Senate, and Fiorello La Guardia, later New York's fighting mayor, got it through the House. Hoover signed it only because both Houses had passed it by more than enough to override a veto.

The fight for the Tennessee Valley Authority was even longer, overlapping that for the Norris-La Guardia Act at both ends. It began when the Harding administration of fragrant memory tried to sell out the great works built at Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River during World War I. (Actually Theodore Roosevelt saved the seed of TVA long before, when he vetoed an act to give that waterpower away.)

Norris time and again prevented the sale, and got through one TVA act that was pocket-vetoed by Calvin Coolidge and another that was just plain vetoed by Herbert Hoover.

Finally he saw his triumph under F. D. R., and TVA became a shining light for democratic emulation all over the world, a savior of a ruined region, an enormous source of national * * * safety, as in World War II and Korea. * * *

The REA of course has also provided an immense economic stimulus as well as modernizing the homes and barns of 2 million farm families to make them income to buy the products of factory workers. (Once, talking to Norris in his last year, I asked him which of his achievements he thought would live longer. He hesitated, then in a bashful sort of small-boy voice he said: "You forgot the REA.")

I did not know him so well as some, but in a lifetime of reporting he is about the only man who talked exactly the same whether with feet cocked up on the table in his Senate committee room, or in his living room in McCook, Nebr., or on a rostrum before many thousands.

He was defeated, to Nebraska's loss, in his last campaign at 80, and died 2 years later after completing an autobiography that is a plain man's testament.

We shall not see his like again. Nor shall we see a fitting memorial for this great man of the people, unless the people see to it.

He is commemorated by Norris Dam and powerhouse of the TVA, and his Nebraska friends intend to name a reclamation lake after him and to preserve his home as a

shrine. But for national honors, little has as yet been done.

Labor and the great farmers' and cooperative and conservation organizations to whose causes he devoted his life, might well see to it. A monument in the Nation's Capital, or a resumption of Norris' forward march, such as a giant power public grid spanning the West and maybe the Nation? The time is pretty short, too, until July 11, although the whole year is Norris' centenary. And for that matter his name will glow brighter down the American years whether we, his beneficiaries, do anything about it now or not.

Roosevelt on Norris

1. The place: McCook, Nebr.

The time: September 29, 1932.

The occasion: Franklin D. Roosevelt, Democratic Party candidate for President of the United States, had this to say of Senator George W. Norris, Republican, of Nebraska:

"We should remember that the ultimate analysis of history asks the answer to questions which are not concerned so much with what you and I, in these modern days, call ballyhoo, or headlines, as they are with much simpler fundamentals.

"History asks: 'Did the man have integrity? Did the man have unselfishness? Did the man have courage? Did the man have consistency?'

"And if the individual under the scrutiny of the historic microscope measured up to an affirmative answer to these questions, then history has set him down as great indeed in the pages of all the years to come.

"There are few statesmen in America today who so definitely and clearly measure up to an affirmative answer to the four questions as does the senior Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris. In his rare case, history has already written the verdict.

"Not you alone in Nebraska, but we in every part of the Nation, give full recognition to his integrity, to his unselfishness, to his courage, and to his consistency. He stands forth—whether we agree with him on all the little details or not—he stands forth as the very perfect, gentle knight of American progressive ideals.

"I am hoping that at this moment thousands of boys and girls—thousands of first voters—are listening to my words, for I should like them to give some thought and some study to the very remarkable public service of the man in whose hometown I now stand.

"I should like them to read of the able and heroic fight on behalf of the average citizen which he has made during his long and honorable career. I should like them to know that sometimes he has made this fight with his party, and sometimes—as now—against the leader of his party.

"I should like them to know that always he has been thinking of the rights and welfare of the average citizen, of the farmer, the laborer, the small businessman—yes, and of the rights and welfare of those who have been born to or have acquired greater wealth.

"But especially it has been an unselfish fight, and directed to the fact that it is the little fellow who has the fewest friends in high places, and that too often it is the little fellow who has been forgotten by his government."

2. The place: Omaha, Nebraska.

The time: October 10, 1936.

The occasion: President Roosevelt, campaigning for reelection, declared:

"First, a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope it will be heard by the citizens of the other 47 States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

"On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in

every community—a man old in years but young in heart—a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience—and the senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the Nation by the people of Nebraska—George W. Norris.

"Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.

"But Senator Norris' name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of nonparticipation in State elections I have made—and so long as he lives I always will make—one magnificently justified exception.

"George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines. In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who, like him, have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

"He is one of the major prophets of America.

"Help this great American to continue a historic career of service.

"Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole if it places this great American above partisanship and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States."

3. The place: Washington, D.C.

The time: December 10, 1942.

The occasion: a testimonial dinner in honor of Senator George W. Norris heard this letter from President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"DEAR GEORGE: You can understand, I am sure, why it isn't possible for me to attend dinners these days, nor do I need to tell you of the pleasure it would give me to be with the friends who are gathering in your honor tonight.

"It would ever be a privilege, as well as a pleasure to join with any group of fellow Americans whose purpose is to recognize your long and faithful service as guardian of the public interest. Of all that you have done for your country and for your fellow citizens as the tireless champion of liberalism, I have spoken many times, publicly and privately.

"Through twoscore years you have been a tower of strength in every storm. I can only reiterate what I have often said before—that in our national history we have had few elder statesmen who, like you, have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

"In these critical days we need your counsel as never before and the youth of the land particularly need the force of your example which has been as a beacon light of righteousness for more than a generation.

"Always affectionately,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the worldwide challenge of communism must be fought by the free nations with alertness, diligence, and intelligence if we are to win.

The temptation to adopt some of the more direct tactics of the Communists in this fight is almost overwhelming. The worth of the principles of a free society—when faced with subversive and

conspiratorial tactics—is being tested daily. Throughout the world we face Communist military moves, usually by the use of native revolutionists as a front. Korea, Indochina, Laos, and Cuba present examples of Communist methods. Before any of these military moves were made, however, there was a time period of Communist subversion and infiltration—a softening up of the existing structures of government. During this softening up process, the Communist infiltrators used the liberties of a free society—such as free speech, free assembly, and the free press to lay the conspiratorial foundations for Communist governments, which, when once established, proceeded to abolish these selfsame freedoms. This method of operation presents to democracies their greatest dilemma and their severest test.

How can we preserve the freedoms of speech, assembly, and press when they are being used to undermine the very foundations of our free society? That is the difficult question we seek to answer.

The problem of procedure by a congressional committee dealing with the problems of Communist activity in the United States has concerned a great many Members of the House. Over the years, I have joined with other Members in criticizing some of the procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I find that I am still critical of certain procedures under which the committee operates.

I have been critical of intemperate statements by staff members in the past, as well as some of the committee members. Notwithstanding these criticisms, I am aware of the need for investigation by a congressional committee of some type, into those movements of the extreme left or extreme right.

Perhaps a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee could be the answer to this problem. The term "un-American" is too vague to lend itself to clarity of meaning. Supreme Court decisions have certainly cast doubt on the definitions which develop in regard to what the specific meaning of the word "un-American" happens to be. Other Supreme Court decisions have overturned citations for contempt which have originated in this committee on the grounds of improper procedure or unconstitutionality. These decisions are controversial in some quarters, nevertheless they cannot be lightly dismissed.

I do not join with any group, whether they be from the extreme left or extreme right, in their vicious personal attacks on either the members of the Supreme Court or the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe that the members of the judicial and legislative groups are men of sincere dedication to the preservation of the basic liberties guaranteed by our great Constitution. I certainly do not always agree with the wisdom of their decisions or actions, but I refuse to attack them on the basis of their motives.

I have discussed these matters many times with my colleague from California, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, who serves as one of the Democratic Members of the House Committee on Un-American Ac-

tivities. Mr. DOYLE is, in my opinion, one of the most dedicated Members of the House of Representatives. His loyalty to constitutional principles is unquestioned. He is a fine American. The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has been under vicious personal attack because of his membership on the Committee on Un-American Activities. He could have solved this problem at any time by resignation from the committee. He would have been, in such an event, no longer a target for abuse.

Along with many other Members of the House of Representatives, I urged the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] to stay on the committee. In view of the fact that the committee has been reestablished every Congress since it was made a permanent committee and there being little likelihood that it would be abolished, it has seemed to many Members important that Members of Congress who were fairminded and possessed of judicial qualifications retain their membership on the committee.

Certainly Congressman CLYDE DOYLE possesses the qualifications noted. In my opinion, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has exercised a moderating influence on the procedures of this committee. He has studied the rules of the committee in regard to the rights of witnesses to appear in prepublic hearings, to have the advice of counsel in regard to their legal rights and to receive fair treatment during their appearance as a witness.

As a result of Congressman DOYLE'S study of the rules of procedure, the Committee on Un-American Activities has accepted various revisions of its rules and, I understand, that new and improved rules are now under consideration and will soon be printed.

In a democracy we deal with facts and situations as they are and not as we would like them to be. We move forward slowly through time periods of education, persuasion, compromise, and finally, action. Each of these four steps are partial steps; they are never the full stride which contestants on either side of an issue would like to see made. The education may be inadequate, the persuasion may be weak because of disunity in public opinion or fears of real or fancied dangers. The compromise may be much less than the contestants on either side desire and the action taken may be partial in nature rather than complete. This is the procedure of the democratic process. It is slow. It is at times frustrating. In the face of this slowness and frustration, we are prone to compare the quick and decisive actions of the totalitarian governments. We are tempted sometimes to adopt their methods to obtain their efficiency. When we are tempted let us examine closely the other items which must be included in the totalitarian package; that is, loss of individual freedom, liberty, and dignity and the degradation of all our moral and spiritual values under the brutish impact of the police state.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I append to my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post under date of April 17, 1961.

GOLDEN RULE

Representative CLYDE DOYLE extended to House Members the other day an invitation which ought not to be ignored—to suggest rules for the conduct of the Committee on Un-American Activities. He did this in his capacity as chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Rules and in terms indicating a genuine desire to meet criticisms of the committee and improve its procedure. In the same spirit, and in spite of the fact that Mr. DOYLE specified that "this invitation is not extended to any private group but only to the Members of the House," we offer some observations with due deference.

Rules are not the real remedy for the problem presented by the Un-American Activities Committee. Its trouble lies more in what it tries to do than in how it does it. Often it aims to try men for opinions, associations and activities which are not forbidden by law and to subject them to punishment by publicity for conduct which the Constitution forbids Congress to declare criminal. Its power to subpoena citizens and hold them up to obloquy operates, we think, to inhibit the freedom of expression which is basic to the democratic process.

It is hard to think of a procedural rule that could curb this tendency. Procedure that would ensure a fair trial would cripple the normal and proper investigating functions of the committee. What is needed is not formalization of proceedings as though the committee were a court but relaxed modes of inquiry so that the committee can do its legitimate work effectively without treading on the rights of individuals.

The only rule likely to bring this about is the Golden Rule—a rule of consideration for the liberties and sensibilities of others. If committee members will remember that they are neither censors nor inquisitors but simply agents of the House of Representatives empowered to obtain information relevant to the discharge of the House's legislative responsibilities, they will cure the conduct which has brought the committee into such widespread disrepute. An indispensable condition of the power they exercise is forbearance and respect for the right of freemen to hold diverse views.

NEEDED AMENDMENTS TO THE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a bill which is designed to encourage voluntary pension plans for self-employed individuals by affording them an equitable tax standing with wage earners.

This Chamber has considered this proposal before and a proposal of this type, the Keogh-Simpson bill, was approved by the House on March 16 in the 86th Congress. Among those submitted for the consideration of the House earlier was one proposed by my distinguished predecessor, the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed, in 1951 and 1952.

Mr. Speaker, present law provides that amounts set aside by an employer to an employee's credit in a retirement fund are not subject to Federal income tax until they are withdrawn or made avail-

able. Without this tax deferment, these amounts would be subject to current taxation. However, this advantage does not cover self-employed persons, such as proprietors of small businesses, doctors, lawyers, and farmers.

This proposal would permit self-employed persons to defer payment of Federal income tax on earnings set aside for their retirement up to 10 percent of annual income, provided such amounts do not exceed \$2,500.

The Treasury Department raised objections to a similar proposal and in so doing suggested that an alternative be drafted "to secure the tax relief for their retirement saving only by establishing qualified pension plans providing comparable benefits for their own employees on a nondiscriminatory basis."

The present version of the bill takes advantage of the advice of the Treasury Department, as developed by Senate hearings last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which suggests an amendment to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to clarify the technical information required by section 7, and I would like to make explanations.

Subsection (b) of section 7 should be amended because industry-wide, multi-employer plans do not have records of employees—they only have records of beneficiaries.

Subsection (c) of section 7 should be recast. The way it is now worded is ambiguous. A plan might be funded, that is, pensions may be provided under a modified pay-as-you-go system through the establishing of a liability to be carried on the books of the company for this specific purpose. The costs are then met, as incurred, by the allocation of assets against this liability. The reserve assets so set up would still belong to the general assets of the company.

Subsections (f) (1), (f) (1) (D), and (f) (2) of section 7 need to be amended since their meaning is misleading. At present, they confuse the method of funding and medium of funding as being one and the same thing.

When subsection (b) of section 7 is recast, subsection (f) (3) will have to be changed to conform with it.

Under the section on definitions, section 3(a), it is necessary to add three of the terms used in the act. Without clarification, these terms are easily misconstrued.

I strongly urge the Committee on Education and Labor to give prompt consideration to these suggested changes.

LINCOLN—A CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, I had the distinct

privilege of hearing a scholarly address by Prof. William Wolf, professor of theology at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., during the last meeting for my tenure of office on May 10.

Professor Wolf spoke eloquently on Lincoln as a Christian statesman, and since I found so much in this address which should be considered as America gropes for a moral tone to characterize its position of leadership in the world today, I want to share it with those who could not be present at the meeting:

"The grandest figure on the crowded canvas of the nineteenth century"—this was Walt Whitman's description of Abraham Lincoln. His judgment has not only been sustained by history, it has been deepened by the perspective of the 150 years since his birth. Professor Randall, one of the greatest Lincoln scholars, concluded his study of the Presidential years with a chapter entitled "God's Man."

"Lincoln," he wrote, "was a man of more intense religiosity than any other President the United States ever had. * * * Surely, among successful American politicians, Lincoln is unique in the way he breathed the spirit of Christ while disregarding the letter of Christian doctrine." (J. Randall, "Lincoln the President," IV, pp. 375 ff.)

The focus of our present interest is Lincoln as a Christian statesman and Lincoln's religion as illuminating the spiritual center of American history. Let us allow Lincoln himself to sharpen our focus. On that long, circuitous train ride from Springfield to Washington in 1861 the President-elect spoke many times about the Nation as God's instrument and about himself as open to God's guidance and direction.

He spoke to the New Jersey legislators of his boyhood excitement in reading about the Revolutionary War and the promise in it for "all the people of the world for all time to come." Then he added: "I shall be most happy indeed if I shall be an humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty, and of this, his almost chosen people, for perpetuating the object of that great struggle." ("Collected Works of A. Lincoln," IV, p. 236. Rutgers Press.)

These two themes—"this Nation under God" and Lincoln as "God's instrument"—can be traced through the Presidential years as they increase in depth and in consecration and as they more and more penetrate each other.

After a period of doubting Lincoln had early manifested an intellectual interest in the Christian faith although he never became an actual member of a church. After the death of their son Eddie in 1850 the Lincolns began attending the Presbyterian Church in Springfield. They continued this regular church attendance in Washington. The chief inspiration religiously for Lincoln, however, came from the Bible. He had a minute and profound knowledge of its contents, greater by far than that of most present-day clergymen.

Lincoln enjoyed quoting a text as his immediate response to something said to him. He deflated the somewhat pompous Lord Lyons, the British Ambassador, who made an official call to announce formally to the President in the name of his gracious sovereign Queen Victoria the betrothal of the Prince of Wales to the Princess Alexander of Denmark. Said Lincoln to the bachelor Ambassador when he had finished his communication, "Go thou and do likewise."

Next to this type of repartee, he liked to quote Scripture in answer to Scripture. Hugh McCulloch, an official of the Treasury Department, once introduced a delegation of New York bankers with much deference. Speaking of their patriotism in holding the

securities of the Nation, he clinched his commendation of them with the text: "Where the treasure is there will the heart be also." Lincoln, like a crack of the whip, rejoined, "There is another text, Mr. McCulloch, which might apply, 'Where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.'" (Hill, "A. Lincoln, Man of God," pp. 269-70.)

It would be possible to multiply illustrations of his sharpness in tracking down Biblical texts. More significant than these humorous items for his maturing faith is his view of the authority of the Bible as revelation for him. Lincoln told his lifetime friend Joshua Speed that he should take all of the Bible that he could on reason and the rest on faith and that he would live and die a better and a happier man. Lincoln spelled out this conviction with even greater clarity in his response on September 7, 1864, to the loyal colored people of Baltimore, who presented him with a magnificently bound Bible as a token of their appreciation of his work for the Negro. This is one of the great documents of Lincoln's religious confession.

"In regard to this Great Book, I have but to say, it is the best gift God has given to man. All the good the Savior gave to the world was communicated through this book. But for it we could not know right from wrong. All things most desirable for man's welfare, here and hereafter, are to be found portrayed in it." (CWAL, VII, p. 542.)

Lincoln's religion was founded upon the bedrock of Scripture. From the Bible in a quite independent way he quarried granite to support a religious interpretation of American history and of man's vast future.

Lincoln held the Nation under God's judgment. He was very far removed from a current type of piety that drags God in by the backdoor in the last paragraph. A southern newspaper gave wide publicity to one of Lincoln's encounters with a clergyman in a visiting delegation. The minister said he hoped "the Lord was on our side." When Lincoln rejoined, "I don't agree with you," the mouths of all were stopped. The President made it clearer. "I am not at all concerned about that, for I know the Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my constant anxiety and prayer that I and this Nation should be on the Lord's side." (Carpenter, "Six Months at the White House," p. 282.)

Such perspective and detachment from self-justification is the fruit of the conviction that God is Lord of this universe. "Behold, the nations are like a drop from a bucket, and are accounted as the dust on the scales." (Isaiah 40:15) In his proclamation after the humiliating disaster of Bull Run in July 1861 he expressed his belief in God as ruler of the nations. "It is fit and becoming in all people, at all times, to acknowledge and revere the supreme government of God; to bow in humble submission to His chastisements; to confess and deplore their sins and transgressions in the full conviction that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom * * * it is peculiarly fit for us to recognize the hand of God in this terrible visitation, and in sorrowful remembrance of our own faults and crimes as a nation and as individuals, to humble ourselves before Him, and to pay for His mercy." (CWAL, IV, p. 482.)

After Lincoln's death there was discovered among his papers a meditation on the divine will. His secretaries, Nicolay and Hay, said he had not intended it "to be seen of men." The first sentence underlines again the basic belief that God is in control of this world. "The will of God prevails. In great contests each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both may be, and one must be wrong. God cannot be for, and against the same thing at the same time. In the present civil war it is quite

possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party—and yet the human instrumentalities, working just as they do, are of the best adaptation to effect His purpose. * * * " (CWAL, V, pp. 303-304.)

The Rutgers editors of Lincoln's collected works date this piece early in September 1862, following the second defeat at Bull Run. During this month he finally decided to issue the preliminary Proclamation of Emancipation. He had always believed slavery to be a moral wrong and had early risked his political future by calling it such in the Illinois Legislature, then predominantly southern in orientation. As President, however, he had felt that his sworn duty to uphold the Constitution obligated him to accept slavery where it already existed. Slowly he moved toward emancipation, convinced that he might legally free the slaves only as an act of military necessity.

Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, has recorded in his diary the solemn way in which Lincoln announced his decision to his Cabinet on September 22, 1862.

"We have a special Cabinet meeting. The subject was the proclamation concerning emancipating slaves. * * * There were some differences in the Cabinet, but he had formed his own conclusions, and made his own decisions. He had, he said, made a vow, a covenant, that if God gave us the victory in the approaching battle (which had just been fought) he would consider it his duty to move forward in the cause of emancipation. We might think it strange, he said, but there were times when he felt uncertain how to act; that he had in this way submitted the disposal of matters when the way was not clear to his mind what he should do. God had decided this question in favor of the slave. He was satisfied it was right—was confirmed and strengthened by the vow and its results; his mind was fixed, his decision made; but he wished his paper announcing his course to be as correct in terms as it could be made without any attempt to change his determination. For that was fixed." (Atlantic Monthly, 1909, p. 369.)

The testimony is incontrovertible. Lincoln reached his decision about the timing of the proclamation in an immediate awareness of the presence of God. The solemn vow and covenant could become dangerous in the hands of a fanatic or even of a lesser man than Lincoln. The taking of a vow may have been more in conformance with Old Testament than with New Testament religion, but the practice was imbedded in Lincoln's biblical piety and came to him as part of the early religious heritage of the Nation.

Once in a talk with L. E. Chittenden, his Register of the Treasury, Lincoln spelled out further his sense of being directed by God's will. "That the Almighty does make use of human agencies, and directly intervenes in human affairs, is one of the plainest statements in the Bible. I have had so many evidences of His direction, so many instances when I have been controlled by some other power than my own will, that I cannot doubt that this power comes from above. * * * I am satisfied that, when the Almighty wants me to do or not to do a particular thing, he finds a way of letting me know it." (Chittenden "Recollections," pp. 448 ff.)

The decision to emancipate the slaves had not been an easy one. It was preceded by the blood, sweat, and tears of a struggle to know the will of God on the matter. The historian Randall comments perceptively on Lincoln's decision: "If these deliberations had given him humility, and a sense of association with divine purpose (which was more than once indicated), they had also given executive confidence. In reaching his important decision there is ample reason to

believe that Lincoln had not only endured anxious hours, but had undergone a significant inner experience from which he emerged with quiet serenity." (Randall, II, p. 161.)

Lincoln's strong prophetic sense of the injustice of slavery kindled in him an indignation at those clergymen who tried to defend the peculiar institution. There is a fragment from the time of the classic debates with Douglas with a reference to a Dr. Ross, a minister in Alabama who wrote a pamphlet "Slavery as Ordained of God" in 1857.

"The sum of proslavery theology seems to be this: 'Slavery is not universally right, nor yet universally wrong; it is better for some people to be slaves; and, in such cases, it is the will of God that they be such.'

"Certainly there is no contending against the will of God; but still there is some difficulty in ascertaining, and applying it, to particular cases. For instance we will suppose the Reverend Dr. Ross has a slave named Sambo, and the question is 'Is it the will of God that Sambo shall remain a slave, or be set free?' The Almighty gives no audible answer to the question. No one thinks of asking Sambo's opinion on it. So, at last, it comes to this, that Dr. Ross is to decide the question. And while he considers it, he sits in the shade, with gloves on his hands, and subsists on the bread that Sambo is earning in the burning sun. If he decides that God wills Sambo to continue a slave, he thereby retains his own comfortable position; but if he decides that God wills Sambo to be free, he thereby has to walk out of the shade, throw off his gloves, and delve for his own bread. Will Dr. Ross be actuated by that perfect impartiality which has ever been considered most favorable to correct decisions?

"But, slavery is good for some people. As a good thing, slavery is strikingly peculiar, in this, that it is the only good thing which no man ever seeks the good of, for himself.

"Nonsense. Wolves devouring lambs, not because it is good for their own greedy maws, but because it is good for the lambs." (CWAL, III, pp. 204-205.)

One of the greatneses of Lincoln was the way he held to strong moral positions without the usual accompaniment of self-righteousness or smugness. He expressed this rare achievement provisionally in his humor and in an ultimate way in his religious evaluations. To the Pennsylvania delegation that congratulated him after the inauguration he said, urging forbearance and respect for differences of opinion between the States, "I would inculcate this idea, so that we may not, like Pharisees, set ourselves up to be better than other people." (CWAL, IV, p. 274.)

The second inaugural is the climax of Lincoln's religious development. In it he gave the theme of "this Nation under God" its most powerful expression. Earlier, in the proclamation after Bull Run, he had urged the Nation to see the hand of God in the terrible visitation of war. Increasingly he defined the theological issue in the conflict. His papers and letters show his belief that God willed "His almost chosen people" like Israel of old to be the bearer of new freedom to all men everywhere. The Puritan background of Lincoln's confidence in American destiny under God had become rationalized in the 18th and 19th centuries into the dream of world democracy with the original religious perspective rapidly disappearing into the distance.

With his incisive logic Lincoln gave definition to America's hope for democracy in terms compelling to his contemporaries, but he also sustained that vision in its original religious rootage and reference to God's will. The religious interpretation was organic and fundamental. It never savored of a pious but irrelevant afterthought as it does in so much contemporary political and pulpit

oratory. The depth of Lincoln's religious interpretation of the Nation's history, however, was not merely an inheritance from the past but a living power of rekindled insight.

Lincoln interpreted the slavery issue in terms of the Old Testament prophets. His Puritan forebears would have called it a discerning of the signs of the times. As Lincoln analyzed God's intention to lead men into larger freedom and appropriated to his use the language of the Declaration of Independence and the sayings of the Founding Fathers he came in the context of events to regard slavery as a contradiction of God's will. This defiance of God's justice had been built into the life of the Nation and was therefore subject to God's judgment.

The long, unhappy debates over the slavery issue had weakened the Nation and made it seem hypocritical to aspiring men in other countries. For somewhat more than the last year of his life Lincoln understood the tragedy and suffering of the Civil War as God's judgment upon this evil and as punishment to bring about its removal. The judgment fell upon both sides, for slavery was a national and not merely a sectional evil. The North had also prospered from the cheap raw materials that slave labor fed into its factories. It was conceivable to Lincoln that a just God might allow the war to continue "until all the wealth piled by the bondmen's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk." In the severe language of Scripture Lincoln held the Nation under judgment: "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

But the judgments of God have as their purpose the reformation of His people. The renewal of an America newly dedicated to the increase of freedom had been his theme at Gettysburg and must be understood as the implied correlative here of the emphasis upon judgment.

The leaven of Christianity that is at work in this address and carries the analysis of judgment beyond that of an Amos or a Jeremiah is expressed in the Savior's warning about the peril of judging. It is also present in the scriptural paraphrase of the Savior's summary of the law and of St. Paul's famous chapter on love that Lincoln achieves in his phrases "With malice toward none; with charity for all." The disclaimer of human judgments does not lead, however, to irresolution in action. The very opposite is the case. Understanding the perspective of two antagonists before the judgment seat of God and thereby freed from the tyranny of self-righteousness fanaticism, there comes to Lincoln the resource of "firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

This document is one of the most astute pieces of theology ever written. It is also a charter of Christian ethics. It may seem strange to call Lincoln a theologian, for he was obviously not one in any technical sense. There are many profundities in the Christian religion which he never did illuminate, but in the area of his vision he saw more keenly than anyone since the inspired writers of the Bible. He knew he stood under the living God of history.

He understood, for example, the finiteness of man's religious perspective without thereby becoming either a relativist or a skeptic. He achieved a perspective above partisan strife that was not shared by most of the Christian theologians of his day or any day, who often express Christian insights in obsolete terms in a way that defies the position of man. Lincoln could detach himself from his own interested participation in events and submit all, including himself as judging, to higher judgment. The highly tentative nature of his own judgments do not argue uncertainty or irresolution but simply confess that God is God and man remains on every level man.

The Second Inaugural illuminates the finiteness of man when in sincerity men embrace opposite courses of action under the conviction that each is responsive to God's will. "Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other." It has often been pointed out that religion has exacerbated human strife by clothing diametrically opposite lines of activity with the sanctions of holiness.

There is a fanaticism in men that blinds them to the truth of their position, increases their self-righteousness, and isolates them from their fellows. It is the fallacy of supposing that a sincere intention to do God's will guarantees that what I sincerely do is the will of God. Lincoln could detach himself from the element of pretense in the idealistic claims made by both sides. In his meditation of the Divine Will Lincoln opened up horizons beyond the simple but all too common analysis—that one side is right and the other wrong. Both could not be right. Each might be partly right and partly wrong and God might use both sides as His instruments to effect a result not foreseen by either side. Lincoln argued that this was the case with the Civil War. "Only God can claim it," he once said, thereby stating that the complexities of historical events are so involved that finite man cannot claim infallible insight for his own interpretations. Lincoln expressed this again in his own comments on the Second Inaugural in a letter to Thurlow Weed:

"I expect the latter to wear as well as—perhaps better than—anything I have produced; but I believe it is not immediately popular. Men are not flattered by being shown that there has been a difference between the Almighty and them. To deny it, however, in this case, is to deny that there is a God governing the world: It is a truth which I thought needed to be told; and as whatever of humiliation there is in it, falls most directly on myself, I thought others might afford for me to tell it." (CWAL, VIII, p. 356.)

The fact, however, that the divine will remains in ultimate mystery need not lead to a despairing or resigned agnosticism. Because Lincoln was aware that Providence would overrule the element of pretension in the highly idealistic claims made by each side he was not therefore led to the conclusion that responsible action undertaken by either side would necessarily be irrelevant to the moral issue. The mystery is illuminated by meaning like lightning in the night sky. Knowing that God and not Lincoln would have the final word in the dilemma of the two contestants at prayer, he could yet venture provisional judgments and act resolutely in their light. "It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces * * * let us strive on to finish the work we are in." Lincoln's sympathy for the dilemma of the Quakers, caught between pacifism and emancipation as a act in war, is another illustration of the depth of his biblical spirituality on this point.

He could appreciate the sincerity of his foe although he believed him wrong, but because of his religious perspective he could deal magnanimously and forgivingly without the self-righteousness of the victor. This point of vantage beyond the strife of factions did not, however, kill the nerve of resolution. Since God was supreme a man might act without fanaticism and hatred on the one hand and without torturing doubt or irresolution on the other.

This is the charter of responsible action for the Christian citizen. St. Francis, the loving, gentle imitator of Christ, will always be dear to the hearts of men. The appeal, however, of the ascetic who leaves the responsibilities of society for the cultivation

of individual piety and ecstatic person-to-person relationships has an element of romanticism in it. Lincoln represents the responsible Christian citizen of this world struggling to be responsive to the guidance of God amid the challenges of the full historic setting of man's life. Both the Christian saint and the Christian statesman are needed, but there can be little doubt as to which one more fully represents the demands of a God revealed through the Bible as the "Great Disposer of Events."

Lincoln's religious analysis of the Nation's history is as relevant today as it was when he painfully developed it. One has only to substitute the phrase "segregation in public education" for Lincoln's word "slavery" and his theological analysis becomes luminous. America stands today among the nations of the world as the self-professed defender of democracy in areas that are being progressively inundated by totalitarianism. Our professed defense of the right of all men everywhere to be free sounds increasingly hollow to multitudes in Asia and Africa because of our racial discrimination at home. If the rising colored peoples of the world turn from democracy to communism partly because of our racialism the security of America will become a very frail thing. And yet "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

To a religious understanding of the Nation's destiny that is as meaningful today as for the crisis of the Civil War, Lincoln adds a dynamic for responsible action that is equally helpful. Courageous action prayerfully undertaken in openness and in unself-righteous concern for all men in the heaven that can alter the whole lump. It was such a perspective that enabled Lincoln not only to serve the Union without Pharisaic stances but also, therefore, to serve it more effectively. Those who wield great power are often snared in traps of their own making when they become blinded by considerations of prestige.

Lincoln could concentrate on practical actions needed to restore the Union because he was free of the determination to punish the South. A Christian statesmanship rooted in reconciliation and forgiveness marks the address he made on the evening of April 11, 1865, his last public utterance. He appealed to the people to support his principles and action for reconstruction. "Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restoring the proper practical relations between these States and the Union; and each forever after, innocently indulge his own opinion whether, in doing the acts, he brought the States from without, into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it." (CWAL, VIII, p. 403.)

The problems of national reconciliation in a spirit of forgiveness were uppermost in his mind when the bullet struck him on Good Friday. He carried to his death another item of unfinished business mentioned 4 days before in this last speech. "Him from whom all blessings flow, must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared, and will be duly promulgated." (CWAL, VIII, p. 399.)

Lincoln was a biblical Christian, or to be still more precise, a biblical prophet who saw his country as "God's almost chosen people" called to world responsibility and himself as "an instrument of God" responsible "to the American people, to the Christian world, to history, and on final account to God." (CWAL, VII, p. 302.)

The Second Inaugural reads like a supplement to the Bible. In it there are 14 references to God, 4 direct quotations from Genesis, Psalms, and Matthew, and other allusions to scriptural teaching. The London Spectator commented prophetically on this masterpiece:

"We cannot read it without a renewed conviction that it is the noblest political docu-

ment known to history, and should have for the Nation and the statesmen he left behind him something of a sacred and almost prophetic character. Surely, none was ever written under a stronger sense of the reality of God's government. And certainly none written in a period of passionate conflict ever so completely excluded the partiality of victorious faction, and breathed so pure a strain of mingled justice and mercy." (Carpenter, p. 31.)

HON. ROY G. FITZGERALD

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of April 1961 which was written by a former Member of Congress from Ohio, the Honorable Roy G. Fitzgerald. It is particularly interesting and, refreshing I might add, to review the momentous work done by our predecessors in the Congress. Many valuable contributions have been made which have gone relatively unheralded.

Mr. Fitzgerald is still active though 86 years of age. He was a Member of Congress from 1921 to 1931. He has climbed Mt. Rainier and swam the Bosphorus from Asia to Europe and his accomplishments are legend. I am also enclosing a letter from my good friend, Robert Klepinger, a Washington attorney, which sheds further light on this milestone:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The enclosed American Bar Association article is a jewel. Congressman Roy G. Fitzgerald, the dean of the Dayton, Ohio, bar and who represented our Third Ohio District in Congress, is the father of the United States Code and the system of cumulative codification of the Federal laws. The United States Code is, of course, the greatest accomplishment in the field of revision and codification ever enacted. The article fails to state that the chairman of the House Committee on Revision of the Laws was Colonel Fitzgerald. Under his chairmanship and for the first time in the history of our country, the laws of the District of Columbia were gathered in one volume which included the centuries old British and Maryland statutes applicable to the District. The District laws as of this date still have never been actually revised as distinguished from being codified.

In 1948 titles 18 and 28 of the Code were revised and enacted into positive law. Those titles contained the laws relating to crimes and criminal procedure, and to the judiciary and judicial procedure, and represented the most careful and accurate revision and simplification ever presented to the Congress. The monumental task required 4 years and was performed by the original compilers of the Code, the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co.

I well recall "An Afternoon in Congress" as I was clerk to Mr. Fitzgerald's committee from 1925 until 1934. Incidentally, the Congressman who was certain there was

no chance at all of passage of the bills to which the article refers was the late Representative B. Frank Murphy of Ohio.

ROBERT F. KLEPINGER.

AN AFTERNOON IN CONGRESS

The code of the United States laws has been enacted into law, clearing the chaos that had resulted from neglect to collect the permanent law since the Revised Statutes of 1878. No one knew what the law was, hidden in 40-odd volumes. Two Commissions of Congress had worked on the problem in vain. The House Committee on the Revision of the Laws was established and a special committee to cooperate was set up in the Senate. Col. Edward Little, chairman of the House Committee on the Revision of the Laws, wore his life out at the task. He prepared a code and had it adopted by the House, but as it was called The Little Code, the Senate committee chairman seemed hostile.

A committee of the American Bar Association was appointed to press the matter. Cases were being reversed upon the discovery of an obscure law. A bill was pending in the Senate to amend a law which had been repealed. "An attempt to hang a picture on a wall that had been torn down."

At Colonel Little's death, the new chairman received better cooperation from the Senate through George Wharton Pepper, Senator from Pennsylvania, and the help of the West Publishing Co. was secured. The code was prepared and passed by the House and Senate and the Senate committee dissolved.

Then Senator Robert La Follette, stirred by suspicions in the minds of some labor leaders that the code was a scheme to cheat the unions, in some mysterious way, had the Senate pass a bill to provide that the code would be but prima facie evidence and declared that he would resist any further code legislation unless the House concurred in his amendment.

The House convened at noon on May 29, 1929, the last day of the session. The chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws was interested in three bills—the Senate bill of Senator La Follette, and bills to provide cumulative codification of the laws of the United States and those of the District of Columbia. By unanimous consent he secured their passage. The procedure was to have bills enrolled after adjournment and sent to the Senate the next day. The enrollment clerk was persuaded to enroll them at once and permit the chairman to take them to the Senate. He took them and handed them to George W. Norris, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and asked him to have a meeting of the committee, to approve the two cumulative codification bills. He said, "Impossible—the Congress will adjourn in a few hours and all the Senators are too busy. It's useless anyway, for we've entered into an agreement not to take up any bill that hasn't been on our calendar 24 hours." The House chairman persisted and asked him to have the committee polled on the two bills. He was opposed to the polling of a committee. The House chairman went to Thomas G. Walsh, ranking Democrat of the committee. The House chairman went to Walsh. He was opposed to the polling of the committee, but finally said, "If Senator Norris wanted it, all right." The chairman reported to Senator Norris that Senator Walsh would "go along." The House chairman then descended to the Judiciary Committee office, the only such office in the Capitol building, and there found a clerk, Allen E. Cozier, who took his dictation on the typewriter, reporting that the Senate committee has considered the bills and recommended their passage. Cozier accompanied him to the Senate floor and had the two reports signed by Senator Norris, and borrowing his pen, went through the

Senate and secured the signatures of all the other members of the Judiciary Committee. The House chairman handed them to Senator Norris and asked him to seek recognition by the Vice President. Again he said, "See Senator Walsh." They were handed to Senator Walsh who was told that the House had concurred in the La Follette amendment to the code. Senator Walsh arose. Vice President Curtis said, "For what purpose does the Senator from Montana rise?" He replied, "I move that the Rules of the Senate be suspended and that the House bills for the cumulative codification of the laws of the United States and of the District of Columbia pass." Senator La Follette demanded to know about his amendment to the code and was told that it had been passed by the House. Senator David Reed, of Pennsylvania, asked, "What number are these bills on our calendar?" turning through its pages. Senator Walsh said, "They are not on the calendar," and as Reed hesitated, the Vice President said, "I hear no objection, the bills are passed." The Senate had passed into law two bills which no Senator had read.

The chairman returned to the House and asked a Congressman of greater experience, "What chance is there to get the Senate to pass a bill that we passed here this afternoon?" He replied, "No chance in a million. No chance at all."

ROY G. FITZGERALD.

DAYTON, OHIO.

THIRTY-ONE YEARS ON THE JOB

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is so easy to criticize and call attention to mistakes and unfaithful service. It is far more important, I feel, Mr. Speaker, to give well deserved recognition when important tasks are done faithfully and well by dedicated Government employees. An unusual number of Federal employees go about their duties in a quiet, efficient manner day after day. Even though they, like everyone else do not always feel full of pep and vigor each day and even though they have accumulated sick leave which can be used, they report daily and work daily because they have a deep sense of responsibility. Such devotion to duties and personal responsibilities is found among many Federal employees in all branches of our Government and, unfortunately, is not given the recognition so richly deserved.

