

owing by life insurance companies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7884. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOWDY (by request):

H.R. 7885. A bill to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, to provide for the indemnification of certain persons suffering injury or loss as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by uninsured motorists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7886. A bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 7887. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 7888. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 to extend the time within which land in certain reservoir projects in Texas may be reconveyed to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 7889. A bill to authorize the promotion of certain retired officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps who were retired for physical disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 7890. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to dispose of certain land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7891. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit the construction of luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 7892. A bill to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local units of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7893. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 7894. A bill to provide for municipal use of storage water in Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7895. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may act upon certain license applications under a summary procedure after according parties in interest an opportunity to be heard with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 7896. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy to convey a portion of Fort Adams, Newport, R.I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 7897. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 342. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes extended to the Honorable Sam Rayburn, and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 343. Concurrent resolution to recognize the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the symbol "Uncle Sam," in the Christian Chapel Cemetery, Merriam, Ind., as the burial place of the original Uncle Sam and that it be made a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, concerning the centennial in 1962 of the Homestead Act and the monument of the National Park Service to the Nation's first homestead entryman located near Beatrice, Nebr.; requesting that 1962 be designated as the Homestead Centennial and that the Postmaster General be directed to issue a commemorative stamp of the 100th anniversary of the Homestead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to House Joint Resolution 24, passed in the present session of the legislature, which relates to issuing the proclamation of limited martial law in Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7898. A bill for the relief of Dana Hinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7899. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 78 years old; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 7900. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg.) James B. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE:

H.R. 7901. A bill to authorize M. Sgt. Hugh F. O'Reilly, U.S. Army, to accept and wear the Order of the Sacred Treasure, Sixth Class, conferred upon him by the Government of Japan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7902. A bill to provide compensation for moving certain improvements from the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7903. A bill for the relief of Iris Maitland Munds; 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:

188. By Mrs. MAY: Petitions of individual Americans of the Committee of One Million to the President of the United States opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations and requesting he stand fast against appeasement of Red China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

189. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Arthur G. Boyd, executive secretary, California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., relative to the adoption of a resolution having to do with the impact of foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

190. Also, petition of Rollis B. Bowman, president, the First Presbyterian Church, Augusta, Ga., relative to requesting aid in resolving that the church and state remain forever separate institutions for the mutual benefit of both; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

191. Also, petition of Dr. John F. Drac, Chicago-Kent College of Law, Chicago, Ill., relative to the extension of the right of self-determination to the Slovakia and its Slovak people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Promotions of Certain Naval and Marine Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which is designed to correct longstanding injustices to certain Naval and Marine officers now on the disability retired list.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to promote certain officers whose promotion was authorized during the period July 24, 1941, to September 16, 1946, but who, because of hospitalization and subsequent placement on the disability retired list, did not receive such promotion. There is no clear indication as to how many Navy and Marine Corps officers this would affect. However, estimates have been made previously indicating that there would be about 45 Marine Corps officers and approximately 100 naval officers. Generally speaking, the promotions referred to here were ALNAV promotions just prior to and

through World War II and extending to the January date in 1946. As a general rule in most cases the hospitalization of officers was directly attributable to combat. During this time hospitalization barred an individual from receiving his promotion and if he was placed on the disability retired list he did not receive his promotion. On January 16, 1946, the President promoted officers on the active list on active duty whose promotions were previously withheld by reason of hospitalization. Any officer in this category who was still on active duty on January 16, 1946, received his promotion. This did not, however, accomplish

the promotion of those officers who were generally in the same category but who had already been placed on the disability retired list. This bill would alleviate that situation and allow such officers to receive the promotions which they would have received except for their hospitalization and subsequent disability retirement.

Analyzing Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Dr. Seymour Harris of Harvard wrote a letter, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, taking issue with me on my concern about deficit spending. I wrote a letter in answer, and the newspaper very generously printed it in the Tuesday morning edition, June 27. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ANALYZING DEFICIT SPENDING

Dr. Seymour Harris on June 14 took umbrage at some remarks I made in my newspaper column concerning his advocacy of Federal deficits.

In the interest of brevity, I will not attempt to answer in detail all of what I believe was wrong with Dr. Harris' letter. Instead, I will address myself primarily to those assertions which touch on unemployment. The temptation is great to elaborate on his deductions that the Federal debt isn't great compared with the gross national product, but I will content myself with pointing out that the application of a "constant dollar" to his computation would destroy his argument.

Equally inviting is Dr. Harris' suggestion that I might persuade the Federal Reserve Board to do something to lower interest rates. He apparently would like to forget that the refusal of a Democratic Congress to allow long-term financing of Government bonds forced the short-term approaches which raised interest rates. If Dr. Harris feels that the way to contain deficits is through adequate monetary policy, I can only say he has done a poor job of communicating this to his friends along the New Frontier.

Dr. Harris' thesis that unemployment will be greatly reduced by Government deficits has, of course, been proven wrong by experience. We tried this panacea from 1933 until World War II pulled us out of depression and put people back to work. The following table will show what really happened:

	Deficit (billions)	Unemployed (millions)	Percent of unemployment
1931	\$0.5	8.0	15.9
1932	2.7	12.1	23.6
1933	2.6	12.8	24.9
1934	3.6	11.3	21.7
1935	2.8	10.6	20.1
1936	4.4	9.0	16.9
1937	2.8	7.7	14.3
1938	1.2	10.4	19.0
1939	3.9	9.5	17.2
1940	3.9	8.1	14.6

We can see by the above table that the average annual deficit for the period was \$2.8 billion—or about 3.5 percent of the gross national product of the same period. Now applying the same percentage of the gross national product of today, Dr. Harris could just as easily be urging an \$18 billion deficit as a \$10 billion deficit. But, my point is that he could make it \$18 billion or more without having any effect on the Nation's unemployment. Deficit spending is not now and never has been the answer to unemployment. It failed in the 1930's and it will fail in the 1960's.

Even Dr. Harris recognizes this in his letter. He states that "despite the upward movement of business, we shall have about 6 percent unemployment at the end of 1961 and 1962, unless corrective measures are taken." His estimate of unemployment is correct, but his letter contains no suggestion of what corrective measures should be taken—unless he means that we must reduce interest rates. And here again, we have past experience to show that low interest rates do not prevent unemployment. The following table will illustrate what I mean:

Year	Commercial paper rate (percent)	Percent of unemployment
1929	5.85	3.2
1930	3.59	8.7
1931	2.64	15.9
1932	2.73	23.6
1933	1.73	24.9
1934	1.02	21.7
1935	.75	20.1
1936	.75	16.9
1937	.94	14.3
1938	.81	19.0
1939	.59	17.2
1940	.56	14.6

Now let's look at more recent years.

Year	Commercial paper rate (percent)	Percent of unemployment
1949	1.49	5.5
1950	1.45	5.5
1951	2.16	3.0
1952	2.33	2.7
1953	2.52	2.5
1954	1.58	5.0
1955	2.18	4.0
1956	3.31	3.8
1957	3.81	14.3
1958 (June)	1.54	6.8

Unemployment percentages before 1957 are based on Department of Commerce old definitions of unemployment; for 1957 and 1958 they are based on the new definitions, which make unemployment slightly higher—4.2 percent of the labor force in 1956, for example, instead of the 3.8 percent in the table.

It is certainly obviously from these figures that low interest rates accompany high unemployment. The reason for this is simple enough. When the economy is running at a high rate, money is hard to get and the price of money (interest) rises. In periods like these employment is high and, conversely, when the economy slows down money becomes easier to get and competition forces interest down. In these slack periods, unemployment rises.

Frankly, in a free economy the performance just described and proven by the tables cannot be otherwise. Even Government meddling in the free markets will not alter the fact unless we assume the ultimate—complete Government control and operation of the economic system and, of course, this would not be a free economy nor, I might add, would it have a long life.

Dr. Harris makes the constant mistake of those people who place their faith in either the Keynesian approach to our economics

or in complete governmental control of the other facets of our life when he says "Voters generally however misinformed * * * Voters are not misinformed. In fact, if Dr. Harris would take the trouble to visit throughout this country he would find the voters are 3 to 5 years ahead of the National Legislature in their thinking. One thing they are certainly aware of is that present Government activities are not correcting unemployment, just as governmental activities in the 1930's failed to correct unemployment.

They know this, which the Government planners evidently do not, that the only way jobs can be created in this country is by the investment of private capital and that for the last 28 years, war years included, the investment of private capital has been retarded by restrictive tax policies of the Government which have been caused in large measure by deficit spending.

They know that if the economy is to move ahead this restrictive force must be removed and if Dr. Harris wants to do the President a good turn he should urge him to suggest a complete revision of the tax structure emphasizing liberal depreciation allowance.

BARRY GOLDWATER,
Senator from Arizona.

WASHINGTON.

A Tribute to the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the vital work of the Salvation Army. Possessing a noble history which reaches back almost a century, this organization, aided by its thousands of volunteers across the Nation, greatly strengthens our community life through its spiritual and social welfare ministry.

Among its many activities, the Salvation Army provides social, educational, and recreational programs for all age groups through community centers established throughout the country. It operates over 100 men's social service centers where homeless men have the opportunity to rebuild their lives. It welcomes over 3 million men of our Armed Forces to its USO and Red Shield Clubs; responds to floods, fires, and other disasters with mobile centers and emergency rescue workers; and visits persons in hospitals and correctional institutions.

The Salvation Army cares for children in homes, settlements, and day nurseries, serves the neglected needs of unwed mothers and helps to alleviate the distress of many troubled families. This worthy organization also operates boys clubs, maintains camps which provide a rewarding outdoor experience for children, mothers, and senior citizens, and is a source of spiritual strength through its religious meetings, many of which are held in the open air which the Salvation Army considers the greatest cathedral.

In short, the Salvation Army has come a long way since the days when the big bass drum of its founder, Gen. William

Booth, was a sound of comfort and encouragement to the weary and downtrodden.

The vital work of the Salvation Army is worthy of our profoundest respect and deepest gratitude, and it is my earnest hope that it will continue to march forward in its distinguished service to the community life of this country and that the sound of the big bass drum will never be stilled.

America in Today's World—Address by Senator Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a most thoughtful address delivered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] before the graduating class at Suffolk University in Boston, Mass., June 18, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

I commend the address to the reading of my colleagues, because the Senator from Oregon is considered to be one of the best informed and most experienced men in the Congress in the field of foreign relations, particularly with respect to Latin America. The address concentrates the full force of its argument upon the Latin American problems, and particularly our relationships with Cuba.