One such instance came to light only recently and was the subject of an editorial in the Dayton Daily News and was reported in the Miamisburg News. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial and news story, reprinted in full at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Dayton Daily News, May 2, 1961]

IN BODY AND SPIRIT

During all of his 31 years at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, William P. Bonner never missed a day's work. Starting in as an airplane mechanic's helper, he was a foreman in the flight and engineering test group at the time of his retirement. He has been dubbed by fellow employees "the healthiest man on the base."

Healthy in more than one sense of the word. Not just physically healthy. The man enjoying the soundest bodily health is bound to have his bad days. A rough

cold, a splitting headache, a lame back, a smashed fingernail.

Only the ones who are mentally healthy and morally responsible go 31 years without missing a day.

[From the Miamisburg News, May 4, 1961]
MIAMISBURG MAN RETIRES AT WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB WITH UNIQUE RECORD

After more than 31 years of service in the Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, William P. Bonner of 4034 Maue Road, retired last weekend leaving behind an outstanding on-the-job record.

In 1959, after completing 30 years of service without taking a day's sick leave, Bonner was given the "Healthiest Man at Wright Field" title by his fellow employees. He extended his record to his retirement date. When elected "healthiest man" and upon being interviewed, he said he guessed he was "just lucky" for he ate no special diets and took no special exercises.

Bonner has been an experimental electronic systems modification foreman in the Flight and Engineering Test Group at the Aeronautical Systems Division. He began his career in October 1929 as an airplane mechanic's helper and remained in the same department throughout his career, progressing to the foremanship during World War II.

Civilian employees of the division numbering 225 were honored last week at an awards ceremony, many receiving pins for lengthy service, others gaining recognition for inventions and money or laborsaving suggestions. In the latter category one of those receiving recognition was Thomas J. McGuire, 603 Buckeye Street, Miamisburg.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we have had considerable debate here today about Cuba, and we have a resolution which will be voted on on Wednesday relating to the Organization of American States and the situation in Cuba. Previously—last June 25 to be correct—I had expressed some concern about the Organization of American States. Now we have had a discussion a few minutes ago about the establishment of a university. We have asked that the Organization of American States make a study to determine whether or not it is feasible to have a university. I would suggest it would be much better for the Organization of American States to make a study on how to get rid of communism in Cuba. That, after all, should be the prime objective of the Organization of American States and the prime objective of the United States of America. We have long since passed the time when we should continue to accept the insults and the indignities that we have received from Cuba. I made this same

statement on the floor last June. I repeat it now.

Now, I am concerned about the Organization of American States, Mr. Speaker, and I want to read, so that there will be no misunderstanding on that point, the article of the Organization of American States which, in my opinion, repeals the Monroe Doctrine. And, if we repeal the Monroe Doctrine, then surely we are in trouble. Let me read it. It is article 15 of the Organization of American States, and this is what it says:

No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

Now, let us analyze it. "No State"—that would mean the United States—"or group of States," which would mean those that were today petitioning to do something, "has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly," and today by this resolution which we will vote on Wednesday, we are indirectly attempting to do this, "for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs"—now, this is the internal affairs we are talking about of Cuba, which is prohibited by this article of the Organization of American States—"of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force"—but listen to this, Mr. Speaker—"but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State"—and listen to this—"or against its political, economic, and cultural elements."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this poses a very serious question which this Congress should consider. I think it poses a very serious question that every Member of this House should consider before voting on these resolutions next Wednesday, because in a specific reply to a question of mine it was stated that this one resolution endorses this provision of the Organization of American States, and I do not believe that any of my colleagues in the Congress want to endorse a prohibition against our taking any action in any manner whatsoever, economic, cultural, or by force, against communism, just 90 miles off the shores of the United States of America.

I believe that with any reading that we can give this, this particular provision negates the Monroe Doctrine that so many of us have talked about in the past. And, if we have done this, then it seems to me it is time that, instead of a resolution providing for the Organization of American States to study universities or a resolution asking them to make some statement, we ask the Organization of American States to take some action against communism in this hemisphere, and if they fail to do it, that we do it ourselves, because if we do not do it, we are soon going to find communism spreading throughout this entire hemisphere. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, for my country. We seem to bellow loud and carry a toothpick, let us return to a policy of self-preservation

and carry a big stick and speak softly. I fear our countrymen are becoming a bit weary of resolutions, and appeal to others rather than our taking care of our own.

Let us stand firm and make it clear to all that we shall with courage protect and defend our heritage and our rights.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, the special Subcommittee on Labor, of the Committee on Education and Labor, begins hearings on bills to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, with the Secretary of Labor as the first witness. Views of the Department of Labor are incorporated in a letter of August 9, 1960, that follows. The Secretary outlines the need for revision of the act, citing that neither its reporting nor disclosure purposes are being effectively achieved. As chairman of the subcommittee that will begin hearings on this act, I feel the information is particularly pertinent, and under unanimous consent I include the letter in the RECORD for study by my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1960.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Two years ago the Congress enacted the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. At the time of its adoption some Members of Congress expressed misgivings as to the adequacy of the law and indicated a desire to reappraise the act at a later date on the basis of subsequent experience.

In view of these expressions of doubt and concern as to the effectiveness of the legislation, I am submitting to you a report covering the administration and operation of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act during the first 18 months of its existence.

As you know, this legislation became effective January 1, 1959. It was enacted by the 85th Congress after investigations and hearings by both Houses of Congress extending over several years. These investigations clearly demonstrated the desirability of full disclosure of the facts surrounding the provisions and operations of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

The President in signing the bill into law (Public Law 85-836) on August 28, 1958, noted a number of shortcomings in the legislation and stated that he had approved the act "because it establishes a precedent of Federal responsibility in this area. It does little else." He declared that "if the bill is to be at all effective it will require extensive amendment at the next session of the Congress."

The President, both in 1959 and in 1960, has made specific recommendations to the Congress for strengthening amendments to the Welfare and Pensions Plans Disclosure Act. Although bills to carry out his recommendations were introduced in both Houses of Congress, no legislative action has been taken. Experience in administering the law shows a substantial amount of confusion

and noncompliance on the part of those responsible for meeting its modest provisions. Meanwhile, over a half million dollars is being spent annually by the Department of Labor in an attempt to administer the law while the cost to those required to prepare reports undoubtedly runs into the millions.

As the law is now written, neither its reporting nor its disclosure purposes are being effectively achieved. Nor is it likely these important objectives can be accomplished unless the law is substantially strengthened. The inability of administrators of employee benefit plans to obtain authoritative interpretations of the Act's provisions has caused confusion and contributed to the substantial degree of noncompliance and inadequate reporting which has occurred. The lack of either investigatory or enforcement powers by the Secretary of Labor has seriously handicapped the Department and affords no persuasive deterrent to those who wish to ignore its provisions, or to manipulate or embezzle funds.

For example:

1. The number of plan descriptions (142,500) which have been filed with the Department of Labor to be made available for public disclosure is many thousands short of the number of plans believed to fall within the scope of the act.

2. Based upon information relating to the frequency of changes in employee benefit plans it is obvious that the number of plan amendments submitted to the Department of Labor under the requirements of the act is thousands short of the total number which should have been submitted and thus full and current details of these plans are not available for public disclosure.

3. The law requires that for each description of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan the plan administrator shall file an annual report covering the operations of that plan. By June 30, 1960, only 100,500 annual financial reports had been filed with the Department of Labor. Not only were some 15,000 to 20,000 reports delinquent and in violation of the law after June 30 but thousands of other submissions consolidated the financial data for several plans into a single report contrary to the explicit provisions of the act.

4. Moreover, obvious defects and omissions are clearly evident in thousands of reports which have been filed and thus patently not in compliance with the law. In many instances, after these deficiencies have been called to the attention of plan administrators, they remain uncorrected. Under the present state of the law, the Department can take no further action.

5. Finally, the overall adequacy or accuracy of seemingly complete reports filed with the Department of Labor cannot be effectively determined because of the absence of rulemaking, investigatory or enforcement authority thus leaving the Secretary of Labor for all practical purposes, powerless to uncover abuses.

These examples are clearly symptomatic of the unsatisfactory character of this act. The net effect, to date, raises grave doubt as to the wisdom of retaining so weak a law on the statute books. To continue the law in its present form in the belief that it assures adequate protective safeguards is a shameful illusion. To abandon it entirely, however, would be an act of betrayal to the millions of Americans who have a right to a sense of security that the billions of dollars annually received and disbursed by these plans are being honestly and prudently managed.

The only recourse, therefore, is the prompt amendment of the act to require, among other considerations, that reports should be complete and meaningful and timely filed; that plan administrators should be entitled to receive authoritative interpretations of the act's provisions; and that the Department of Labor should have the appropriate

investigatory and enforcement powers customarily granted by the Congress for the proper enforcement of legislation it has adopted.

The attached report enlarges on these matters. It also describes the nature of the specific recommendations made by the President for strengthening amendments. These necessary improvements in the present act are reflected in bills introduced in 1959 by Senator SCOTT (S. 2550) and by Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN (H.R. 7489) which are still awaiting action by the Congress.

I again urge their speedy adoption.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights legislation that I am introducing today is brought before this Congress not with the intention that it be acted upon immediately, but rather with the thought in mind that if our present law in respect to court appointed referees in matters of evaluation involving denial of voting rights to American citizens proves ineffective, an alternative solution will be constantly kept in mind. Should the present law prove ineffective and an alternative plan become imperative, this proposal is readily available for consideration by my colleagues.

PROPOSED KLM CONCESSION

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] made a most illuminating address before this body last Tuesday. Unfortunately, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee business prevented my being on the floor while this talk was delivered.

Since then, I have read the speech in the RECORD, together with the sensible, intelligent remarks of several of our colleagues who associated themselves with the Oklahoma gentleman's thesis. I am happy to join with them in asking that the Congress pay particularly close attention to negotiations now in progress between our State Department and Netherlands Government representatives.

Air rights are valuable commodities these days; they should not be disposed of free of charge or at bargain rates.

Mr. Speaker, the current edition of Babson's Washington Report covers the KLM situation particularly well. Under unanimous consent I include this brief analysis as a part of the RECORD:

President Kennedy is under strong pressure from the Netherlands Government to

make Los Angeles another American port of call for KLM the Royal Dutch Airline.

There are rumors that the Netherlanders are so serious in their demand that veiled threats of a Dutch withdrawal from NATO are involved.

American-flag international airlines are justifiably concerned. Such a concession to KLM could provide new wedges for airlines of other nations—most of them heavily subsidized by their governments—to demand similar expansion of operating facilities in the United States.

Already harassed by competition from subsidized foreign airlines, the U.S. carriers are in danger of being backed against the wall, by the impractical generosity of their own Government.

Strong U.S. oversea airlines are vital to our national security. Other nations recognize this fact of life. It's time we did, too.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), for May 15 through May 18, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE, for 30 minutes on Thursday, May 18, 1961.

Mr. OLSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) for 1 hour on Wednesday, May 17, 1961.

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) for 5 minutes today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 30 minutes tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois.

Mr. EDMONDSON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BELL.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. JUDD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. NORRELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 201. An act to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned

land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 322. An act to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinalt Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 751. An act to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1208. An act to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1215. An act to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1289. An act to amend sections 337 and 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1719. An act to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

901. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

902. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

903. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal

year 1961 in the amount of \$48,024,000 for various agencies of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

904. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving an increase in the amount of \$100,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission (H. Doc. No. 162); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

905. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries and the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

906. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

907. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the court's order relating to the case of *Wilma D. Marsh v. The United States* (No. Congressional 3-58), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 513, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

908. A letter from the executive vice president, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the National Safety Council for the year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 259, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

909. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

910. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives, pursuant to section 1(f) of the Act of June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 151); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

911. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 11, 1961, the following bill was reported on May 12, 1961:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 6874. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 15, 1961]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7035. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and

Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 7030. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7035. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 7036. A bill to prohibit strikes at defense facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7037. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7038. A bill to eliminate the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7039. A bill to amend chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7040. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to clarify the technical information required by section 7; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 7041. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7042. A bill to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 7043. A bill to extend to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 the benefits of salary increases in connection with the protection of basic compensation rates from the effects of downgrading actions, to provide salary protection for postal field service employees in certain cases of reduction in salary standing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7044. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 7045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization over a 60-month period of certain civil defense facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7046. A bill to provide reimbursement for New York City for the portion of the costs of its police department attributable to providing protection to the United Nations and delegates thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7047. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to clarify the technical information required by section 7; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 7048. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for military service shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7049. A bill to amend section 204 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide incentive pay for duty performed by members of the Armed Forces involving space flight; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7050. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the free flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 7052. A bill to amend section 927 of the Act of March 3, 1901, relating to responsibility for criminal conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7053. A bill to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 7054. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7055. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 7056. A bill to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State and/or Federal apprenticeship laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 7057. A bill relating to the application of the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" to certain clays and shale for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1959; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7058. A bill to allow in the computation of percentage depletion in the case of clay used in making brick, tile, sewer pipe, and other burnt clay products, the same cutoff point and the same depletion rate as are presently allowed in the case of calcium carbonates and limestone used in making cement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 7059. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, without any prior determination by the President, to furnish emergency assistance in the form of feed grain and seeds to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen who suffer damage or hardship in certain localized disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 7060. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 7061. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for payment for unused compensatory time owing to deceased postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7062. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 7063. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 7064. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7065. A bill to protect civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 7066. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7067. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 7069. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 7070. A bill 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; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 7071. A bill to advance certain officers on the retired list without affecting retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during

the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 291. Resolution to provide for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to pollution of Klamath River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take action to halt the flood of surplus foreign military rifles into the United States, and to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 7072. A bill for the relief of Mason and Angeliki Bakhos and their minor child, Andre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7073. A bill for the relief of Sangwoo Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Politis Konstatin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7075. A bill for the relief of Cecylia Shemezis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7076. A bill for the relief of Sangwoo Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 7077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Sahagun de Lara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

145. By Mr. SHRIVER: Petition of Frank Vannerson and other students of the University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans., urging the necessary appropriations to the degree recommended by the President for the support and promotion of the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

146. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Merwin K. Hart, president, National Economic Council, Inc., New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a thorough investigation

of the State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

147. Also, petition of Harold Elsten, Cortland, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance for compensation based on *Elsten v. U.S.* and *F.C.C. and Elsten v. ABC Network*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. Also, petition of Ray H. Meyer, Batesville, Ind., relative to petition by creditor for private bill for the relief of creditor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. Also, petition of George Washington Williams, Baltimore, Md., relative to a redress of grievance relating to integration and its effects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. Also, petition of C. Taylor Burton, director, Utah State Department of Highways Salt Lake City, Utah, relative to requesting the extension of the deadline specified under section 131, title 23, United States Code, for Federal-State agreements to regulate advertising in areas adjacent to the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

151. Also, petition of Clark Foreman, director, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, New York, N.Y., relative to requesting Congress to pass a resolution asking the Un-American Activities Committee to cancel its hearings on the Fund for Social Analysis; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

152. Also, petition of L. R. Hegland, executive secretary, Montana Medical Association Billings, Mont., relative to transmitting a copy of a resolution upon health care for the aged which was adopted by the Montana House of Delegates at its interim session in April 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Late Gary Cooper: A Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of a distinguished citizen, Gary Cooper—actor, artist, business leader, husband, father, outdoor man; a real American.

He came to be a symbol of vigor, courage, and heroism in American life. He served as a source of inspiration to many of the youth of this Nation who admire such pioneer qualities of quiet strength of character, steadfastness, honesty, and fairplay.

He had a public career of the highest order of fidelity and service. He gave of both himself and of his resources, not only to many of the worthwhile charities, but to many of those who needed a helping hand in their strife for a better life.

His two Oscars—given for his performances in the title role in "Sergeant York," 1941, and as the courageous sheriff in "High Noon," 1953—doubtless rank among the most popular awards ever presented by the Motion Picture Academy.

Mr. Speaker, the manly qualities in American life that Gary Cooper so ably

portrayed in such pictures as "The Virginian," "The Westerner," and "For Whom the Bell Tolls," future generations will not only continue to enjoy, but what is more important, will continue to emulate and thus will find a source for renewed courage.

I am honored by listing myself among those who have been Gary Cooper's friends. I will miss him. The people of this Nation and of this world will miss him.

But at this sad time our particular sympathy goes out to Mrs. Cooper, the devoted wife who shared the trials and satisfaction of our friend's varied and eminently useful career.

Local Support Strong for Area Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about local interest in and support for area development, after a remarkable meeting held yesterday afternoon in Muskogee, Okla.

In response to a letter inviting their attendance to discuss the program, more than 100 mayors, city managers, and

other county and local officials of Oklahoma's Second Congressional District met for more than 3 hours.

Federal officials attending the conference said last night they had never attended a more enthusiastic and constructive meeting of local officials.

Tomorrow, because of the widespread interest in this program, I will submit a more detailed report on the Oklahoma area development meeting.

Under aggressive and enlightened New Frontier leadership, the tremendous area development program just passed by the Congress is off to a flying start—and the people are ready and eager for action at the earliest possible date.

Needed: Neutralist United Nations Disarmament Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the arms race between the Communist world and the non-Communist world poses an ever greater threat to peace, either by premeditated war or by accidental war.

For almost 15 years, the world has talked of reduced—rather than increased—armaments.

Regrettably, however, the Communists adhere to a policy of aggression. Their aggression is ever toward ultimate triumph of communism, rather than the establishment of peace in a world of self-governing nations.

Consequently, progress has been literally impossible. The Communists have continued to block conference after conference. Militarily, they have reduced manpower only if such reductions were balanced—or perhaps stepped up—by increases of firepower by new weapons.

Because of the stalemate, I suggested yesterday, in a broadcast over radio station WGN, in Chicago, the establishment of a neutralist United Nations commission to attempt to set up universally recognized criteria for disarmament. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Today, the United States and the non-Communist world, face major challenges, including efforts to find:

Ways to stop Communist aggression without sparking a third world war; a formula for negotiating differences between the non-Communist and Communist worlds; and, establishment of a climate of peace and law by which nations can, by self-determination, seek and attain their national destinies.

These are great and formidable challenges. Around the globe—in Cuba, Laos, Berlin, the Congo, and elsewhere—Red trouble-makers are threatening the freedom of peoples and nations.

What can be done about it?

Over the years, there has been a great deal of talk about disarmament. Unhappily, this has been difficult to achieve. Why? Because the Communists are committed to aggression rather than to disarmament and peace.

Time after time, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have restated their ultimate goals of world conquest. As recently as January of this year, Khrushchev, in a policy speech, reemphasized that if a takeover of the world, nation by nation, could not be accomplished peacefully, then force would be utilized to attempt to gain this objective. Despite an all-out addiction to aggression—military, political, ideological, however—the Reds continue to pay lip service to the cause of disarmament. Why? Because it serves as a smokescreen behind which to carry on their evil acts of aggression. Actually, too, they frustrate every effort to negotiate for realistic reduction of armaments. At the same time, they accuse—and all too often successfully—the United States and the Western allies of roadblocking progress in this field.

In the light of the Reds' sabotaging disarmament at the conference table—and indulging military-economic-political-ideological aggression elsewhere in the world—is there any hope for realistic negotiations?

Personally, I would like to be more optimistic. Unhappily, however, the picture is darkly clouded. Nevertheless, we must keep on trying: (1) to get agreement at the conference table; and (2) to mobilize world opinion on the side of realistic disarmament.

How can this best be accomplished? Perhaps by the following suggestion: The United Nations, I believe, could well establish a Commission on Disarmament comprised solely of neutralist nations. The commission would have the responsibility of hammering out a realistic plan of disarmament. The plan could be presented to the United Nations. Then, a vote of "Yes" or "No" would be required by the major powers.

This would put all nations—including the Soviet Union—of the world on the spot—reflecting more clearly whether they were for or against disarmament. Regrettably, the smokescreen of charges and countercharges fired between East and West have made it difficult for nations of the world to clearly discern who is responsible for the obstruction of progress.

The traditional, major points of difference between East and West have focused upon inspection. Experience—both prior to, and following, World War II—should have taught the world, however, that treaties signed by tyrants are so much paper—unless self-enforceable. The Russians—like Hitler—have freely and recklessly torn up a great many treaties and agreements, after these have served their cause.

The establishment of such a neutralist U.N. Commission could not be expected to miraculously resolve the difference between East and West in negotiations. Nevertheless, such a body could, I believe, (1) develop criteria which would be universally recognized as fundamental to reduction of arms in the world; (2) present a clearer picture of who—namely, the Red bloc—has continually been obstructing progress.

Until a realistic system has been developed, we will need to continue (1) to maintain a strong deterrent power against massive attack; (2) develop more effective forces to cope with brushfire wars; (3) design techniques for stopping the infiltrative actions of the Reds in Southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere in the world; and (4) gird ourselves for a long, difficult struggle—for the battle against the great and growing Red threat to freedom will not be easily won.

H.R. 7036: A Bill To Prohibit Strikes at Defense Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would outlaw any strikes, work stoppages, or slowdowns at any defense facility or any plant or enterprise in connection with the national defense or security of the United States.

The recent hearings in the Senate have disclosed the scandalous events which have taken place at our missile installations. Strikes, slowdowns, and work stoppages have greatly curtailed our program—a program which is costing the taxpayers billions of dollars.

The shocking disclosures have made every American citizen sick at heart, and has caused a sense of frustration for our well-being. I think it is high time that legislation be introduced and passed, which would make unlawful these tactics.

The work stoppages have resulted in the loss of over 162,000 man-days of work during the last 5 years at our missile sites. It has resulted in much overtime pay which has resulted in workers on the job receiving more pay than our top scientists. This is a ridiculous situation, as every American well knows. Without these labor abuses, the United

States would probably have been first with a man in space. Labor unions are disregarding their responsibilities. There is involved here too much urgency—yes, even our own survival—to allow these irresponsible actions to continue.

The danger from communism is too real and too great to tolerate this condition to exist further. Action to correct these abuses is needed now. We are in a desperate fight to maintain our freedoms against the evil forces of communism. The hour is late; action is needed now.

Congratulations! This Is National Tax Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it takes the average taxpayer today just short of 4½ months to earn enough to pay his year's local, State, and Federal taxes. So assuming on January 1, 1961, he assigned the entire amount of his regular weekly paychecks to the tax collector until his annual tax debt was paid, today for the first time in 1961 his taxes would be paid up and he would commence receiving his own paychecks to expend for his own family needs.

Today, for the first time, the average American breadwinner is free, as such, and will be until December 31 to earn his and his family's needs for food, shelter, and recreation if there is any left for the latter.

A similar average taxpayer in 1920, in the days when Government was not so big and costly, would have worked to cover his share of taxes from January until February 28. After 2 months of work the average taxpayer 40 years ago could have celebrated Tax Freedom Day.

Twenty years later in 1940 taxes had increased so that March 27 could have been celebrated as national average taxpayers Tax Freedom Day. The anniversary was almost a month later.

If one figures the rate of increase each 20 years and projects it into the future a taxpayer in due course will be working 365 days a year for his Government and all his needs will be provided. But until then, Mr. Average Taxpayer, congratulations are in order—the rest of your paychecks this year you can keep.

Mr. Speaker, during the days of the "old frontier," a citizen if he desired could work a few days on the local roads and his obligation was over.

Today under the New Frontier the people are headed into full-time employment but under the modern affluent society of the near future there will be only one employer and the work will be steady.

The only freedom will not be tax freedom but, unfortunately, will be the free-

dom to work day in and day out, year in and year out—all needs cared for from the cradle to the grave—for Uncle Sam.

Until then, congratulations, Mr. Average Taxpayer. This is your National Tax Freedom Day.

Pennsylvania Is Meeting Its Responsibility in School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to address a group of students, teachers, parents, educators, and other citizens of one of the communities in my district of Pennsylvania. The occasion was the dedication of a new high school at York Springs, in the Bermudian Springs Joint School System.

Because I, as a former schoolteacher, and school director for many years, feel very strongly on the subject of school and education, I ask consent that my address be made a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING AT DEDICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL, BERMUDIEN SPRINGS JOINT SCHOOL SYSTEM, YORK SPRINGS, PA., SUNDAY, MAY 14

I think it significant that you dedicate this building on the day we honor the mothers of America.

The mothers and schools of today will pretty largely determine the shape of the world tomorrow.

One hundred years ago, April 12, 1861, members of the Confederate Army shelled Fort Sumter. Recently I was privileged to visit Charleston, S.C., and this fort which became the first target in a tragic era of civil conflict and hatred—which, unfortunately, did not end with the surrender at Appomattox, on April 9, 1865. Adams County bears mute testimony to this strife since many regard the Battle of Gettysburg as the turning point of the war.

The years 1861 to 1865 were years of crisis. Since that time we have had similar critical times: 1914-18 and the First World War; 1941-45, the Second World War; 1950-53, the Korean conflict. Today we are living through a continuing, highly tense cold war with Russia, Communist China, and Socialist Cuba.

We have achieved a remarkably high level of scientific and technological knowledge—for peaceful as well as warlike purposes. How we use this knowledge will depend pretty largely on you and me. With every scientific advancement, life appears to become more complex and highly mechanized. We use our cars to drive a block. Our children are transported to schools. Electrical appliances tell us when to get up, furnish music in the process, perk the coffee while we shave with an electric razor, tell us when the evening roast is cooked to our specifications, stop the washer when the clothes are clean, show us what others are doing on our TV screen, heat our houses, cool our food and drinks; jet airplanes transport us at 600 miles per hour; and so it goes.

Six days ago I stood within 3 feet of the man whom we know definitely, and without any question of doubt whatsoever, was in

outer space and returned safely. A prior claim by another country has never been fully substantiated to the satisfaction of some of us.

The splitting of the atom was the first step in the preparation of the atom bomb—a device which could either destroy all mankind or result in undreamed of technological advances. With each advance tensions rise and it will require all of our intelligence, conscientiousness, and strength to avoid war and with it the possibility of total annihilation.

How will we meet this challenge and what bearing do wars, spacemen, and atomic bombs have on dedicating a new school building? Each can have a tremendous impact—not only on Adams County and the United States but on the entire world. All are involved in these new discoveries and the accompanying threats to our lives and well-being. Those of us who are older are attempting to deal with the world's problems of today, but age ultimately takes its toll and others take our places. This school has been constructed for one purpose—to better prepare those who follow, to meet life's many challenges and obstacles, and I predict these challenges will multiply with each advance in knowledge. This high school and the adult community of the Bermudian Springs school system have the responsibility for training students to better meet these challenges.

This new structure is another expression of our American ideals and traditions. We believe that obtaining an education is the privilege of every American, regardless of race, creed, or color. John Adams, our second President, expressed the views of most of us when he said: "The education here intended is not merely that of the children of the rich and noble, but of every rank and class of people, down to the lowest and poorest. The revenues of the state would be applied infinitely better, more charitably, wisely, usefully, than even in maintaining the poor. This would be the best way of preventing the existence of the poor."

Theodore Roosevelt expressed a similar sentiment: "From the lowest grade of the public school education in this country is at the disposal of every man, every woman, who chooses to work for and obtain it. Each one of us, then, who has an education has obtained something from the community at large for which he or she has not paid. The man who accepts it (education) must be content to accept it merely as a charity unless he returns it to the State in full in the shape of good citizenship."

Public education has expanded from an isolated, poorly supported concept to a nationwide system controlled by each individual State and I might add, parenthetically. I trust the individual State concept will remain.

After spending half a lifetime in some phase of public education, I become intensely weary and my blood pressure rises on many occasions when calamity howlers, for political expediency or for some other personal or selfish reason that cannot be justified, continually condemn our system of education. Their remarks are an insult to every loyal, conscientious administrator, classroom teacher, and school director. I want to be the first to admit our system is not perfect, but what, I ask you, is?

I like a phrase coined in the last political campaign—"A record is not something on which to stand but on which to build." You people in education have compiled a good record but that is not enough. You must and will move forward.

In January I was driving from Washington to my home. It was the day on which an educational task force appointed by the President made its report. The chairman of the committee, Dr. Hovde, president of Purdue University, was being interviewed on radio. He remarked quite casually that

a Federal outlay of \$2½ billion per year would be required to give American education a significant uplift. What that significant lift should be he did not say. When asked how the committee proposed to raise this money he replied, even more casually, they had not gotten around to that.

Sometime later Governor Lawrence was quoted as having said, and I quote: "We must come face to face with the chaotic, frequently obsolete, educational system which surrounds us." Just when did the Governor become an authority on public education? He also quoted Dr. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education, as having "called many of our schools flabby and soft." I should like to ask the educators present, What is a soft and flabby school?

This week a publication, *Decade of Experiment*, came to my desk. It is a report of the Ford Foundation for the Advancement of Education. The following is the first sentence in the publication: "In the middle of the 20th century the American educational system—a distinctive feature of our democratic life and one of which we have been traditionally proud—finds itself in crisis."

On the opposite page is a statement made by Walter Lippmann in 1954: "Our educational effort today is still in approximately the same position as was the military effort of this country before Pearl Harbor."

To what period do these dispensers of gloom refer? A product can only be evaluated after it has been tested. The end product of every school system is its citizens. Ten, fifteen, or twenty years from now an honest value can be placed on your efforts here today and in the days to come. Didn't the school systems of a decade or two ago produce the Alan Shepards and thousands like him? Let's quit being calamity howlers and talk of accomplishments.

This building has been erected to meet the demands of an ever-increasing school population as well as to improve the standards of the education being offered. A phenomenal growth on high school population has recently occurred. In 1905 one-third of those enrolling in grade school entered high school and only about 9 percent of an age group graduated. By 1930 over 75 percent entered with 45 percent graduating. Today those figures are higher.

There are reasons for this change. The non-high-school graduate has a difficult time finding employment. Our expanded courses, such as vocational education, tend to keep students in school longer because they realize in this days of automation some knowledge of mechanization is essential.

The little red schoolhouse was a landmark and served a distinct and useful purpose in a pioneer society in thinly populated areas.

However, with the tremendous growth of urban areas, a complete revamping of our school system seemed desirable. Smaller districts were consolidated and were thus able to offer advantages not possible previously.

Larger units in themselves do not necessarily mean improved education. It does mean an expanded curriculum, easier administration, and better physical facilities. Stone and mortar do not make a school. You now have the physical facilities and it becomes the responsibility of teachers, administrators, students, parents, and that maligned group of men who have a thankless job and whose reward comes only in the knowledge of a job well done—and I mean school directors—to provide the best education possible for the children of this community. In building a better educational system here, you make your contribution to a better America—this, in turn, helps build a better world. The starting point for all of this is the individual citizen and that citizen dare not be a mediocre one if he is

to make his contribution to society. He must be equipped to take his place in an extremely diversified world and become a conscientious, contributing citizen. He must maintain a vital interest in all that occurs around him.

Someone has said, "The success of democracy rests on wise citizen participation in public affairs and on respect for the individual wherever his talents lie."

My experience in Washington sometimes makes me fearful there are those who would take away our individual freedoms and rights and in their place substitute rule from a central point. We do not want all roads leading to Washington. That day can come only if we fail to exercise our God-given rights and remain strong as individuals.

We are still a relatively new country and the opportunities for discoveries and advancement have never been greater. To meet the mounting challenges, we must produce citizens capable of maintaining the strength and integrity their country demands. This can only be accomplished if all take advantage of educational, social and political opportunities offered. This school, and every similar one throughout this great State, is another indication of our vast resources available to interested individuals, and may I remind you all this has been done at the State and local level and I trust will continue to be done in that manner.

Our hope and future strength lies in an educated populace which will form an intelligent, dedicated citizenry.

May I wish you, citizens of this community, parents, teachers, students, members of the school board, good fortune and success in all your endeavors.

The Responsibility of Being a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 13, 1961, Congressman CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland's Sixth District, addressed the annual convention of the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans in Hagerstown, Md.

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

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

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF BEING A REPUBLICAN
(Delivered before the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans in Hagerstown, Md., Saturday, May 13, 1961, by Congressman CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland)

Just one century after the Republican Party saw its first President inaugurated on the steps of the east front of the Capitol, the party is faced with the necessity to assess its maturity. In spite of valid cause for optimism in many areas, the Republican Party in Maryland and throughout the Nation will face one of its most crucial tests in less than 18 months. Our optimism can only be justified and the tests can only be met if we realistically assess the validity of our cause, the soundness of our principles and the maturity of our party. If the results of this self-examination give us the confidence that our dedicated work is an essential ingredient of national existence and progress, we can go forward.

In the first place, let us be honest with history. In many respects, the Republican Party has been a minority party since 1932. We have attained a majority in the House of Representatives at only brief intervals since that date. Without the tremendous personal prestige of General Eisenhower it is questionable whether we would have held the White House at any time since that date.

Although this record is not encouraging, many Republican leaders, newspaper editors and political commentators now predict that we have an opportunity to gain a majority in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1962 and to increase Republican membership in the 50 State legislatures. With proper planning, sound policy, adherence to principle and hard work, these prophecies can become reality. Nowhere is the promise greater for a Republican victory than in the State of Maryland.

The Monday morning quarterback can serve a useful purpose. While it may not serve the needs of the moment to review in detail the presidential election of 1960, it is possible to draw some conclusions that may guide us in the future. These conclusions take into account both our gains and losses on November 8, 1960.

Without trying to alibi the fact that we lost; we lost the White House and we lost the House of Representatives; yet we did make the impressive gain of 22 seats in the House. Before examining some of the reasons for the loss, let us consider the factors which may have influenced the gain. Most of these 22 seats were won from Democrats who had earned the radical tag for extreme records far to the left of center of both political parties. At the same time, seven incumbent Republican Congressmen lost their seats and an analysis of these losses indicates that they suffered from either positions in the extreme right wing or from weaknesses engendered by factional fights within their district Republican organizations.

Comforting as the gain in House membership may be to the Republican Party, it is still necessary to realistically remember that in Congress the Republican Party ran behind Nixon and the Presidential ticket. John F. Kennedy won the White House by only two-tenths of 1 percent of over 68 million recorded votes. This is a plurality of less than a single ballot in each of the Nation's precincts. President Kennedy's plurality was 49.7 percent of the total recorded vote with Richard M. Nixon being credited with 49.5 percent. Cope, the political paper of the AFL-CIO, estimated that in 11 States a popular shift of a fraction of 1 percent would have resulted in a Nixon victory. The New York Herald Tribune has pointed out that excluding Dixie, Democrats outpolled Republicans in contested elections by a total of 26,950,000 to 26,295,000.

These figures indicate that the Presidency of the United States hung as evenly in balance as it is historically possible to imagine. This balance, of course, turned upon the personalities of the candidates, the campaign that they conducted and the assets and the liabilities that each brought into the campaign with him. But, if personality can sway a presidential election, we may assume that the collective election of the Congress reflects more accurately the reaction of the electorate to parties and platforms. In this respect, the Republican Party in congressional campaigns throughout the country did not equal the performance of Vice President Nixon. This is the gap that we must recognize and seek to close next year.

The New York Times in an article which appeared on May 7, 1961, analyzed the problem as follows:

"This raises the question of what new factors are in play to affect the long-term trend, and here everything is arguable." (The very short-range factor, how time and change will treat President Kennedy, is not

arguable except by the most reckless knights of the crystal ball.)

The most compelling phenomena, as always for politicians, are voting statistics. These suggest—though not to Senator GOLDWATER's satisfaction—that the electorate will take large doses of Republicanism of the liberal, internationalist persuasion, but has less and less taste for the party in traditional old-guard packaging.

In the 1960 elections, for example, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, running on a strongly liberal-Republican voting record, won by a majority of a third-of-a-million votes in New Jersey at the same time Kennedy was carrying the State for the Democrats. The two other Republican senatorial victories won with impressive ease also returned liberals—MARGARET CHASE SMITH in Maine and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER in Democratic Kentucky, by wide majorities.

Conservatives, by contrast, had difficulty everywhere except in New Hampshire and Kansas, and KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, that model of orthodox prairie Republicanism, barely squeaked through with a majority of only 15,000 out of over 300,000 votes cast.

The 1958 Senatorial elections were even more conclusive. Democrats won seats previously held by such stalwarts of conservatism as John W. Bricker of Ohio, George W. Malone of Nevada, Chapman Revercomb of West Virginia, William E. Jenner of Indiana, Charles E. Potter of Michigan, Edward J. Thye of Minnesota, Frederick G. Payne of Maine, and Frank A. Barrett of Wyoming.

Former Senator William F. Knowland, running for Governor of California on a platform endorsing the so-called "right-to-work" law, was humiliatedly defeated. The only new Republican Senators elected this year—KENNETH B. KEATING of New York, WINSTON L. PROUTY of Vermont and HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania—quickly identified themselves with the Senate's liberal Republican minority and have since been voting accordingly.

I do not know whether you will agree with Russell Baker, the author of this quotation, but I think that we have to recognize that he is expressing the opinion of many Americans both within and without the Republican Party.

I would personally take issue with Mr. Baker on one point. I would take issue with him to the extent that he attempts to draw a sharp line of division between elements within the Republican Party. To this concept I must address myself today.

I do not mean to contend that there will not always be variations of opinion within the Republican Party and I hope that the day will never come when this is not so. We shall always have Republicans who, by virtue of background, environment, and experience react differently to national issues. But such healthy variety of viewpoint should not inhibit Republican unity and a solid party front. Such party unity can, however, be only achieved when there is a firm adherence to the basic principles of the party and a willingness on the part of individual Republicans to slough off personal and sectional interests for the sake of advancing our ideas of government and policy. For those of us who feel deeply about public questions it is often a great sacrifice to realize that an abiding principle of the party would restrict the exercise of our own whim in such matters. As one who has felt it necessary to cast an independent vote on occasion in my brief career in the Congress, I feel peculiarly qualified to issue this call first to party responsibility and secondly to the resultant party discipline. I do not believe that my conduct in the past has been inconsistent with this challenge.

I speak of principles; you may well ask me to define what I mean. In other words, what is a Republican?

The answer is simple: individualism is the bedrock of our party. If we are a conservative party, it is that we are dedicated to conserving human freedom and human dignity above all else. As Republicans we recognize that human freedom does not originate in Annapolis or in Washington. Human dignity is not the product of legislation or bureaucracy. Liberty is a common goal of people and we as a party contend that it can only flourish in the soil of freedom, economic and human freedom. Nor can the seat of any government be the source of the wealth of nations. It is created in factories or farms, at desks and in the market places where thrifty, industrious Americans earn. Although some Democrats may choose to forget, it was Thomas Jefferson who said, "That government which governs least, governs best," and it was Woodrow Wilson who said "The history of liberty is a history of limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

Republicans are unshaken in the wisdom of individuals to determine their own personal and national destinies. We are Republicans because our party is more deeply endowed with a sense of integrity in public affairs. We are Republicans because we seek to speak as Americans not as members of special groups of economic or social interests which may be inconsistent with the larger interests of our Republic. We can become the voice of the Nation expressing the opinions and the aspirations of all the people; truly a collective voice rather than a mere babble of shrill, individual cries for preference.