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

"AMERICA IN TODAY'S WORLD"—REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, OF OREGON, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MASS., JUNE 18, 1961

Mr. President, faculty, graduates, parents, and friends of Suffolk University, the twofold honor which Suffolk University has bestowed upon me on this occasion fills me with humility. It is always an honor—in fact, a trust—to have the privilege of making a commencement speech to a graduating class. But "my cup runneth over" by the double honor on this occasion of being the recipient of an honorary degree of doctor of juridical science. It is with deep feelings of appreciation that I express my sincere thanks to this graduating class and to the university for both these honors.

The task of a commencement speaker is to say something to a graduating class that will serve to guide them in their journey beyond the walls of an educational institution. Yet as one who taught in such institutions myself for over 20 years, I always take the view that the speaker cannot say anything in a few minutes that will improve upon what the teaching staff has done or has not done.

So I would rather speak here simply to try to review and to put into perspective some of the conditions and problems with which I struggle as a national legislator and with which you, too, will have to struggle as citizens of your community, your State, your Nation, and your world.

Your commencement program committee suggested that this graduating class might be interested in my making a few comments on the subject of national security problems and foreign policy developments in recent months.

It is important to remember that events of each day in which we live are part of history. History, change, growth, evolution, and revolution did not stop on the date of the last printing of your history textbook. We live today in a world of as much turmoil, unrest, progress, and decline as has ever occurred.

When the members of this graduating class were being born, the United States had taken its place in the world as the foremost nation. Every other industrial country in the world was in shambles.

Japan, Germany, Great Britain, and Russia had lost millions of their people. Their factories and transportation systems were shattered. China was long since devastated by years of war and was in political and economic collapse.

Of all these nations, only the United States was physically unmarked. As a result, this generation of Americans came into a world where we were unchallenged. Many of us, and I include adults, too, came to think of the United States as a director and manager of world affairs, and felt that whenever something we did not like developed in another nation, it was because someone in high office in the United States wanted it that way, or simply allowed it to happen.

Yet, if anything should have been clear, it should have been that this unchallenged power of ours had to be temporary. And it was. Within 15 years, and with assistance from us unparalleled in world history, the nations of Western Europe restored their economies. Our help was extended in equal amounts to the countries we had defeated, Germany and Japan, and as a result, both are again among the great powers of the world.

Great Britain, France, Italy, and the other ruined countries of World War II are more than thriving. The Soviet Union has, much to our dismay, surpassed the United States in at least a few of the dramatic and sensational exploits of technical and scientific achievements. While we cannot be certain of what is going on in China, indications are that China, too, will soon have the scientific and engineering capacity to join the "Nuclear Club."

The results of this revival of the wrecks of World War II have caused many Americans to feel that it is all our own fault that we now have so many rivals in the world, both in the military sense and in the economic sense.

I do not share that view. I think it is based upon a false assumption that the United States could remain omnipotent in world affairs.

We could not. We can help guide and encourage events to go the way we want. And we did that in the Marshall plan, when we helped restore the economies of Western Europe. But in many other places, especially in areas of the world which are the least like our own economic, cultural, and political systems, our ability to influence events is much less.

That, in my opinion, is a fact we should accept, instead of trying to find some scapegoat to blame it on. Back when I was in your place, graduating from college, it was the British Empire that we thought of as the great manager of the economic affairs and political affairs of the world. There was great disagreement as to whether that management was good or bad. But just in my lifetime we have seen many parts of that empire take an independent place in the world.

Today, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Malaya have joined the community of nations in Asia. Many countries of Africa have emerged into statehood. In our own hemisphere, the new West Indian Federation, a whole group of former British islands in the Caribbean, is in the process of becoming independent. The same thing has happened

to the colonial empires of France, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

I do not believe that these changes have necessarily diminished the importance and significance of Great Britain in Western affairs. But they signify the impossibility of one nation maintaining a status quo for very long, in a world whose population is exploding and whose communication in ideas and aspirations is rapidly increasing.

IMPORTANCE OF AMERICAN EXAMPLE

We cannot maintain such a status quo either. In my opinion, our greatest means of influencing world events is through the example we set in our own country. The United States can no more hide its image from the world today than it could in the 19th century when we were the Mecca for the oppressed everywhere. As a practical matter, our very freedom invites not only our friends but our enemies to put America under a microscope.

Recent tragic events in the South have produced headlines in Africa and Europe as large as in Massachusetts. There was one big difference, however. We know we are doing something about it. We know that areas of discrimination are gradually being eliminated. But the Africans do not get that side of the story. No matter how much money we put into the Voice of America, words cannot catch up with acts.

This freedom which we cherish imposes heavy burdens. Our acts must conform to our words. This is in remarkable contrast to the Soviet Union and Communist China, the No. 1 closed societies. There is no doubt that we live in a world characterized by a double standard. An open society must do what it says. A closed society can do what it pleases and say what will serve its purposes.

We must also demonstrate to the world that while freedom of all kinds is imperiled by Communist tyranny, we are not going to be duped into curtailing our freedom in the name of preserving it.

There has never been a time when the liberty of American people was not threatened from one source or another. There has not been a period in our history when someone was not saying that unless we dispense with some or all of the Bill of Rights, the country was doomed.

What we must strive for in this generation is a realization that a devotion to our liberties, especially to those set forth in our Bill of Rights, is probably the strongest and greatest influence we have in the world.