Adherence to principle can cause hard decisions. I frankly mention the recent vote in the House of Representatives on the enlargement of the Rules Committee as an example of this. There we had a simple choice between an opportunity to embarrass a new administration, but to do so we had to deny the right of a representative assembly to control of its own legislative processes. For me the choice was compelling, but not easy. At no time in the protracted debate on this subject in the press and on the floor of the House did I ever hear anyone deny this simple proposition.

In Maryland we have a similar difficult but compelling choice. We have seen how a ruthless majority has ridden roughshod over the principles of representative government and ignored the demand for equitable congressional representation. The creation of the so-called Eighth Congressional District violates every concept of fair and reasonable congressional districting. I personally went to Annapolis and testified in favor of a complete and equitable redistricting of seats in the House of Representatives. When the general assembly ignored all the calls upon its sense of fairness and historical and constitutional policy on this question, I then announced my support of the petition for referendum on the Congressional Redistricting Act of 1961.

But at this point we have another decision to make. If we support fair representation in the Congress of the United States, it follows that we must support fair representation in the General Assembly of Maryland. This may be less popular among some Republicans but I say to you that the principle is the same and that we as a party will gain dignity, honor, and victory if we recognize the validity of the principle. From my personal experience in campaigning in one of the largest suburban communities of Maryland, I can assure you of the tremendous response that we will receive if we demonstrate that we are ready to act upon this principle.

What I have had to say amounts to a plea to all of you and to all of our fellow Re-

publicans throughout the United States that by our actions and our words we make it clear to all our fellow countrymen that true Republican doctrine is as we know it.

This does not mean that we should compromise our principles and our convictions for the sake of a transitory success. It does not mean that we should become the feeble echoes of the cry of "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." It does mean that as the one political party which can genuinely represent a majority of the American people we must offer constructive opposition and reasonable alternatives to the proposals of the other party. It means that we must constantly evidence our concern for human problems and human rights. It means that we must persuade the American people that we do not regard power and responsibility as an end in itself but rather as an evidence of our conviction that human freedom rests on economic freedom.

In the light of recent events in Cuba, in Laos and around the world we must demonstrate that our respect for the individual is the most important political weapon in our struggle with the forces of communism. Our national purpose as stated in the Declaration of Independence is to proclaim "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." As this is the essence of the American spirit, it must be the essence of the Republican policy. As we recognize that there are human needs to be met, we can recognize that there are solutions to be found within the framework of our principles. We must know ourselves to be the party of responsible progress and we must be willing to organize ourselves to fulfill the responsibility of that role.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy Pays Tribute to Poland's Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 7, by proclamation of Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago officially observed the 170th anniversary of Poland's inspiring constitution.

More than 150,000 Chicagoans participated in a colorful parade and a program in Humboldt Park in tribute to this magnificent Polish document, which in 1791 brought to the people of Poland and to the European Continent for the first time the principles of dignity and self-rule, which only 2 years earlier had been incorporated into the Constitution of the United States.

I am sure I speak for all of those who participated in Sunday's inspiring program that we were indeed proud to welcome as the main speaker for this event in Chicago the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the inspiring remarks delivered by the Attorney General in tribute to Poland's Constitution of 1791. His remarks reflect to a great extent the sentiments expressed here in Congress by more than 100 of our colleagues last week, when on May 3 we honored the

Polish Constitution here in the House of Representatives. I am sure it is a source of great pride to all Americans of Polish descent that the Attorney General of the United States would join in this tribute.

Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Kennedy's remarks, delivered in Chicago on Sunday, follow:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY OBSERVANCE, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 7, 1961

I want to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to all of you for inviting me here today because I know I am among people who are dedicated forever to love of country and liberty. It is a great honor to join with you in celebrating the 170th anniversary of Poland's adoption of a constitution which gave meaning and noble expression to liberty and the fundamental rights of man.

The history of Poland goes back many years—many more than that of the United States, but almost since the day the Declaration of Independence was drafted in Philadelphia, the history of Poland and the United States have been entwined. These close ties have existed between the Poles and the Americans because of mutual respect for each other.

Casimir Pulaski was 29 years old when he came to America as a volunteer to serve in the Continental Army. He participated with distinction in the Battle of Brandywine and formed his own cavalry unit which was known as Pulaski's Legion. Pulaski was with the ragged American Army during the cruel winter at Valley Forge and lost his life leading an attack against the British defenses at Savannah, Ga. Though he died fighting for America's freedom, I cannot help but believe that he also was fighting for Poland's freedom.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, another Polish volunteer, was one of the most popular officers in the Continental Army—by all accounts. He was Washington's adjutant, built the fortifications at West Point and later served as a strategist and fighting officer in the recapture of Charleston, S.C.

After the United States had won its independence, Congress awarded him American citizenship, the rank of brigadier general and a large land grant. But Kosciuszko returned to Poland and a few years later fought to defend the constitution which we honor today. In 1794, when Polish patriots again sought to win their freedom by fighting, Kosciuszko returned from exile to lead them—and again distinguished himself—only to be overwhelmed by vastly superior forces.

Kosciuszko still was pleading the cause of Polish independence in 1814—at the Congress of Vienna. He was then 68 years old, but the same democratic spirit which burned brightly in Jefferson and Lafayette—also was unquenchable in him.

And down through the years to the Second World War—Poles and Americans have stood steadfast for the cause of liberty. The Poles, under Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, had the distinction of capturing Cassino and its historic abbey which blocked the Allied advance in Italy for so many months. I visited Monte Cassino several years ago and climbed up the steep, rocky hillside where the Polish soldiers fought their way forward. I will never forget the inscription on the memorial to the Polish soldiers who are buried there:

"We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given ourselves to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy and our hearts to Poland."

These very same principles of freedom for which these gallant Polish soldiers died at Cassino should be an inspiration to free people everywhere in the world today.

I might add that on this same trip in 1955, I visited Poland, too, and after traveling through the Soviet Union, it was inspiring to see that the people of Poland still stand and yearn for the principles of freedom and meaningful democracy.

So, the ties between our countries, beginning with Pulaski and Kosciuszko, go to the present time and it just wasn't a coincidence that the President, in his state of the Union message, mentioned one country—Poland—because he has the same admiration and affection for the Poles than I do.

We continue to be interested in and have concern for the welfare of the Polish people and we have attempted to maintain our close ties with them. In doing this, we have developed cultural relations and exchanges. We have developed economic programs which are of assistance to the Polish people.

What we need are:

1. More flexibility in giving assistance to Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

2. Strengthen the economic and cultural ties between Poland and the United States.

3. Increase the exchange of students, teachers, and technicians.

4. Explore with the Polish Government the possibility of using our frozen Polish funds on projects of peace that will demonstrate our abiding friendship for and interest in the people of Poland.

Recently, we have been disturbed by a number of hostile statements made by Polish leaders. However, we believe that the Poles favor, as we do, the continuing development of constructive relations between the two countries and we hope that they will avoid words and actions which would impede such development.

The Polish people will know that the American people and the American Government will continue to seek friendly relations. They also will know that we will work unceasingly to defend freedom and individual rights as heirs of a noble heritage—in the spirit of 1791 as well as in the spirit of 1776.

Israel: A Demonstration of Freedom With Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Saturday, May 13, 1961, to have been a participant in the ceremonies at Clarksburg, W. Va., commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel. This bar mitzvah anniversary observance, which afforded me a stimulating and enriching experience, was sponsored by Louis Hiller Lodge No. 727 of the B'nai B'rith, the Sisterhood of the Tree of Life Congregation of Clarksburg, and the Clarksburg Chapter of Hadassah.

Mr. S. J. Birshtein, a prominent civic and business leader of Clarksburg, conducted the gathering as master of ceremonies and reported that the subscription of \$15,000 in bonds for Israel was the best in recent years.

Rabbi Elihu E. Elefant, spiritual leader of the Tree of Life Synagogue, offered an inspiring invocation, and warm welcoming addresses were delivered by Mr.

Hyman Rosen in behalf of the B'nai B'rith and Mr. Donald Berman, chairman of the Clarksburg Israel Bond Committee.

Among the dramatic highlights of the evening was the lighting of 13 candles for each of Israel's years as an independent state, and one for growth. The participants in this ceremony were Mr. Jake Berman, Mr. H. A. Caplan, Mr. Abraham Chapnick, Mr. Leonard Gottlieb, Mr. Ray Kramer, Mr. Jack Marks, Mr. Albert Rosen, Mr. Jack Schwartz, Mrs. Jack Schwartz, Mrs. A. Robert Marks, Mrs. Sarah Markowitz, Mrs. George Rosen, and Mr. Maxwell Samuel.

Mr. Steve Gaynor, prominent vocalist and comedian from Pittsburgh, added the lighter touches to an evening of encouragement and inspiration.

It was my pleasure on this occasion to confer awards on the two winners of a community essay contest on Israel commemorating the bar mitzvah of Israel, Mr. Robert Lees, age 14, and a student at Central Junior High School, who received the junior award, and Miss Barbara Birshtein, age 16, a junior at Washington Irving High School, winner of the senior award.

Dr. Isadore Buff of Charleston, State chairman of bonds for Israel, and Mrs. Buff were among the honored guests at the celebration, as were also Mr. and Mrs. Julian Blackman, community and State civic leaders from Portsmouth, Va., and Mr. W. G. Stathers, a leading Clarksburg attorney.

As speaker of the evening, I was introduced by the Honorable Howard Caplan, a close personal friend and former U.S. attorney for the northern district of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks delivered at the bar mitzvah celebration of the State of Israel in Clarksburg.

There being no objection, the remarks will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL: A DEMONSTRATION OF FREEDOM WITH RESPONSIBILITY

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel bonds for Israel rally, 8:30 p.m., e.s.t., Clarksburg, W. Va., Saturday, May 13, 1961)

Seldom has the ancient ceremony of the bar mitzvah been more symbolically appropriate than this year in its application to the State of Israel. The Jewish nation, the source of much of the greatest moral and religious philosophy of Western civilization, now observes the "coming of age"—the traditional acceptance of moral responsibility—of the State of Israel.

There has probably been no state, not excepting even our own United States, which has achieved statehood with a higher degree of moral consciousness and national self-awareness than has the State of Israel. And the Christian world is reminded today by the State of Israel—as it has been in times past by the Jewish people themselves—of how far we have often strayed from our own moral commandments. Thus, though it is a grim connection to make, there is an almost poetic justice in the Eichmann trial being held in Israel during the year of its bar mitzvah.

For this trial, which is being conducted with the most scrupulous regard for judicial process, is not animated by the desire for vengeance against the man Eichmann.

There can be no mortal punishment or vengeance suitable to the ghastly crimes for which he stands accused. Nor is it a trial merely of the Nazi system and the German people who supported it during its days of power. Western civilization itself is, to some extent, on trial. For the Nazi system prospered in one of the most advanced nations of the Western World, and it had its apologists even in the United States and in England. Thus, each of us who, as an adult during the thirties and forties, did less than his utmost to combat the disease of nazism, shares a portion of the guilt for the crimes for which Eichmann is accused. In this sense, the State of Israel, in the year of its bar mitzvah, probes the moral responsibility of the Western World.

The American poet, Robert Frost, during his recent visit to Israel remarked half facetiously that he "looked upon Israel as an American colony." Though it would not do to overstate the point, as in most of Frost's remarks, there is the pungent taste of truth in this one. I refer not only to our official and early recognition of the State of Israel, nor to that country's substantial financial support from Americans of Jewish faith.

Equally important is the hold which Israel has upon the imagination of millions of Americans of every faith because so much of the Israel experience seems related to our own national experience. Like the United States, Israel has drawn its population from the exiles and refugees of many lands—the "ingathering" of the past 13 years, which has almost trebled the population of Israel, being one of the great and dramatic achievements of this century.

And as the United States, the first great democracy of the modern world, was viewed with dislike and anxiety by the monarchies of Europe, so Israel, the first experiment in democracy in the Middle East, is feared and disliked by the Arab autocracies.

Finally, Israel shares the American "frontier experience" in the form of the Negev desert, which comprises half of the entire country. This region, as forbidding as the most wild and barren regions of the American West, has already begun to yield to the genius of Israeli science and the courage and industry of Israeli pioneers.

Thus, as Americans and as participants in the great enterprise of Western civilization we are committed—within certain limitations—to the support of Israel for moral, political and practical reasons.

First, we have been politically involved in the support of an independent and peaceful development of Israel since our support of the United Nations partition out of which the State of Israel emerged. This was further sealed by President Truman's immediate recognition of Israel on May 14, 1948, only a few hours after the final withdrawal of the British forces.

But American political support of Israel is not solely a matter of our keeping trust with past resolutions to serve the rightful and legitimate interests of Israel. We have strong and compelling practical reasons of our own self-interest in our desire to see Israel prosper and flourish in peace. As a cultural enclave of the West, it offers our best hope for the development of democracy in a section of the earth torn by centuries of oriental despotism, intrigue and tribal rivalries. Israel thus offers the best hope for political stability and orderly progress in the Middle East, and hence, our strongest defense against the infiltration of Soviet power.

Though the Middle East has temporarily yielded the headlines to Cuba, Laos and Vietnam, we know that as long as that region is a battleground of the cold war, Russian interests are served by instability and by pitting Israel and the Arab nations against one another, while we must seek to maintain political stability and develop friendship

with the Arab nations without sacrificing the claims of Israel.

Another eminently practical reason for our support of Israel is the increasing importance of its role of technical assistance and guidance to the lesser developed countries of Asia and Africa. Commenting on the contributions of foreign specialists to the development of such countries as Ghana, Nigeria, Liberia, Ceylon, and the Philippines, one observer recently remarked:

"Perhaps the most sympathetic figure among these rivals experts is the Israeli, sun-burnt, stripped for action; he too comes from a poor land which is making itself richer by sweat and ingenuity. Many in Asia and Africa would prefer to go into partnership with Israel, whose problems are more nearly related, and who, therefore, sees solution in more realistic terms."

In addition to such technical assistance, Israel has provided training in Israel for a significant number of students and civil servants from Asia and Africa. The variety of training and education ranges from a special "in residence" study of Israel cooperative villages by 30 Burmese officials and their families to Japanese scientists doing advanced research at the Weizmann Institute of Science and other Asian and African students engaged in postgraduate studies of mathematics, medicine, architecture, and economics.

A third form of cooperation between Israel and the new states has been the establishment of joint economic enterprises in which Israel provides managerial experts and technical training for the local personnel, participates in the work, and contributes a substantial share of the capital. Typical of such ventures are the Black Star Line, an Israel-Ghana shipping company, and the Ghana National Construction Co., in both of which companies ownership is vested 60 percent in the Government of Ghana and 40 percent in Israeli principals.

The contributions of Israel to the development of the new states and to the extension of democratic forms of government is perhaps best expressed in the words of an African official from Senegal upon the completion of his tour in Israel, when he declared:

"Naturally many of us are overawed by the Soviet experiment. It's a very tempting road to rapid modernization for an underdeveloped country. But we couldn't stomach the forced labor that goes with it. We don't think parliamentary democracy as it is practiced in certain Western countries can work in Africa, yet most of us are anxious to retain the basic principles of a democratic society. In Israel we see a whole nation working hard for the same goals under a democratic system of government."

Thus, the people of Israel, by virtue of their contest with a harsh and formerly barren land, and out of their heritage of democratic idealism which has withstood the centuries of privation and suffering, may assume a role of leadership among the underdeveloped countries which the larger and more prosperous Western democracies are denied.

But equally binding as our political and practical commitments to Israel is the debt we owe to Jewish culture and tradition for having first awakened the moral consciousness of Western man. In the history of the Western World perhaps the first truly civilized answer to the question of what each of us owes to his fellow man solely for the sake of man's humanity to man was that given by the writer of Leviticus: "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Leviticus 19: 34).

The intellectual and spiritual contributions of Judaism were the source of the early nourishment of that which is most precious in Western civilization. The idea of the dignity and integrity of the individual ex-

pressed in Job's despairing cry that "I will not sacrifice my integrity"; the ideal of social justice, served in varied ways and by such diverse personalities as Moses and Spinoza, and the belief in the brotherhood of all men as the children of one Creator—these values have shaped the aspirations of Western man and were the source of much of Christianity and Mohammedanism.

Not only did the Jewish people animate Western moral and religious thought by giving the world their own Book in the Old Testament, but it was the Alexandrian Jews who translated the Book of Law, the Pentateuch, into Greek.

It was these Jews and succeeding generations who kept alive the knowledge of classical Greek during the early Middle Ages when the light of learning had been virtually extinguished in Europe. And it was in large part through Jewish philosophers in the service of Moslem courts that classical learning was reborn in Europe, thus laying the foundation for the Renaissance.

This Jewish devotion to the life of the mind—so strong as to have been thought by many Jews and non-Jews as a hereditary trait—has placed the civilized world in lasting debt. Negligible as a political power in the world at large, and representing less than 1 percent of the world population before World War II, the Jewish people have supplied a leadership far out of proportion to their numbers in every field of human arts and sciences.

Of the 257 Nobel Prizes awarded in the first 50 years of this century, 34 were awarded to Jews. Though the intellectual achievements of Jews have been the product of individuals rather than of a group, they have in large part resulted from mobilizing the individual's resources in response to the oppression of the group. This capacity, perhaps more than any other, has been responsible for keeping the Jew alive as a cultural and national identity through 2,000 years of the dispersion.

Nor is there any indication that the well springs of Jewish creativity have been dried by the creation of the State of Israel. To name only one instance: the desalination of sea water on a practical and economic basis—which may well prove to be the greatest scientific boon to mankind in this century—has been further advanced by the scientists of Israel than by those of any other nation.

But whatever the source of Jewish creativity, the modern world would be far poorer but for the artistic and scientific contributions of Jews. Indeed, it is not overstating the case to observe that of the four men who have framed the problems of our century, three were Jews. I refer to Charles Darwin—the only gentile—Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and Albert Einstein.

Whatever one may think of the conclusions they reached, the works of these four men opened new ways of thinking and gave an indelible and distinctive stamp to the modern world.

Thus, as legatees of Western civilization and as brothers of the human race we are morally obligated to the cause of a Jewish national homeland. We are thus compelled, not only as an acknowledgment of our debt to Jewish culture, but as insurance against the persecution and oppression which has marked the life of the Jew in Diaspora.

Spinoza, among the most gentle and noble of our great philosophers, once wrote that "A free man thinks of nothing less than of death; and his wisdom is a meditation not of death, but of life." Thus he set forth the text of Israel. For certainly no people has offered its martyrs more bravely or in greater numbers than the Jew. The Christian martyrs of the Roman Empire are numbered in the thousands. The Jews cannot name or number their martyred millions in the world of Christendom, culminating—in the eternal shame of all men—in the ghastly and bestial crematoria of the Nazis.

There has been a further difference between the lot of the Christian martyr and that of the Jew. The Christian died secure in his faith in the reward of immediate afterlife. The Jew received no halo and no promise of reward; and though the idea of an afterlife acquired some popularity after the Dispersion, it has never been the article of faith, the flaming conviction for the Jew that it is for the Christian.

Thus, if Jewish martyrdom had meaning, it was related to the continuity of Judaism and the hope of the ultimate rebirth of a Jewish national homeland. In the moving words of the ancient lament, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning—let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." For this reason also, the free nations of the West—which call themselves Christian—must help justify the nameless martyred millions of Jews.

The two millennia of the Diaspora are drawn to a close. But the epic struggle of the Jewish nation is not at an end, but a new beginning. The State of Israel, as it observes its Bar Mitzvah, has a man's work to do. In the words of Mrs. Golda Meir, Foreign Minister of Israel, in her eloquent address to the United Nations in 1957, "The deserts of the Middle East are in need of water, not bombers. The tens of millions of its inhabitants are craving for the means to live and not for the implements of death."

Israel has shown the way. There, in a desolate and alien land the broken victims of the Nazi horror and destruction brought only their faith and the invincible spirit of free men and women. The desert has retreated under the steady advance of fields of cotton, corn and wheat; forest and vineyard are covering the once barren and eroded hills; and the new city of Eilat has become a thriving port and Israel's outlet to Africa and the Far East.

Under the inspiration of the example of Israel, and with the support of the free nations of the West, these acts may be duplicated in the other countries of the Middle East, and thus bring that region to a new level of civilization. In this way also Israel will serve the spirit of freedom and responsibility.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news-letter of May 13, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT—TOWARD DICTATORSHIP?
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 13, 1961)

The Constitution, the basis of our limited Federal-State Government, outlines a republic within a democracy to safeguard personal liberty and dignity from Government regulation and control. Checks and balances are stipulated to assure limited government by prevention of the executive, legislative, and judiciary from encroachment on each other through balance of power. Any factor affecting this balance must be resisted. The world has witnessed a series of dictatorships, so it is not surprising that many people are aware of the need for containing the power of the Executive. It is in order, therefore, at any time and particularly now to

evaluate the performance of the executive branch since this administration took office 3½ months ago.

Here are a series of actions by the Executive, by officials within the administration following President Kennedy's demands, or by Congress as controlled by the Democrats and following his demands: (1) The President's first Executive order was to declare food surpluses and give them away as a welfare measure for nutritional reasons. This exceeds the Executive's jurisdiction under the law. (2) The Rules Committee membership was increased to expedite legislation programing and to control the ground rules of debate and the amendment of legislation; (3) military speeches must be censored, must go through the executive (Arleigh Burke); (4) newspapers asked to impose self-censorship; (5) television and radio executives told by FCC Chairman Minow, "There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license. I intend to see that you pay your debt to the public with service." (6) Regulatory agencies, arms of the Congress, not the administration, are the subject of President Kennedy's proposals to reorganize and delegate powers; (7) Congress forced to give up constitutional duty to scrutinize and approve appropriations annually in the depressed areas bill during the House-Senate conference (back-door spending); (8) Congress told to approve \$500 million for foreign aid to Latin America, the Executive absolutely refusing to specify countries and projects to receive aid, although Congress was told last year such information would be forthcoming; (9) Peace Corps set up by Executive order not by legislation; (10) House minimum wage replaced by President Kennedy version in House-Senate conference; (11) judgeships, public works, and patronage used to force and keep Congressmen in line to vote as President Kennedy decides on all his many legislative proposals; (12) the agriculture bill proposed by Secretary Freeman would relieve Congress from any future need for action.

When you realize that already the House has given up constitutional control of trade and tariffs, that CIA intelligence information goes to the administration, not Congress, and that the Presidency has already been likened to a benevolent dictatorship through past transfer of power from Congress to the Executive, what does it add up to?

Now let's explore the foreign situation: (1) The Executive is Commander in Chief of our defense forces representing approximately one-half of all Government expenditures; (2) foreign aid is almost entirely under the control of the Executive and nations, friend or foe, may be subsidized at the will of the Executive. In summary, are we indeed becoming a dictatorship? Can we hope to maintain our individual freedom and free institutions, indeed, our very form of society, if we concentrate the balance of power in one branch of government, dominated by one man? On the contrary, are we not then trying to beat dictatorships (communism) by becoming a dictatorship, while preserving the outward form of constitutional government?

The international scene is no more encouraging at this time: (1) Cuba continues unhampered its warlike buildup; (2) Laos seems scheduled to be added to Communist victories; (3) pro-Castro sentiment runs rampant in many Latin American countries; (4) no apparent end is in sight for settling the dangerous issues in the Congo; (5) the Soviet Union continues to stall in negotiations for the control of nuclear weapons.

Optimistically, positively and constructively, I say there is a solution to our present troubles at home and abroad. At home, let us reassert constitutional checks and balances—let us keep Federal Government lim-

ited, cut welfare spending, reduce debt and taxes—in short, the reassertion of Jeffersonian Democracy now championed by conservatives. Internationally, let us show to the world once again the majesty and power exemplified by our national symbol, the American eagle. Let us demonstrate to all people, and especially the Communist leaders, that we are not the "paper tiger" the Chinese Reds have been able to convince too many uncommitted peoples that we are. The American people are far ahead of the leadership in demonstrating our willingness to show the world that the American eagle will remain a symbol of hope and strength and courage to all who desire to be free. The leadership must let the world know the will of the American people to support with action the magnificent words of President Kennedy in his inaugural address. There can be no further stalling. We must be done with continuous negotiations which are merely used by the Communists to cloak further aggression. We have the will and the means to show clearly that America is not a "paper tiger" but a mighty eagle, soaring into the heavens with strength and ready to defend freedom by backing up our words in Cuba, in southeastern Asia, and wherever the Communists threaten the freedom and liberty of mankind.

Mother's Day Service, Combined Church Schools, First Lutheran Church of Altoona, Sunday, May 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 14, 1961, it was my privilege to deliver the following Mother's Day address to the combined Sunday Schools of the First Lutheran Church of Altoona, Pa., as part of their annual Mother's Day service:

MOTHER'S DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT MOTHER'S DAY SERVICE, FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 14, 1961

Holy Scripture reminds us that "he that honoreth his mother is as one that layeth up treasure."

The converse of this text for my Mother's Day message is to be found in Proverbs, chapter 14, verse 20: "A foolish man despiseth his mother."

The scriptural lesson here taught agrees with common experience and general opinion.

A man's value can generally be pretty well determined—by his relations with his mother—by the way he looks at her—speaks to her—speaks about her.

The attitude of an honorable and manly man toward his mother is an attitude of love and respect.

An affectionate regard for the wishes of his mother does no harm to a man's dignity and independence, and a protective chivalry helps a man to develop a firm courage.

Mother's Day is an excellent institution if we take it as an occasion to emphasize an attitude that reveals our conduct and speech the year round.

Thus we can observe Mother's Day in an appropriate manner by giving some extra remembrance to one we never forget, and by displaying on Mothers' Day before the world

a feeling that we show to our mothers and experience in ourselves, every day of the year.

Mother's Day can be worthwhile, too, if it marks a turning point in our relations with our mothers, by providing a time of good resolutions which are adhered to in a conscientious manner.

It can be worthwhile if we write a letter and continue the correspondence, if we give needed help, resume close association, apologize for past neglect and, above all, resolve to do better in the future.

On the other hand, Mother's Day is a mockery if it is only an occasion of momentary attention after 12 long months of utter disregard for our obligation of love and respect.

Wear a carnation if you wish, but unless it represents an emotional tie, a relationship of affection and honor between you and your mother, it might just as well be a lowly cabbage.

The beauty of the carnation must represent the beauty of the relationship it is intended to symbolize.

To wear it honestly as the token of Mother's Day you must mourn your mother if she is dead, or rejoice in her if she is living. Living or dead, she should be the object of your unflinching love and deepest respect.

Every mother has borne pain and undergone danger for her child. Mothers down through the ages have given years of effort to the physical care and sustenance, the intellectual development, and the moral training of their children. This display of deep maternal love is a free gift, expecting no sort of return or reward.

But though our mothers have freely given, with no thought of recompense, the gift itself demands at least the just recognition of gratitude and of whatever form of expressing that gratitude deemed appropriate to present circumstances.

For those who are grown up and have established their own families and independent way of life there is no one prescribed and proper form of relationship with their mothers.

In some families it has been found an ideal arrangement to have the mother live with them, helping with the household duties, thus being spared the expense of a separate establishment and benefiting by the consciousness of being needed.

In other families, where circumstances or personalities may differ, such an arrangement might be disastrous to family relationships. In such cases harmony and happiness might be best served by the mother's keeping a separate and independent living place, to whose upkeep her children might contribute if necessary. Some find the best answer in a flexible system of traveling and exchanging visits.

The basic necessity is affection at the core of the relationship, with the physical details to be adjusted by mutual agreement, and with regard to financial and other circumstances.

What is essential is the attitude of mutual respect and love that leads to cordial agreement and generous cooperation in establishing harmonious conditions of living.

This attitude is represented neither by the slogan, "Mother knows best," nor by the masterful declaration, "Now, mother, we know what is best for you, and you needn't trouble yourself—we'll arrange it all."

Respect should not be exaggerated into abject submission nor care and solicitude degraded into tyranny.

A mother is, first of all, a person entitled to recognition as an equal and independent personality, with her own opinions and preferences.

Her opinion on your affairs is to be sought with respect, listened to with courtesy and attention, and given its due weight in the formation of your decisions. Her opinion on her own affairs is paramount and deci-

sive, except insofar as she may choose to defer to your opinion or preference.

Courtesy is the outward expression of the warmth of affection that must permeate family relationships. But courtesy does more than express that warmth of affection—it preserves and stimulates it. Mother's Day affords the opportunity for an expression of formal courtesy from all of us toward our mothers.

The writing of letters, the wearing and giving of flowers, the special celebrations of the day such as dinners, parties, entertainments, all these are of value as acts of courtesy, as tangible, audible, visible assurances to our mothers of the warmth of our feelings for them.

This virtue of courtesy has been fittingly celebrated by the English Catholic poet, Belloc, in terms that associate it vividly both with religion and with motherhood:

"Of courtesy, it is much less
Than courage of heart or holiness,
Yet in my walks it seems to me
That the grace of God is in courtesy.

"On monks I did in Storrington fall,
They took me straight into their hall;
I saw three pictures on a wall,
And courtesy was in them all.

"The first the annunciation;
The second the visitation;
The third the consolation
Of God that was our Lady's Son.

"The first was of St. Gabriel;
On wings a-flame from Heaven he fell;
And as he went upon one knee
He shown with heavenly courtesy.

"Our Lady out of Nazareth rode—
It was her month of heavy load;
Yet was her face both great and kind,
For courtesy was in her mind.

"The third it was our little Lord,
Whom all the kings in arms adored;
He was so small you could not see
His large intent of courtesy.

"Our Lord, that was our Lady's Son,
Go bless you, people, one by one;
My rhyme is written, my work is done."

Courtesy is a form of politeness, but it is a stronger word than politeness, carrying with it the implication of real feeling, of gentleness and courage and kindness.

Courtesy goes with the "something more" of politeness, with the dramatic demonstration of affectionate respect.

Politeness, therefore, is suitable to our everyday relations with our mothers and courtesy is suitable to this special day.

Not a nod of greeting but a low bow, not a hasty kiss but a hearty embrace, not a friendly word but a gift, a flower, a speech of tribute.

This is a day for the plentiful and courteous bestowal of gifts and praises—upon our mothers. Let us be grateful and gracious in our observance of the occasion.

We ourselves know, and we can be assured our mothers know, how we feel about them. If our feelings are not such as are appropriate to the day let us labor to amend them.

If our feelings are, however, in tune with the spirit of the day, let us not shrink from giving full and enthusiastic expression to them in the confidence that a bold expression of devotion to the ideal of motherhood, and to one particular mother, will be beneficial not only to our personal relationships but to the community in general, and particularly to our young people.

Standing in this holy place, I am made strongly aware of the most fitting celebration of this occasion—the spiritual. The best and greatest gift we can give to our mothers is to pray, sincerely and fervently, both for their welfare and for our own fulfillment of their hopes for us.

Nearest to the heart of any mother is the hope that her son or her daughter will be a good man or woman. An endeavor to fulfill this hope in the development of our own characters should, therefore, be our resolve on this day for the coming year.

May God guide our consciences in the formation of this resolution and strengthen our wills in its performance.

The value of this day, in strengthening and renewing our relationship with our mothers, is great and lasting. From the natural human virtue of love between mother and child we rise easily and naturally to the love of God.

The value of such natural human emotions and virtues is eloquently celebrated in a familiar poem by Father Abram J. Ryan, which might well be taken as the keynote of our Mother's Day observance:

"Better than grandeur, better than gold,
Than rank and titles a thousandfold,
Is a healthy body and a mind at ease,
And simple pleasures that always please.

"A heart than can feel for another's woe,
And share his joys with a genial glow;
With sympathies large enough to enfold
All men as brothers, is better than gold.

"Better than gold is a conscience clear,
Though toiling for bread in an humble
sphere.

Doubly blessed with content and health,
Untried by the lusts and cares of wealth,
Lowly living and lofty thought
Adorn and ennoble a poor man's cot;
For mind and morals in nature's plan
Are the genuine tests of an earnest man.

"Better than gold is a peaceful home
Where all the fireside characters come,
The shrine of love, the heaven of life,
Hallowed by mother, or sister, or wife,
However humble the home may be,
Or tried with sorrow by Heaven's decree,
The blessings that never were bought or
sold,
And center there, are better than gold."

Progress at This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Congress has now passed the midway mark in this session. In a weekend address over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to review some of the progress, as well as some of the jobs left to be done.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Today, we live in a pushbutton age. In Congress, however, the right buttons have not been pushed to create the kind of fast-paced progress anticipated in this era of the New Frontier.

Now, it is true that the problems are complex. And the instruments of accomplishment are sometimes unwieldy.

As of now, the major legislation—and some of it very controversial—passed, included:

Increase in minimum wage and extension of coverage to workers;

Area development program for communities suffering from economic depression;

Extension of unemployment compensation benefits;

Approval of additional Federal judgeships. However, midway in the session, this is not a startling record.

What are some of the major fields in which action is still needed? These include: Speeding up the space program; Strengthening our defenses; this involves also reexamination and improvement of our global effort to combat communism, not only in the military, but also on the nonmilitary fronts;

Reexamination of the farm problem to try to find realistic solutions to production-consumption imbalance;

Needed improvement and expansion of our educational system;

Carrying forward the highway construction program, if possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis;

Equitable revision of our tax system to better serve, not stunt, economic growth and progress;

Liberalization of social security, including realistic efforts to meet the health needs of our aging folks.

These measures and a long list of others still await final consideration in Congress.

LEGISLATION OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO WISCONSIN

In addition, there are a number of pieces of legislation of special interest to Wisconsin. These include:

(1) Appropriations for improvement and expansion of our port and harbor facilities and flood control.

(2) Congress has failed, in my judgment, to provide realistic legislation to enable the Menominee Indian Tribe—now terminated from Federal control and constituting our 72d county in Wisconsin—to meet the great economic, health, sanitation, educational, and other problems confronting them. Early this session, I cosponsored legislation for extension of Federal control until a proper foundation could be laid for tribal control over their affairs. Unfortunately, the Congress too long delayed consideration of such legislation.

Now it appears that the best that may be achieved is legislation to (1) extend assistance in the field of education, health, and sanitation until the tribe itself can handle these matters; (2) provide loans to help meet the tremendous financial obligations; and (3) authorize Uncle Sam to keep a watchful eye on the financial affairs of the tribe to attempt to assume its economic stability.

Unless these minimum actions are taken, however, the tribute will find itself hard put to meet its obligations and fulfill the needs of the Menominee Indians in years ahead.

(3) Next, we find that there has been a failure to act expeditiously on my bill S. 1515 to provide \$10 million supplemental funds for the school lunch program for the current fiscal year.

Unfortunately, the Department of Agriculture has too long delayed a report on the bill—holding up action in Congress. As a result, the program is now suffering serious curtailment. In the light of these facts, I contacted, not only the Appropriations Committee, but the Secretary of Agriculture to "prod" them for action.

(4) The appropriation of funds for expansion of research facilities at our Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, also, is of major interest to Wisconsin.

Regrettably, the House of Representatives cut out \$300,000 for much-needed expansion of the research facilities. In the Senate, however, I urged reinstatement of these funds. In my judgment, this is essential, not only for our forest interests, but for the economy of Wisconsin and the Nation.

INVEST IN AMERICA

Now turning to another topic: A great many of you will recall that during the past week there have been nationwide observances held to encourage more folks to invest in America. This is indeed a sound, most worthy project. Today, there are more than 13 million shareholders in publicly owned corporations. In my judgment, however, this number can and should be greatly expanded to include more people. Why? Because by sound, confident investment in our job-creating free enterprise system we can—

More quickly lick such problems as unemployment and business and industrial slowdowns;

Successfully meet the Communist challenge to our free enterprise systems; and

More effectively fulfill the ever-growing needs of a fast-expanding population.

Investing in America, however, means more than just investing our money for a profit. Rather it means also dedicating the time, thought, energy, and resources to building a stronger, better America to meet the growing challenges of the future.

NEEDED: GREATER PUBLIC EDUCATION ON FREE ENTERPRISE

The economy, in my judgment, could be greatly strengthened by instilling in our people, particularly youth, a greater understanding of the working principles of our free enterprise system.

Today, unfortunately, there is an abysmal lack of such knowledge.

To a large degree, too large, I believe, people still believe—in a vague, distorted way—what, in effect, the Communists are saying about us, that is—

That big business attempts to bleed the public for profits;

That labor represents a class struggle against the capitalists; and

That our society is essentially one of conflicts, rather than of cooperation in efforts to fulfill our needs, individually and nationally.

Now, it's true that, in the past, there have been conflicts, and abuses of power.

Today, however, the enlightened interests are becoming more and more aware that the broad, long-range interests of management, labor, consumer, and the Nation can be best served, and are being best served, by cooperation, rather than by antagonism and conflicts of interests.

Management, traditionally interested, to a large degree, in profits, more and more looks after the human needs of their workers; for a happy, well-paid employee is a more productive worker; and also a market for more products of the economy.

Labor also has a vested interest in the success of the business upon which jobs are dependent.

The public, as consumers, as well as investors (exemplified by the 13 million shareholders of publicly owned corporations) has a real interest in the success of job-creating, commodity-producing enterprises, as well as the welfare of the American worker.

The American people, however, in school and by adult education, need to be better informed of ways in which we, as individuals, can contribute to further strengthening our free enterprise system.

Only if this is done, can we successfully meet the ever-growing needs of a fast-expanding population, as well as the challenge of the Communists.

NEEDED: SPEED UP U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

During this past week, also, we witnessed one of the great "breakthroughs" in our space program: that is, the successful sub-orbital flight of Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard into space. This was a historically significant step forward in freemen's efforts to explore the universe.

The American people, I believe, can be justly proud.

Now, however, we look forward to success, with, we pray, a minimum of setbacks, in our next step of launching a manned spacecraft into orbit around the earth.

In the world stadium, nations are carefully watching the contest between the major protagonists of freedom and communism in space exploration, the United States and the Soviet Union. Although we didn't plan it that way, this is, indeed, a real space race.

According to experts, the cumulative scientific-technological value of our accomplishments far exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore nor underestimate the psychological impact which Russian "firsts" in space have had upon the minds of the world.

Regrettably, the U.S. timetable has run only a short distance behind Communist launchings. After the first sputnik, for example, we shortly orbited not one, but many, satellites—now outnumbering the Soviets by about 40 to 15.

Recently, the Soviets reportedly orbited the first man in space. Now, we have successfully conducted a suborbital flight.

With such a relatively short lag in timing, it would appear that by only a slight speed-up of our program we could demonstrate to the world that we can accomplish space feats not only equal to and greater, but also faster, than the Soviet Union.

"The question is not: Will we do these things? Rather, the issue is: When will we do them?"

"Will we do them before, or after, the Soviets? In my judgment, we should do it before."

"We recognize, of course, that space feats are basically scientific-technological-military accomplishments rather than weapons of propaganda warfare."

"Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the tremendous psychological impact which Soviet triumphs have had upon the world."