Moreover, we are in for a long contest with communism. It already has gone on for many decades, and has become acute in the last 15 years. It will stay that way for as long as anyone can see into the future.

This means that any liberty surrendered by the American people in the name of combatting communism will be surrendered for an indefinite time, and perhaps permanently. One cannot talk about giving up this or that "for the duration", as we do in time of war, because the term "duration" has no practical meaning.

OUR LIBERTIES MUST BE CHERISHED

So it seems to me we must reexamine what it is that we prize most highly about our country. It is what we prize the most that we must insist be preserved and if possible, strengthen and expand it. I think it is not far wrong to say that it is our political and personal freedoms which we prize the most highly. It is the right to speak, to assemble, to petition, to worship, and to publish what we think and feel.

These are the liberties our forebears prized so highly they put them into the Bill of Rights. They are the liberties which are under the most severe threat and attack from communism. That is why I say they are the liberties which must be the most firmly protected by those of us who cherish

them. They have been lost to others by being taken away; they must not be lost to us by our own volition, by our voluntary surrender.

I point out most respectfully that these are days when we free men and women should reexamine and rededicate ourselves to the governmental principles of democracy which guarantee our freedom.

We are too prone to take these freedoms for granted. We are too quick to accept an expediency in the administration of government, at the sacrifice of a basic civil right which our constitutional form of government was intended by our forefathers to guarantee us.

Let us look for a moment, at just a few of our governmental rights as freemen. These are not platitudes. These are not political slogans of two bygone centuries. These are not impractical constitutional ideals.

These basic principles of government spell the difference between freedom and totalitarianism; between economic freedom of choice for the individual and any form of a state economy by communism, fascism, state socialism, or cartellism, with its economic dictation through monopolistic combines.

In a very real sense, commencement time is a time for rededication to ideals. It is a time for assuming the responsibilities and opportunities of citizen statesmanship. It is only to the extent that your generation, represented by thousands upon thousands of college graduates all over America, puts into practice the ideals of our democratic form of government, that we have any hope of leaving a heritage of freedom to our great-grandchildren.

Let us look at a few of these abstract principles of government that form some of our basic guarantees of freedom and the right to govern ourselves.

First, you have been taught that we are a government of laws and not of men. This principle of democratic government is not only an ideal of self-government, it is an absolute essential to personal liberty. May I digress from my thesis for a moment to call your attention to the truism that all practicalities are, when all is said and done, just ideals put to work? You will never experience a practicality in your lifetime, except in terms of an ideal put to work. There is nothing practical about an expediency. All an expediency is, I would have you remember, is a rationalization for more or less intellectual dishonesty, or downright corruption.

An expediency is a compromise of principle, and once you compromise a principle just a little bit, you destroy it in its entirety. Therefore, I beseech you not to compromise this basic guarantee of constitutional government, that we are a government of laws and not of men.

This means, of course, that we must be on guard against proposals that seek to give arbitrary, capricious, unchecked power to mere men who hold governmental power, high or low.

Remember, this ideal of self-government is the warp and woof of constitutional government. You learned it in high school, and college, as an essential part of our system of checks and balances. Don't ever waive it, if you want to remain free.

It must be applied to all public servants of the people, if they are not to become masters of the people. It must be applied without fear or favor to Presidents, Congress, and courts. It must be applied in the carrying out of the functions of every government official, National, State, and local.

This leads me to comment on a second ideal of self-government just referred to. We say we are a government under which the people are the masters and the government is the servant. Not only is this a great

ideal, but it is an absolute necessity, if we are to remain free.

Sit with me for awhile in the Senate and you will recognize how vital it is that this ideal be carried out in running our government. Men, mere men in government, sometimes forget they are servants and not masters of the people. They don't like it when they are called to an accounting for usurpations of power. They seek to scare the people into believing that the security of the country will be jeopardized if they are not permitted to make little dictators of themselves in some branch of the government, unchecked by legislative inquiry or surveillance.

Remember this, if you remember nothing else from your college courses in government. Our forefathers feared and rightly so, the exercise of secret powers of government officials. The personal government of the British Crown produced the American revolution. The history of many revolutions is the history of people fighting a government of men rather than by law, governments in which the people were the servants, the slaves, the pawns, the victims of government masters who had become drunk with unchecked personal power.

To protect us from personal power, our forefathers gave us the precious Bill of Rights. They gave us a free press which in a very real sense is the most potent weapon in the arsenal of democracy against tyrannical government. They gave us freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, trial by jury, freedom of religion, protection from unwarranted search and seizure, protection from self-incrimination, our home as our castle. They gave us the most important personal freedom of all—the right to govern ourselves—the right of the free ballot. From beginning to end, they gave every generation of American boys and girls the greatest charter and covenant of self-government yet penned by man—the Constitution of the United States.

As you commence your life of citizen statesmanship today, please remember that the rights of freedom guaranteed you by that Constitution are your greatest wealth. It is the greatest wealth you can will to your children and theirs.

As I have said, you are now commencing to take up the responsibilities of citizen statesmanship. You cannot pass the buck, so to speak, to Congress or to the President or to the Supreme Court if you are to remain free. You, as a citizen, must help them keep you free.

If we are to have a government by law and not by men, then we must support government by law and order and not countenance government by mob. The responsibilities of government by law and order apply to every citizen in every walk of life. It applies to students protesting the work of a congressional committee whose procedures they may not like. It applies to them in San Francisco or New York or anywhere in between. It happens to be a function and duty of a Congress to investigate alleged communism, fascism, racism, or any other form of democracy-destroying maneuver in the United States.

If any of the procedures of congressional investigation violate rights of personal liberty and some of them do, the answer is not mob violence against the committee, but the election of Members of Congress who will change the rules of procedures for conducting such investigations so as to accomplish both the purposes of finding the facts about subversion of all types in our country, and protecting the civil liberties of our people at the same time. It can be done and it should be done.

We do not have to worry about the effectiveness of fair procedures in finding the guilty. Shortcuts in police and investigation procedures such as wiretapping, denial

of confrontation by those who make secret charges against the accused, refusal to allow cross-examination of those who make the accusation, badgering of witnesses, denial of immediate arraignment, are the procedures of a police state, not of a government by law.

However, the remedy for any such abuses, when they arise, is not mob action. It is not to be found in any attempt to deny government the right and power to conduct investigations into termite forces that would eat away the foundation of our system of self-government. It is to be found in legislative reforms called for by the people at the ballot box.

I would have you be on guard against the subversive activities of not only communistic forces, but other advocates of the law of the jungle. I would have you express your faith in government by due process of law in keeping with the inalienable rights guaranteed all men, both the guilty and the innocent, under our constitutional government by law rather than by men.

That applies to mob rule in Birmingham or Montgomery, Ala., or Mississippi or New York or Chicago or anywhere else in America.

FOREIGN POLICY FOR FUTURE

But America must do even more than preserve the best of our past.

I believe it is essential that if this Nation is to exercise an important role in the creation of a world in which man can enjoy freedom, we must recapture the revolutionary spirit which characterized our Nation in the past. This country did not become great by sitting on its status quo.

Too many Americans have been overtaken by old age before their time. They believe that education which was good enough for grandpa is good enough for grandson; that housing conditions of the 19th century should be perpetuated in the 20th; that relations between the races which hardened into a post-Civil War pattern should be maintained in the interest of domestic tranquility.

Fortunately, we have a new administration which is young at heart, albeit a trifle inexperienced. Certainly, the President in his public pronouncements has given expression to our aspirations. His statement in his inaugural address, "if a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich," is a call to action to every American. But a call to action is not enough. It is important to distinguish between statements and results.

PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTERING LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

Let me be specific. It is not enough to announce a vast social program for Latin America. Responsibilities must be fixed in individuals to convert words and dollars into highways, public works, and social reform.

Fortunately, after many months of delay, Mr. Robert Woodward has been appointed to the long-vacant post of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. But for several months, we had a variety of special aids, and task forces outside the State Department, working in this area.

The result was that cooperation with the Congress in this area of foreign policy was virtually nil. The Cuban fiasco was a monument to this scattered and divided command. The good-will tour of Ambassador Stevenson can have only the most limited results, unless there is now a systematic followup by regular diplomatic personnel. It is greatly to be hoped that the ad hoc committees will now be terminated.

Now that we have this vital office filled, Mr. Woodward's most important job is to hold the respect and confidence of the governments of the hemisphere.

This is so, in my opinion, because the threat Fidel Castro's communism poses in

the Western Hemisphere is directed far more at the republics to the south of us than it is to the United States. This country has infinitely less to fear from Castro than has Venezuela, or Colombia, or Bolivia, or half a dozen other governments.

Castro is not trying to export his revolution to the United States, or to Canada; he is trying to export it to other Latin American countries, and up to now he has had at least a degree of success.

That is what the Alliance for Progress is all about. It is intended to put American capital together with social and economic reform in Latin America, to raise living standards and remove the claim of communism that it alone holds the promise of a better life.

But it is perfectly clear that the major task is not the supplying of capital, which is our end of the job. The major task is social and economic reform, which the co-operating governments must provide.

Senator HICKENLOOPER of Iowa and I went to Bogotá, Colombia, last September when the Act of Bogotá was written, setting forth the pledges of all governments to participate in this effort. But as our report to the Senate made clear, no amount of American capital can overcome the vast gulf between rich and poor in these countries; these governments must themselves undertake extensive tax reforms, so their own wealth is put to work at home, instead of being put in Swiss and New York banks where much of it goes now.

These Latin American governments must prepare their blueprints for land reform, and then go ahead with it. They must plan for home construction, and then go ahead with it.

The American taxpayers have for over a decade now, been supporting some governments in other parts of the world through our foreign aid, when it amounts to little more than supporting a rich, aristocratic class in power. Every year the bill gets higher, as we are finding out in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as we consider the foreign aid measure. Every year, more corruption and mismanagement comes to light. And every year, another government seems to dissolve anyway, taking our money with it. That happened in Iraq not so long ago, and now it is happening in Laos.

That is a mistake we must not start in Latin America. The Congress has put up \$500 million for the alliance for progress. Now it is up to the governments of Latin America to show their good faith by using it to promote real and effective and far-reaching economic reform. They cannot get away from the fact that their people are demanding a revolution of one kind or another. The only question is whether it will be peaceful, and guided in the channels of due process and just compensation, or whether it will be Fidel Castro's kind, with confiscation and mass executions.

The alternative whereby the wealthy hang on to their oligarchic position, while the American taxpayers pay a relief bill for the masses of their poor to keep revolution away from their door, is just not available to them.