"The task now is to, first, predetermine the next major accomplishments in space; and second, as possible, set up the timetable so that the United States can get the maximum benefit not only from the accomplishments themselves, but also from the great psychological impact of firsts in the space race," Senator WILEY concluded.

Who Killed Atomic-Powered Plane?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which I wrote for the May issue of the national magazine, *Aircraft and Missiles*:

WHO KILLED ANP?—PSEUDOSCIENTIFIC ADVICE GIVEN TO PRESIDENT ON NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT; DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ESTABLISHED DESIGN CRITERIA THEN SHOT HOLES IN PROJECT; CONTINUOUS AIRBORNE ALERT NATURAL APPLICATION FOR ANP

(By Congressman MELVIN PRICE, Democrat of Illinois)

It is extremely unfortunate that the Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion (ANP) project has been canceled. Nuclear propelled aircraft are important to the Nation's future; I therefore believe we will someday develop such aircraft despite this latest Executive decision. The decision just injects an indefi-

nite delay that will cost us a great deal in money, and prestige.

DECISION INPUTS

I admire the President for his ability to make forthright decisions, although I question his decision relative to the nuclear aircraft programs. The previous administration, while pretending to support the ANP program, held back any real progress by their indecision. The Kennedy decision was in error because of incorrect advice provided by his scientific and defense advisers. The same people who have been assembling the information for decisions on ANP provided the input again. Based on my long acquaintance with their behind-the-scenes operations, it is no great surprise to me that again we have an adverse decision. This situation was brought forcefully to the forefront during the Joint Committee's executive hearings on the ANP program early in March. At our hearings we asked the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission to tell us about the technical data and other considerations which supported new criteria which was formulated for the ANP project. We also asked whether, in the development of the latest criteria, the officials in the Joint AEC-Air Force Office responsible for the technical direction of the project, and the contractors responsible for developing the nuclear designs had been consulted.

Unfortunately, we couldn't get adequate answers to our questions. We did find out, though, that certain criteria recently set down by the Defense Department was in direct conflict with the testimony of experts responsible for the technical program. We also found out that the Defense Department did not even consult the experts responsible for the direction of the program and for the development of the designs. It was quite apparent from the hearing that the members of the new administration in the Defense Department relied solely on the advice and recommendations of the same people in the Defense Department who have been against the project for years.

PSEUDO-SCIENTIFIC ADVISERS

What little testimony we could get from these people again confirmed the fact that they were not familiar with the technical developments in the program and had not even attempted to obtain first-hand information concerning the facts of our aircraft nuclear propulsion program. It was most discouraging to again come up against Government career personnel whose actions for years have been—and are—the shuffling and assembly of the same papers and representing the information they contain as the latest facts for the use of those responsible for the decisions. So this time, too, although the decision makers were different, they had the same old input of "facts" upon which to reach a decision.

The situation which resulted in the scuttling of the ANP program must be guarded against in the future. Serious errors could also be made in our other vital atomic energy programs unless we learn from what happened in the ANP program. We must take the time to get up-to-date facts. We must look behind the fancy "position" papers we are presented with and do whatever is necessary to get at the pertinent facts to guide our decisions.

STATUS OF ANP

I think one of the most unfortunate aspects of last month's decision to stop the ANP project is related to the status of the work at the time. A great deal of important progress was made in the last year. Major experiments were conducted to add a great deal of confidence to the designs. In fact, manufacture of a full-power nuclear aircraft propulsion plant unit for ground testing was ready to start. Many thousands of hours of tests were conducted under reactor operating conditions to prove out the mate-

rials and designs. Tests were conducted to the point of breakdown of the materials to obtain complete assurance on the adequacy of design margins. All of the information obtained confirmed the adequacy of the designs and in fact showed that significant growth margins were already in hand in the design. The status of the development, particularly for the direct cycle system which had a considerably greater amount of effort on it, clearly indicated that the next step should be a full-size integrated propulsion plant test. Going back to the laboratory bench, as called for by the new high temperature materials program being started to fill in for ANP, just doesn't contribute anything of significance toward getting on with nuclear flight.

GROWTH POTENTIAL CLICHE

As you know, the ANP program was given a set of design objectives known as the "York criteria" for guidance in developing the first engines. This Defense Department criteria specified a subsonic aircraft since a possible mission was foreseen for such an aircraft and technical data clearly indicated the feasibility of meeting the criteria with the first generation of engines developed. In accordance with this "York criteria," work was going ahead to meet requirements. At the same time, though, within the Defense Department, a talking campaign was being conducted to give the impression that what was really wanted, and what was absolutely necessary to obtain a military useful aircraft, is multimach flight characteristics.

Fortunately, the nuclear aircraft developers had the foresight to look into the multimach growth potential of the individual cycles although their instructions were clear that the goal was, at the time, subsonic operation. The technical data that was developed, which the Joint Committee closely reviewed during the March hearing, indicated multimach potential was clearly present in the concepts under development. Unfortunately the picture on growth potential was not clearly presented, or it may not have been presented at all, to the new administration.

INCONSISTENCIES APPARENT

Consistent with my belief that the facts were not made available to the decision makers are the apparent inconsistencies that now exist between the decision to drop the nuclear aircraft and the characteristics specified for our defense weapons. Take, for example, the Skybolt missile system recently earmarked for additional effort. It is planned to use conventional aircraft with their very limited range to provide a mobile launching platform for the intermediate range Skybolt missiles. A nuclear aircraft with, for practical purposes, unlimited range and endurance characteristics would increase the effectiveness of the Skybolt missile system tremendously.

The recently announced plan to keep one-eighth of our heavy bomber force on airborne alert points up another inconsistency relative to the decision to stop the nuclear aircraft. The unlimited endurance of nuclear energy sources gives a nuclear propelled aircraft enormous advantages in meeting such alert objectives. For the same airborne alert force a nuclear aircraft provides the potential for greatly reduced aircraft, personnel, and support facility requirements.

Obviously the unlimited range which comes from nuclear aircraft endurance characteristics will open up completely new mission capabilities which cannot at present be foreseen. An idea of the military effectiveness which of such a revolutionary system can be obtained from our experience with nuclear submarines. Wouldn't it have been unfortunate if the unimaginative arguments advanced relative to the nuclear submarine turned out to be the controlling ones in that decision as they were in the nuclear aircraft decision?

I have pointed out many times that we could have had nuclear aircraft in flight today if it had not been for the "on again, off again" system of mismanagement by the Defense Department and its scientific advisers.

I can see the same approach creeping into the management of other defense projects and the Rover nuclear rocket program.

Our Religious Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given at the annual meeting of the Religious Heritage of America, Inc., during the annual Washington pilgrimage which it sponsors:

OUR RELIGIOUS HERITAGE AND THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY

(Keynote address by the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota)

Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege to participate in the conferring of the Religious Heritage Awards to these distinguished men and women whose service to God and man has been so outstanding as to merit this recognition and tribute.

Your Washington pilgrimage comes this year at a time characterized by perhaps as great a confusion of emotions as at any period in American history. On one hand there is profound gratitude for the goodness of life that is possible for us in this land. On the other hand there is great uneasiness, uncertainty, perplexity, even anxiety and despair. Less than 15 years after winning a war with total, unconditional surrender of all our enemies, we are soberly asking, What can we do to survive?

We are profoundly grateful that no such thing has happened here as we saw happening in Hungary 3 years ago, in Tibet last year, and in Japan this week. But we are dismayed that such things can be happening to anybody anywhere on this globe in the middle of the supposedly enlightened 20th century.

Can Korea go on indefinitely half slave, half free? Or Germany? Or the whole wide world? Down deep inside, we know the answer is "No."

I

Much of the reason for our confusion is that we have not understood the nature of the conflict in which we are engaged.

We have seen that it is a conflict of arms; who will win the missile race? Whichever side wins could compel the other to surrender or perish. Because of our religious heritage, we would not use superior power for that purpose. Because of their Communist heritage, the other side would so use it—Mr. Khrushchev reavowed that last month.

We have seen that it is a conflict of economic systems. Which will crack up first under the strain?

We have seen that it is a conflict of educational systems. Which will produce not only the smartest but the toughest minds?

We're beginning to see that it is a conflict, not so much of wealth and weapons as of wills. Which side will work the harder?

But many have not seen that the basic conflict is far deeper and more fundamental. It is a conflict between two totally different

philosophies of life and, therefore, of government.

It is a conflict between wholly different sets of values.

It is a conflict between two wholly different concepts as to the nature of man; which means two different concepts as to the nature of the universe; which means two different concepts as to the nature of God—or whether there is a God.

We have not fully understood that most of all it is a conflict of faiths.

On one hand are those who openly proclaim that there is no God, that there is no moral order in the universe, and that man is merely an animal with a larger brain than others—the smartest of the animals, but nothing more. The conduct of the Communists which we denounce flows naturally and inevitably from that philosophy and faith.

During the 8 months in 1930 which I spent in an area under the control of the Chinese Communists in south China, and during visits behind the Iron Curtain in Europe in 1947, I learned—as did you who have had similar experiences—that Communists have no more scruples about wiping out a hundred, or a thousand, or a million human beings who stand in their way than you and I have about spraying DDT on some mosquitoes that are troubling us. And why should they hesitate or have scruples, if man is just an animal? If there is no God, then to whom can we expect men to consider themselves accountable?

On the other hand, our country and our free society were founded on the belief that there is a God; that there is a moral order in the universe; that there are moral laws which men and nations can no more violate with impunity than they can the laws of gravity or electricity; and that, while man is indeed the smartest of the animals, he is also something more—he is a child of God, and therefore, a part of God. Because he is a part of God, he is capable of becoming more and more like God, if willing to respond to God's loving quest for him, as your child is capable of becoming more and more like you, of whom he is a part, if he is willing to do so.

It is this, the divine in man, which we believe is different in character and kind from anything the animals have. It is this which is the unique and precious thing about man. It is this which we, at our best, have always believed it is the first business of a good government and a good society to protect and nourish and develop. It is this religious faith which is responsible for the unique values our civilization has developed. It is because our heritage is a religious heritage that the individual human being is considered by us at our best as sacred and of infinite worth.

Many in our country have assumed that the conflict between the Communists and free peoples is like that between the two major political parties in America. Both want the same good ends, but differ as to the best means to gain those ends—and keep them. But the world conflict is not over different means to the same good ends, different ways to attain the same good objectives; it is a conflict over objectives. Ours is peace; theirs is conquest. We want to end this world conflict; they intend to win it.

A truce to them, or a conference at the summit, is not, as we assume, a move toward real peace, which means a resolution of difficulties; rather, it is a politico-military tactic designed to win another victory. If they offer a truce in Korea, when their military operations there are no longer paying them dividends, it is not because they desire to end the struggle; it is only to shift to some other place like Indochina where they believe they can carry on the war more successfully.

"Peaceful coexistence" means that as long as we are stronger than they, we should be nice enough to allow them to coexist peacefully until they can become enough stronger than we so they can then compel peaceful submission by us.

And when they break up a conference at the summit as soon as they know they cannot divide the free world and score there another triumph, it is only to shift to some other place like Japan or some other tactic than smiles or threats, some tactic like subversion, which offers better prospect of success in advancing toward the never-changing goal of world domination.

The reason why it has not proved possible to get any real agreement with the Communist world, whether at Yalta or the United Nations, at Panmunjom or Geneva or Paris, is because the Communists are not pursuing the same goals as we at our best are pursuing.

And why are they not pursuing the same goals as we? Because they do not believe the same things as we believe—about man, and about the universe, that is, about God.

One reason for our difficulties is that we have been exposed so long and continuously to the Judeo-Christian body of ethics that we take its moral standards for granted. We assume that they are normal human standards. We tend to equate Christian with human. And since the men in Moscow and Peiping are human beings, we assume they will react as Christians do. When they do not so react, we are surprised, angry, and call them inhuman. But their ruthless behavior is not because they are inhuman; it is because they are merely human. We have almost forgotten that human beings, unexposed to moral teachings based on belief in a moral universe under a moral God, or with their spiritual natures unsensitized by a morally and spiritually regenerating religion, are predatory, like other animals. If this is not so, why should any men—including you and me—need a Saviour?

We cannot rightly condemn atheistic Communists for betraying Christian values which they have never professed, and which, in fact, they denounce.

It is absurd to expect them to live as if this were a moral universe when they insist there is no such thing as a moral order in the universe, that there are no such things as right and wrong, good and evil, truth and falsehood.

It is absurd to expect them to believe that man has the capacity to make moral judgments, when their creed tells them that man is not a moral being, he is an economic animal.

In short, it is absurd to expect them to build up a heritage of freedom and to recognize and guard the unalienable rights with which we believe man is endowed by his Creator, if they do not believe there is a Creator.

II

All this means that we have not understood the world conflict because we have not understood the adversary. And a main reason why we have not understood the adversary is because we have not really understood ourselves and our own culture and heritage. We have almost forgotten that our heritage in this land is a religious heritage, predominantly a Christian heritage.

So, our first task is to reexamine our heritage, rediscover the essential elements and forces in it, rededicate ourselves to that heritage, fulfill it in our own land and time and generation, and share it with the world.

How did it begin? Our Pilgrim Fathers came to this land because they were determined to have religious liberty. They had discovered that it was not possible to have religious liberty without political liberty; and that political liberty could not be maintained without economic liberty, that is, opportu-

nity for the individual to improve his lot, in accordance with his ability and his effort.

They had no precedent, no blueprint, but they had clear minds. They devised, for the first time on a major scale in all of human history, a system whereby people control government instead of government controlling people. It worked. It released the creative capacities previously unrecognized in all sorts of persons from all sorts of races, climes, and countries. It led to an unprecedented outburst of creative energy, imagination, effort, production, and progress.

As long as our people adhered to it they progressed, and prospered. Then, little by little, many came to forget the heritage in their preoccupation with the goodness of living which had become possible. They came to trust results more than causes; material fruits more than spiritual roots. They paid less and less attention to the textbook from which the heritage had come. They paid less attention to the counsel of the prophets of their heritage, ancient and modern. They paid less and less attention to its moral principles. Many began to believe that it is possible to get good by doing evil, to get justice by bowing down before injustice, to get right by might, to get trust by being untrustworthy, to get peace by sacrificing our principles and other peoples' rights and territory. Many came to think it is possible to get a brotherhood of man without first of all believing in the fatherhood of God.

Thus has our society come to its present confusion, division, uncertainty, despair.

III

All this tells us what we have to do. We have to return to our religious heritage—not in order to go back, but in order to go forward.

First, we must recapture our faith: faith that God is, that He and His power are available to men, that with God it is possible for man to build His kingdom on earth.

What we need in America today is to recapture a faith in our heritage and our faith comparable to the faith the Communists have in theirs.

For our free society to survive, we must qualify in our generation as a worthy spiritual instrument, as the founders of our heritage did so qualify in their time and generation.

Second, we must rediscover the principles of our Christian heritage. They are recorded in a textbook, a sort of laboratory manual, which faithfully records the experience of those who have followed and those who have rejected the principles. It makes clear that it is not possible to get good by doing evil, but that it is possible to get good by doing good. The latter is just as dependable as the former. It teaches that we cannot get peace by direct pursuit of it. Men have been trying that for 50 centuries and there still is no peace. Rather, peace is a byproduct that follows, if we seek first His kingdom and His righteousness, His right relations in the world. There will be "peace on earth" only when there is "glory to God in the highest."

Third, we must rededicate ourselves to the principles, and put them into practice—in our work; in our homes; in our social and civil organizations; in our churches.

With all my heart, I believe that the religious heritage which our forefathers developed here, a heritage leading to voluntary federation under law, represents the best set of ideas and values ever put together in one place in the world's history. I think they are the hope of mankind. The achieving of a world of freedom and peace depends upon our understanding their true nature, making them work better here at home, and helping spread them throughout the world—with all our hearts and souls as well as our minds.

This world conflict is not an old-fashioned struggle for the control of land; it is for con-

trol of man—the mind of man, the soul of man, the whole of man.

Fourth, if we are to have the inner strength to fulfill our religious heritage here and to share it abroad, we must ally ourselves with the truly great leaders, the founders of our faiths. This means for us who are Christians that we must rediscover Christ our Master, must recommit ourselves to His Lordship and His direction, receiving from God the power to be and to do that He promised to His disciples.

IV

If these things in our heritage are not true, if God is not, then of all men we are the most foolish. Our whole effort in this land is futile, in fact makes no sense.

But if God is, then what ought to be can be. There are dark valleys to go through, but there is no reason for dismay or despair.

God regularly operates through men and women—men and women who allow themselves to be captured by Him, give themselves to preserving and strengthening the heritage others have developed thus far, and work and walk forward with God unafraid.

Never did we in America face such a fundamental challenge to the ultimate values of life. Never did we have to think so deeply or work so hard as we shall have to in the years just ahead if we are to live in dignity and usefulness—or even to live at all.

Our generation cannot escape the call to great dedication and heroic effort if we are to "secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity" which came out of our religious heritage. It is not necessary to remind you of this pilgrimage that on these blessings depend all others.

"Because of the Health Condition Described at the Time of Application, We Cannot Accept Your Wife as a Member"—A Sidelight of Hospitalization Insurance for the Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, few issues scheduled to come before the Congress are as controversial as the proposal for hospitalization and nursing home cost insurance for persons retired under social security. We are told repeatedly that such a proposal has little if any merit, and should not be considered seriously. However, I have a letter in my possession which raises an interesting sidelight on this issue, and I would like to share it with the Members of the House of Representatives as a factor to be considered.

First of all, I should say that our Blue Cross-Blue Shield program in St. Louis was among the first such plans in the country to make it possible for retired persons over 65 to obtain coverage on an individual basis. It is my understanding that in many areas of the country, the worker who goes on retirement under social security can no longer obtain insurance coverage from Blue Cross-Blue Shield, whether he can afford it or not. So our situation in St. Louis is therefore much better than the arrangements pos-

sible for elderly people in many other parts of the country.

WIFE'S APPLICATION FOR HOSPITALIZATION
INSURANCE REJECTED

Nevertheless, in the instance just called to my attention, while the retired worker was able to apply for and receive coverage for himself under Blue Cross-Blue Shield following his retirement and following the cancellation of his coverage under the group plan in effect where he had been employed, he and his wife now discover that the wife's application for nongroup coverage can not be approved "because of the health condition described at the time of application."

The wife writes me:

Am enclosing a letter from the Blue Cross, which tells me they cannot give me hospital insurance. My husband retired recently, and up until then we had a policy from where he was employed, but canceled at the time of retirement.

We are living on our social security and veterans bonus, and if I would become ill and had a large hospital and doctor bill we would have to mortgage our home. I know there are thousands of people in the same position we are in, and would appreciate your voting for passage of the medical bill when it comes to a vote. I would be happy to have my social security reduced by a few dollars and have it applied toward the insurance. Now this might be a suggestion when it comes up for discussion. I would thank you very much if you would give this a thought.

The letter from Blue Cross Service which the wife forwarded to me notified the husband of acceptance of his application for both Blue Cross and Blue Shield nongroup enrollment but added:

Because of the health condition described at the time of application, we cannot accept your wife * * * as a member. This notation has been made on your application.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION FOR FAMILIES IN THIS
SITUATION?

Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest arguments made against the proposed social security program of hospitalization insurance coverage is that retired individuals and couples—who are not medically indigent and thus not eligible for coverage under the Kerr-Mills Act of last year—can purchase adequate insurance by themselves and thus do not need such insurance under social security.

But what about cases of this kind? During his working lifetime, the husband could purchase both hospital and surgical coverage for himself and his wife under the group policy at his place of employment. Suddenly, however, he finds upon retirement that his wife is not eligible for either coverage under the nongroup enrollment open to such individuals following retirement.