So this task of encouraging, persuading, and helping the free Governments of Latin America to achieve effective economic progress through the wise application of the money we have put up, is the most important job we have in his hemisphere.

Every member of the audience here today knows that we are dealing with an implacable enemy. The Soviet Union is, to say the least, unfriendly toward the United States. It is ready to do us in by fair means or foul. The Soviet Union is well organized and has a single mindedness of purpose which is not characteristic of a free society such as our own.

I say these things because we must never underestimate the capacity of this adversary. We can expect that the Soviet Union will do its utmost to be in the forefront of every revolutionary development of the next decade. It will capture those movements whenever possible. Its closed society will hide internal conditions from the free world. It will lie as it sees fit. It will direct the resources of the Nation toward the education of science, the development of space rockets, or the shipping of luxury goods to new nations, as its purposes are served.

The basic question of our time is whether we can so handle our foreign and domestic policies as to compete with an implacable enemy in such a way not only as to win, but to promote a way of life that will give freedom to the common man here and abroad.

You are in for troubled times, but if you will keep the faith of freedom, if you will put into practice the ideals of our system of government by law, I have no doubt about your leaving a heritage of freedom for future generations of American boys and girls.

You are needed as the only hope for millions of people around the world who must be won over to the cause of freedom in your generation. By example, we can teach and help them. By betraying our heritage, we will lose them to the cause of freedom.

Lastly, remember that in essence what I have been saying is but an appeal for putting into practice our spiritual teachings. If we truly believe that man is the creation of a Divine Being, and I do, then we should put into practice the moral teachings in respect to our being our brother's keeper.

Many overlook the fact that the constitutional principles I have been talking about sprung from the very deep religious convictions of the men who wrote the Constitution. Most of them were very devout religious men. I ask you to take up the moral as well as the temporal burden of self-government and carry on in the faith of your forefathers.

Yours will be a difficult job. But every generation of Americans has had a difficult job, and every generation has added something to the physical power and to the moral strength of America. Every age since the time of Socrates in ancient Greece has thought that its younger generation was "going to pot," so to speak, and that the future could not be entrusted to it.

I do not feel that way. I think our younger generation today is better equipped and qualified to take its place in society than any previous generation has been. Your tasks will not be easy ones, but I have no fears whatsoever about putting our future in your hands.

I salute you, congratulate you, and wish you well in all your endeavors. I have faith in your citizen statesmanship.

Interest Expressed in H.R. 10, Now Before Senate Finance Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, a great many of my constituents have expressed an interest in the bill, usually described as the Keogh bill, by which self-employed persons who have less than four regular employees may set aside on a tax-exempt basis in each year a portion

of their earned income for their own retirement.

I am delighted that the House has passed this bill, H.R. 10. This particular bill does nothing more than give to such self-employed persons as doctors, lawyers, dentists, farmers, and many small businessmen who do not choose to operate as a corporation, the same tax and retirement benefits which have heretofore been enjoyed only by the employees of corporations.

I am convinced that this bill goes a long way to remove a longstanding inequity, and I hope that the Senate will join with the House in making it a law for the benefit of those who have heretofore been at a serious tax disadvantage.

Driver of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, a truck driver from the 19th Congressional District of Texas, which I have the honor to represent, who practices what he preaches, was named Driver of the Year for 1961 by the American Trucking Associations for his exceptional safety record and lifesaving feats.

He is Melvin O. "Jack" Griffith, of Big Spring, Tex., who received the award on June 16, 1961, for his record of over 2 million accident-free miles during his 28 years as a truckdriver.

Mr. Griffith was also cited for his quick thinking in aiding seriously injured victims of a two-car collision near Sterling City, Tex. Last August Mr. Griffith came upon the crash scene during a rain-storm. Foreseeing the danger of other cars colliding with the wreckage, he parked his truck where oncoming traffic could see his headlights and flashing signals. He remained at the scene and rendered aid and comfort to the victims. He was commended by the Texas Department of Public Safety for his act and was chosen "Most Representative Knight of the Road," an award given annually by the Hobbs Trailer Co. to a Texas truckdriver.

The 48-year-old tank truckdriver, an employee of the Eagle Transport Co., of Big Spring, also earned for the State of Texas the distinction of being the first State ever to have two men named National Driver of the Year in consecutive years.

The father of five children, Mr. Griffith drives a tractor-trailer oil truck between Big Spring and points within a 500-mile radius. He has frequently appeared before youth groups in churches, high schools, and civic organizations to speak on safety, good citizenship, and general compliance with laws.

An active member of the Northside Baptist Church in Big Spring, he is a member of the board of deacons of the church and teaches adult Sunday School.

As hobbies he hunts and fishes and has conducted junior baseball programs for the young people in the area.

Mr. Griffith was chosen from among a number of outstanding truckdrivers nominated by State trucking associations. Judges in this year's competition were Clarence D. Martin, Jr., Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation; Gen. E. H. Qualls, Director of the Bureau of Motor Carriers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Arthur C. Butler, director of the National Highway Users Conference.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Griffith and his lovely wife are in Washington this week, and are the recipients of many honors in the Nation's Capital. Today they have been congratulated by the Speaker of the House, eaten with friends in the House restaurant, and attended sessions of the House and Senate. I am glad that our Nation produces men and women of the caliber of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Griffith.