Presumably, if the wife has a health condition which makes it uneconomic for the Blue Cross-Blue Shield program to accept her, her chances of requiring hospitalization would be such that the need for prepayment hospitalization insurance becomes even more urgent.

I would urge that those who have insisted there is no need for the coverage under social security proposed for retired persons by President Kennedy

come forward now and advise how this kind of case should be handled. I am certainly anxious to learn how the couple involved in this particular case can solve what to them is a most important and worrisome retirement problem. Everyone interested in this issue would have to concede it is a problem which demands solution.

Federal Support of Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address on Federal support of medical education, which I delivered at the John Archer Society dinner, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa., on April 26, 1961:

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF MEDICAL EDUCATION

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at John Archer Society dinner, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Wednesday, Apr. 26, 1961, at 6 pm.)

Of the many responsibilities shared by all Members of the Congress of the United States, none is more important than the one I shall attempt to fulfill today.

I refer to the duty to render public reports on matters of national significance. There are several ways to do this. One of the best is direct, face-to-face discussions.

Because of the particular congressional role I have held for many years, I believe I have a special obligation to conduct such discussions before groups of physicians.

When that group is within so distinguished an institution as the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, that obligation becomes, instead, a privilege.

In Philadelphia, a Member of Congress cannot help but feel the presence of those early patriots who established the political foundations of the Republic. I am sure that physicians visiting this old city must, in similar fashion, feel the presence of John Morgan and William Shippen, who pioneered our great national structure of medical schools. Close behind these two we—both the legislator and the physician of today—can discern the heroic figure of Benjamin Rush, pioneer in mental health, who in spite of his busy schedule of medical practice and teaching, found time to help formulate the Declaration of Independence.

On down through the years we are reminded of other great physicians associated with this city and this school: men like Archer, Long, Osler, De Leon, and Barnes. Then we reach the contemporary scene and encounter figures such as Drs. Isidor Ravdin, Howard Rusk, Charles Mayo, and E. Vincent Askey, who in the same tradition, combine the talents of teacher, researcher, or practitioner of medicine with invaluable contributions to the larger national scene.

And thus I must blend my gratitude and pride for being chosen to present the annual lecture of the John Archer Society with a large portion of humility in the presence of a gathering which represents so vital a segment of our national history and of present-day eminence in medical science.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the House which has responsibility, among other

things, for the annual appropriations for the U.S. Public Health Service, my work obviously has a direct impact upon the scope and directions of Federal, State, and local public health programs and the very important research programs of the U.S. Public Health Service. Less well known among physicians is the fact that the actions of my subcommittee have had, cumulatively, a far-reaching impact on medical education.

When I first became a member of my subcommittee, the research program of the Public Health Service was small, and limited principally to its own epidemiological and laboratory study of the communicable diseases. Funds for research grants and training awards to non-Federal investigators and institutions were relatively insignificant. This was but a reflection of the emphasis then being given to consolidating the great advances made against communicable diseases in the first three decades of the present century. Even then, however, the shape of our population and its environment was undergoing important changes, creating new health problems and needs for a new research effort.

Oversimplified, the two most significant changes were these:

1. Emergence of the chronic disease problem: Because of reductions in morbidity and mortality from communicable diseases—particularly among infants, children, and mothers—more people were living longer, and therefore becoming more susceptible to the chronic diseases such as cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and emotional disorders.

2. Emergence of environmental health problems: The longer average life expectancy, together with improved economic conditions and other factors, had greatly expanded our population. The flowering of U.S. technology and industry concentrated more and more of these people in our cities. At the same time it introduced an entirely new set of health problems—air and water pollution, ionizing radiations, food additives, a deluge of new drugs and synthetics, an alarming increase in accidents on the streets, in the factory, and in the home.

Thus, almost from the beginning of my service on the subcommittee, we have had to devote more and more attention to national needs in these two areas of chronic diseases and environmental health.

Back around 1945 and 1946 we felt that the Nation should begin learning more about the cause, prevention, and treatment of chronic disease. This required some redirection and strengthening of the Public Health Service's own research. More important is the fact that expansion of research in universities and medical schools was considered imperative.

According to their own representatives, the size of the needed expansion was clearly beyond the resources of the universities, foundations, voluntary health agencies, and other private sources. In concurrence with the advice of experts in and out of the Government, we determined that a gradual, year-by-year buildup of a Federal grants-in-aid program, would be required. The mechanism to be used was the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service—an organization with experience in the granting field and a tradition of first-class medical and biological research.

So much for philosophy and background. Now let us look at what has happened. The simplest and quickest measurement is in terms of the dollars that have been spent to bring our Nation unquestioned world leadership in medical and biological science. Taking as our baseline the last prewar year, the total national investment in this work has risen from about \$45 million in 1940 to around \$715 million in 1960. In 1940 Federal support of such research was 7 percent, or \$3 million. In 1960 the Federal share was 53 percent or about \$380 million, most of

which was provided through the National Institute of Health.

Here I should like to point out that although the percentage of non-Federal funds has greatly decreased in relation to Federal funds, there has, nevertheless, been a remarkable increase in the actual amount of non-Federal assistance to medical research—from \$42 million in 1940 to an estimated \$335 million in 1960. It seems to me this affords clear proof that Federal funds have stimulated rather than suppressed private expenditures in medical research.

Most of these Federal funds have been appropriated for research and training related to specific diseases such as cancer, arthritis, neurological disorders, cardiovascular diseases, and the like. However, very sizable amounts have, of necessity, gone into study of basic medical and biological questions. Overall, the great bulk of the research up until now has been oriented toward laboratory rather than clinical phases.

As to results, a gathering such as this would know, far better than I, of the remarkable array of new concepts, drugs and procedures that have already come forth. You, better than I, know of the still greater advances which lie ahead simply because the greatest part of the work of the past decade has been of a fundamental nature and therefore provides the building material for tomorrow's new clinical developments and the substance of tomorrow's medical education. The research construction program has had the same effect on the physical plants of our schools.

Now I must look at the other side of the coin. The very scope and vigor of our national research effort, not only in biology and medicine, but in many other scientific fields, has either created, intensified, or at least revealed certain problems.

It is easy for us to forget the national proliferation in these other fields of science, paralleling the growth in biomedicine, but involving vastly greater Federal funds. These other research interests of the Federal Government also have had to be advanced primarily through project grants and contracts, largely with the same institutions who are the mainstay of our health-related research.

I am sure you are familiar with the administrative problems; with the rigidities; and with the tendency toward creation of imbalances between research and teaching functions that have been reported from many institutions, as resulting from the volume of project research.

I have heard it said that our national concentration on direct project research grants and contracts carries an inherent danger of causing the universities to lose control over such factors as the relative emphasis their faculties shall give to fundamental versus applied research. Some authorities feel the very independence of many universities is threatened.

These possibilities are a matter of grave concern to my committee, as I know they are also to other segments of the Congress having similar interests in preserving a healthy research and educational structure in our Nation.

As one approach to a redress of the present trend as it relates to medically oriented research, the Congress recently authorized NIH to explore methods for a new program of general research grants to universities and similar institutions. These general grants would augment rather than replace the project grant system. Our thought was that reasonably large sums made available for institutions to use as they saw fit, in meeting particular internal problems, would help them achieve their own institutional goals, objectives and standards of excellence.

The Congress has not yet approved the details of this new grants program. However, the principle is sound and the need seems to be well established. I am hopeful

that something concrete will be forthcoming in the near future.

Another problem growing out of the emphasis on laboratory research during the past decade has been the need for more funds, facilities and projects for clinical research. To meet this need, a new clinical research facilities grants program was established last year by NIH as a result of recommendations by the Congress.

Totally, the program aims to provide support for a variety of basic and clinical research efforts on a broad variety of diseases and fundamental biomedical problems. The similar clinical facility programs of the NIH categorical Institutes are to be concerned primarily with a particular type or group of diseases, such as heart disease or cancer.

Behind the original congressional action were the considerations that (1) clinical research has been insufficient because of a lack of adequate means to provide the careful observation and control needed for research in the complexities of human biology; and (2) that valuable research in animals or chemical laboratories often has not been carried over into studies in human patients because of a lack of proper research facilities and conditions. One of the principal reasons for these deficiencies has been the high costs of clinical research.

A clinical research facility is defined as a resource within a medical institution, aimed at enhancing the quality and quantity of clinical investigations. It is a discrete physical unit or research ward of about 10 to 20 beds in a hospital, but apart from the general care wards, with a stable, well-trained nursing and dietetic staff to provide precise control and observation, and with directly supporting specialized laboratory facilities.

The grant funds pay for the renovation and equipment of the centers, the costs of the care of research patients (including specialized nursing, diet kitchens, and other services), supporting laboratories and certain staff salaries.

In those facilities, scientists can carry on coordinated investigations in a wide range of diseases and basic scientific problems. NIH cites as an example of such cooperative work, the problem of transplanting human tissues and organs. Advances in both the basic sciences, such as chemistry and immunology, and in the clinical sciences, such as surgery and internal medicine, are necessary before important advances can be made in transplantation techniques.

Good progress has been made in getting this clinical program under way. First-year grants averaging about a half-million dollars each have been awarded to 19 institutions in every part of the country. A number of other very promising applications is being studied by NIH and its advisory groups and action on these should be forthcoming soon.

AID TO MEDICAL EDUCATION

While not created by the large-scale investment in medical research, the third problem I wish to discuss was intensified by it. Furthermore, the continuation and future expansion of that research effort will be jeopardized if this third problem is not solved. And finally, full public benefit from the results of the medical research program will depend to a significant degree on how well that problem is solved.

I refer to impending deficits in both the quantity and quality of new physicians that our country must have if we are to maintain and improve our present high standards of medical practice.

Studies made by my committee and by other responsible groups over the past 2 or 3 years indicate that our medical schools are losing ground in the competition for superior college students.

During the current fiscal year approximately 10,000 predoctoral fellowships in the physical, life, and social sciences, psychology,

engineering, the arts, humanities, and education will be awarded by four Federal agencies—the Department of State, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and the National Institutes of Health.

These fellowships provide a stipend of from \$1,800 to \$2,500, plus \$50 allowance for each dependent, and travel allowances. Full tuition is paid to the institution which the recipient chooses to attend, and in some instances an additional subsidy to the institution is provided.

We all know that college enrollments are rapidly increasing. However, the number of college students applying to medical schools has dropped at a time when the number of college graduates has been increasing. Furthermore, the quality of applicants is said to be decreasing. These trends offer a serious threat to the necessary increase in the number of physicians in the future. It is a threat also to the quality of future graduates.

Against this decline of medical school applications is the widely held belief that, today, this country has a relative shortage of medical manpower. We believe that shortage will become acute in the years ahead unless action is taken.

One of the several expert committees that have been studying this problem reported last year that it found four principal reasons for the impending physician shortage:

1. The tremendous increase in population in the past 20 years—from 132 million in 1940 to 180 million in 1960;
2. We have not expanded our production of physicians at a sufficient rate to meet the needs for medical care of the increasing population in an addition to the augmented needs for teaching and research;
3. The shift in the U.S. population distribution resulting in a greater percentage of the very young and very old who require the greatest amount of medical care;
4. The demand for health services resulting from our rising standard of living, wide expansion of hospital and medical insurance, and the increasing health-consciousness of our people.

In addition there are such factors as the great length and cost of medical training and the fact that many other satisfying and intellectually stimulating scientific careers with high prestige and adequate financial reward have developed during the past 20 years.

This same study found the average cost of 4 years of medical school to be approximately \$11,600 for those graduating in 1959. Since scholarship support has been meager, many students hesitate to shoulder a large loan, and the curriculum is so demanding that few students can carry a part-time job without considerable sacrifice of time needed for their studies. Thus the choice of medicine as a career has been to a considerable extent influenced by financial factors, and many promising college graduates who would have liked to study medicine have been discouraged.

To help remedy this situation it has become apparent to me that (1) the Federal Government must provide direct assistance to the teaching functions of medical and related schools; (2) that the Federal Government should supplement private, industrial, and State sources in providing scholarship, fellowship, and loan assistance to medical and dental students as it now does to Ph. D. candidates in the basic sciences; and (3) it should relieve the serious financial and administrative imbalances between the research and teaching functions of the medical schools.

Several legislative proposals now being studied in the Congress are designed to meet these needs. I would like to describe very briefly my own bills which I believe would go a long way toward helping meet our national requirements in this area.

On January 25 of this year I introduced a bill which would provide for a 10-year program of grants for education in the fields of medicine and dentistry to be administered by the U.S. Public Health Service. Under this program each accredited degree-granting medical and dental school would receive a block grant of \$100,000 each year, together with \$500 for each student, plus \$500 additional for each student enrolled in excess of average past enrollment.

For schools providing only 1, 2, or 3 years of professional training in medicine or dentistry, block grants of \$25,000, \$50,000, and \$75,000, respectively, would be awarded. With these funds the schools could meet the costs of establishing, maintaining, or enlarging their teaching staffs and of maintaining, acquiring, and operating the necessary equipment.

I should like to emphasize that these funds are intended primarily to meet the costs of new or expanded instruction programs. Special training projects outside the regular curriculum which are financed with other public funds or private grants are excluded. The same exclusion applies to the costs of research and to the operations of any hospitals.

My bill applies a few conditions for institutional eligibility for Federal grants that I believe you will agree are entirely reasonable and desirable:

1. The school must be either a public or a nonprofit private institution located within the United States.

2. The school must provide reasonable opportunity for the admission of out-of-State students.

3. During the period it is receiving Federal payments, the school must make every reasonable effort to maintain its income for operating expenses from sources other than the Federal Government at a level equal to that which existed before receiving the Federal funds. In the case of a new school, similar efforts should be made to obtain such non-Federal operating income at the highest possible level.

4. The school will submit from time to time such reports as the Surgeon General may reasonably require to assure that these purposes are being carried out.

To advise the Surgeon General on the policies and regulations under which the program would operate, there would be established a National Council on Education for Health. The Surgeon General would be ex officio chairman and the Commissioner of Education an ex officio member. The council membership would include 10 leaders in the fields of health sciences, education, or public affairs. Four of the ten would be persons actively engaged in an appropriate field of professional education.

A companion bill was introduced by me on the day after the first bill was offered. This second legislative proposal is designed to provide Federal funds which would stimulate and supplement non-Federal scholarship funds for medical and dental students. Each State wishing to participate would establish a commission on medical and dental scholarships, or designate an existing agency to serve as the State commission. The commission would develop a plan covering certain broad eligibility requirements which are spelled out in my bill, and which stipulates that the annual stipend paid any individual would not exceed \$1,250 of Federal funds or one-half the amount of the total awarded to the student. My plan also provides that, insofar as possible, 75 percent of Federal funds awarded the State commission must be used for medical and 25 percent for dental scholarships.

Another important requirement is that the State commission review annually the educational progress being made by each scholarship recipient.

To finance this program the bill calls for an appropriation of \$5 million for the first

fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961; \$10 million for the next fiscal year, and an equal amount for the next 8 years.

The Surgeon General will be advised on policies, regulations and administration of this program by a National Advisory Committee on Medical and Dental Scholarships. This group will include the Surgeon General, who shall also serve as Chairman, the Commissioner of Education, and 10 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Three of these shall be recognized authorities in the field of professional education, three shall be teachers or practitioners in medicine or dentistry, and four shall represent the general public.

Since my bills were introduced, others having the same general objectives have been proposed in response to the request made by President Kennedy in his health message of February 9, that over the next decade the capacity of medical schools be increased by 50 percent and of dental schools by 100 percent.

I am particularly impressed with a provision of one of these which would help expand teaching facilities of our medical schools by means of matching grants of Federal money for construction purposes. This provision follows in principle the methods under which the research facilities of the schools and universities have been helped to expand by Federal grants in recent years. This particular bill would also extend and strengthen this latter program of research construction for another three years, an action I heartily approve.

I believe the needs for strengthening the medical schools in their teaching function are so clearly apparent that this Congress will take affirmative action of some kind. Whatever that action may be, I will do all in my power to make certain that it does not lead to Federal control.

Now I would like to discuss briefly the impact upon graduate and continuing medical education of these existing programs of Federal aid to medical and biological research, including the recently initiated clinical research facilities program.

NIH and the American Hospital Association have recently completed part of a study on how much research is being conducted in hospitals throughout the country. They found that in 1958, over \$125 million was being spent on research in more than 850 hospitals—1 out of every 8 in the United States. Twenty-three averaged \$2 million a piece; 58 averaged over \$½ million; 62 averaged about \$158,000 on research; and 145 were spending over \$50,000 annually.

Now my committee has been told by experts that clinical research in a hospital setting is a very painstaking and precise matter. Care and study of the research patient demands much more of the physician-investigator, of the interne and residents, and of every hospital department than does the care of the usual nonresearch patient.

We also understand that the viewpoints and methods of scientific inquiry acquired by students and house officers participating in laboratory and clinical research enhances their ability to practice a superior kind of medicine throughout the rest of their professional lives.

The surprising amount of clinical research already in progress in hospitals and the large expansion now being undertaken should, in my opinion, not be overlooked in any consideration of the impact of research on medical education.

Of the same nature, but perhaps to a different degree, is the impact of the new knowledge resulting from these research programs on the continuing education of physicians having little direct exposure to the organized research process itself.

It seems to me their already difficult task of keeping up with the latest scientific developments in clinical medicine will become even more difficult. In this connection it would appear that more study should be given to improved and expanded methods of medical communications. I expect the professional societies and the medical centers will need to develop more and better kinds of short refresher courses and symposia; more extensive use of new educational media such as closed circuit TV programs may have to be explored.

All of these concerns would seem to be applicable in even greater measure to the schools in their need to keep their curriculums abreast of the rapidly expanding flood of new knowledge.

This brings me back to the need for direct Federal aid to the medical schools and to the greater numbers of superior students needed by medicine and the Nation.

I accept the proposition that medical research, medical practice and medical education are interdependent, and that anything affecting one in an important way will have discernible effects on the other two.

The medical research potential and performance of our country has been greatly enhanced, so much so that it bears little resemblance to what existed before.

With respect to medical practice, the new knowledge and tools coming out of that research already have added greatly to the physician's ability to help his patients. Still greater advances are in prospect.

Thus it follows that the third component—medical education—will have to be helped if we expect it to keep in balance with research and practice, and with the needs of our exploding population.

The Federal Government should not be expected to do the whole job. But it should do its share by reinforcing the efforts of the medical profession and the schools, the foundations and other important elements of our society having a direct interest in maintenance of medical education.

I am committed to the principle that teaching at every level and in every field of science must remain free of central domination. It must retain flexibility to meet rapidly changing scientific patterns and the particular needs of diverse geographical areas. Also, it must truly reflect the wishes of the scientific and academic community. All of these requisites are served best when governmental financial responsibility is shared by nongovernmental funds and interests, and is guided by nongovernmental advice. My bills stress this factor, and I believe, reflect the wishes of all who know the importance of maintaining the integrity of the teaching of medicine and science.

Fifteen years of experience with the NIH research grants, research training and research construction grants programs have demonstrated that Federal assistance need not bring Federal control. Instead, these programs have nourished freedom rather than restricted it. They have helped stimulate a volume, scope, and quality of medical research in this country that has no parallel in history.

By following the same principles I believe we can accomplish the same objectives in Federal aid to medical education.

I can conceive of no more appropriate setting than this city and this school of Rush and Morgan for a careful reexamination of our national methods and goals of furthering teaching and research in science and medicine. These men were physicians who not only helped form a new Nation and its first medical school, but were also participants, with men like Franklin and Jefferson, in laying the foundations for the age of reason and its superstructure, the age of free science pursued by free men in free institutions of learning.