What Price Patriotism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the Members of this House to the Department of Commerce Directive No. FC61-217, under date of June 22, 1961, which in effect authorizes and grants permission to American firms to apply for and receive export licenses to sell and ship surplus Government-subsidized farm products to Soviet Russia and the Communist satellite nations of Eastern Europe.

By the implementation of this order, the executive branch of government in my judgment has added one more to a series of appeasement gestures to the Kremlin. I have in mind the lifting of the ban on the importation of Russian crabmeat, the announcement of the Executive order which permits the free flow of pro-Communist political propaganda from abroad to unsolicited sources within the United States, failure to impose the Trading With the Enemy Act against the Pennsylvania firm importing Cuban molasses and instead persuading this firm to refrain from further traffic with Cuba by offering to provide surplus corn, which in effect amounts to a \$14 million bribe.

These are but a few that occur to me offhand. Consequently, and with reference to this most recent gesture, I have addressed the following letter to the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges.

HON. LUTHER H. HODGES
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to Department of Commerce Order No. FC61-217, dated June 2, 1961, I understand that American firms can now apply for and receive ex-

port licenses to sell and ship surplus Government-subsidized farm products to Soviet Russia and the Communist satellite nations of Eastern Europe.

The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to request your cooperation in instructing the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in your Department to furnish my office, on a daily basis beginning with the day this order went into effect, the names of each individual American firm which makes application for an export license under this new directive.

Inasmuch as the American taxpayer is underwriting a substantial portion of the cost of these farm subsidy programs, I think you will agree that he is entitled to know the names of the American firms who place profit and greed above patriotism and love of country.

It goes without saying that by this order the administration in effect becomes an accessory before the fact. However, I know from past bitter experience that protests to the executive branch of Government on similar actions (such as the lifting of the ban on the importation of Russian crabmeat) fall on deaf ears. Consequently, I propose to seek other, more potent means of circumventing this ill-advised order.

May I, therefore, respectfully ask your prompt attention to this request?

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I take this means of serving notice on any American firm so lacking in love of country and pride in our American heritage as to profit itself by means of this new ill-advised order, that I propose to focus the spotlight of public opinion on each individual firm as each is furnished to me by the Department of Commerce. I will do this by placing any such names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

How To Be a Good Opponent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from the magazine Parade from the Sunday Washington Post and Times Herald.

This is a thoughtful article by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. It outlines the decorum that he feels should be followed by those who disagree. I think it worthy of reading not only by Members of Congress but by everyone who finds himself engaged in contention on issues:

HOW TO BE A GOOD OPPONENT

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

If you are like everyone else, sooner or later you will be "agin" something. It's human to oppose—and thank heaven we in America have the freedom to express our opposition if we wish.

In many years of business and political life, I have learned a few solid facts about this vital right we possess to stand up and say: "I object."

I have discovered that you can fight for your side in such a way that you can become personally unpopular in no time at all.

That way lies almost certain defeat for your cause and perhaps even social exile as well. On the other hand, you can conduct yourself as a decent, honorable human being as well as opponent—and that way lies attention for what you have to say and respect for you as a person.

You see, the Constitution guarantees you freedom of speech and thus the right to object, but nobody guarantees you against hurting yourself and your side if you go about your opposition like a bull in a china shop.

Time and again I have seen causes lost and even careers wrecked because people did not realize this simple truth. In our family store in Phoenix, a young executive lost promotion after promotion because of his smart-aleck methods of expressing his objections. The fact that his points were well taken was unfortunately obscured by the unfavorable impression his attitude created with superiors.

I would like to pass along my own secrets of opposition. I believe deeply in these rules not only because they are useful in arguments but because living by them can also help tone you up spiritually and morally. Thus you win no matter how the battle comes out.

They are practical, too. At one time or another, you are going to rise up and object to something: Maybe you will disagree with the PTA on a project, fight a neighborhood rezoning plan or oppose views expressed by neighbors and friends. You may even find yourself on the opposite side of an issue with member of your own family.

When you do, remember these significant points:

1. OPPOSE—BUT DO NOT HATE

There seems to be a universal belief that you cannot wage a good fight unless you work up a hostility. As a result, many persons develop deep antagonisms. How often have lifelong enmities started because someone began hating a person instead of the issues?

The killer instinct may be essential in the boxing ring but it has no place in the arena of argument. Here are some personal examples of what I mean.

President Kennedy and I are poles apart on many issues but if you assume we must also be deadly personal enemies as well, you're entirely wrong. The fact is that while the President and I are fully aware of the gulf between us, neither has permitted these differences to develop into personal antagonisms.

For instance, the President personally telephoned Dr. Janet Travell immediately after her appointment as White House physician, requesting her to continue taking care of me for a back condition. His thoughtfulness is a clear illustration that one can oppose strongly and still maintain good personal relations.

I have teed off many times at Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, yet telephoned him recently to say: "Arthur, a young newsman would like an interview with you. Would you see him?" "Sure, BARRY," the Secretary replied, "send him right down."

Oppose a man's views if you wish, but respect him as an individual and a human being.

2. KEEP YOUR SENSE OF HUMOR

Fight hard for what you think is right, but find time every so often for a quip and a laugh. Some lightness now and then to balance the seriousness of argument lessens your chances of losing your head and blurt-ing out words you may want to eat later. I freely admit there are a number of my own words I would like to take back and chew up. But a sense of humor has kept these at a minimum.

Once last year Mr. Kennedy, then the Democratic nominee, was trying hard to get

his secondary boycott bill out of committee in the Senate. The committee considering the measure met one morning but was one short of a quorum. I was a member but was standing outside the meeting room. As an opponent of the bill, and in line with accepted legislative procedure, I was absenting myself from the committee meeting to prevent the measure from being voted out.

Suddenly the then Senator Kennedy saw me. He insisted that since I was present at the committee session I could be counted to form the quorum. I quickly pointed out that I was outside, not inside, thus could not be counted. "You're here, aren't you?" Mr. Kennedy asked. "Yes," I said, "but not there."

The discussion got faster and funnier, with remarks flying about the "visible invisible man" and "the little man who wasn't there but here." Soon the entire committee was rocking with laughter. It could have become a bitter battle but didn't because both participants kept their sense of humor. (By the way, I wasn't counted after all.)

3. ALWAYS OPPOSE POSITIVELY

It's never enough just to be "agin" something—be for something at the same time. In other words, always be ready with an alternative or a solution as well as with criticism. If you don't like the new school site, present another and give reasons why yours is better.

This is constructive opposition. It is not only helpful but destroys your opponent's ability to say: "You're nothing but an obstructionist."

Remember that you oppose negatively if you are merely intent on tearing down the other fellow or side. This preoccupation with negative opposition can also lead you into the disastrous trap of mudslinging, which never produces good results in the long run and can only serve to sully the slinger as much as the receiver. It's impossible to hurl a fistful of mud and still remain spotless yourself.

Point out the weaknesses in your opponent's points, rip them apart one by one—but never stop there. Tearing something down only leaves a gaping hole. Build something at the site.

4. LEARN ALL THE TRICKS

Many people are convinced that debating tricks will give them the upper hand in an argument. I am often asked for "inside stunts" to whittle an opponent down. I always answer: "Know the tricks so that you can defend yourself but never use them yourself because they almost always boomerang."

A favorite trick of some politicians is the false comparison. For example, a candidate for Governor in a Midwestern State once told a campaign rally: "How can my opponent hope to solve our farm problem when his own farm has been losing money for 10 years?" On the surface the argument was impressive but the comparison was unfair—mainly because his opponent owned a small vacation farm that he wasn't trying to make pay at all. Watch for these tricks.

Another stunt is a variation of "Have you stopped beating your wife?" A civic leader out West announced stiff opposition to the location of a new hospital in his community. At once his opponent issued the charge that he was against more medical care for the town. He wasn't at all. He was merely insisting that the hospital be built someplace else in the same community.

5. APPLAUD OPPONENTS, IF RIGHT

A fair-minded person hears out the opposition, weighs arguments justly and expresses approval if he agrees. Then, when he does rise to object, his opponents will know he isn't just popping off to hear his own voice but is genuinely convinced of the soundness of his stand.

These, then, are the fundamental rules of opposition I myself follow. They are simple but all-important rules of honest living. Whether you win or lose in an argument depends on the essential rightness of your point of view. But win or lose, these principles will help you become a respected opponent and a human being of conviction and dignity.

Commission of Money and Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I have been examining in some detail the recent recommendations of the Commission on Money and Credit established by the Committee on Economic Development.

Without question, this is one of the most significant public services ever performed by a private organization. For more than 50 years, our fiscal and credit systems have been growing and changing. The CED assumed the responsibility of making a study to be culminated by a report which would contain recommendations on what changes, if any, should be made to improve the structure, operation, regulation, and control of our monetary and credit system. The aim was to supply a guide for policy that would be useful for the next decade and hopefully for longer.

I call your attention to an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Times on June 20, which comments on the accomplishments of the Commission.

In my last television report to my constituents in Connecticut, I also spoke of the work that this Commission has done for the country by preparing its report and I submit this statement to you as well for your interest:

[From the Hartford Times, June 20, 1961]

DON'T LOSE THIS REPORT

The first accounts of recommendations by the Commission on Money and Credit, which under the chairmanship of Hartford's Frazar B. Wilde reported to President Kennedy this week, should set off some lively debate around the country.

For example, the Commission urged Congress to enact programs particularly important to growth on a 5-year basis. This is what the President wants of Congress in his multibillion-dollar foreign-aid program. But the idea runs afoul of Congress' most fiercely coveted privilege—strict annual control of the purse strings.

It has been argued for years that were a business a fraction the size of the Federal Government to be fiscally managed as is this gigantic public corporation, it could not long survive. In its conception, planning and financing of public works, Government proceeds in the hard and most costly way—year by year. And the budgeting and book-keeping principles involved reflect no distinctions between unrecoverable spending and reimbursable investments.

The Commission report resulted from 3 years of study by some shrewdly practical men. In the composite they could hardly be described as doctrinaire. And the first news of their findings reveal such bold rec-

ommendations as giving the President power to slide not more than a fourth of the 20 percent first-bracket income tax rate up or down as a device to combat fluctuations in the economy.

We hope the Commission's report receives the serious attention in Congress that it deserves and is not merely lost in the files of the Library of Congress by men who believe they already have all the answers.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, OF CONNECTICUT, ON WTIC-TV, JUNE 25, 1961

Congress is not far away from a date which is a significant one in the legislative process, but which is not so widely marked at home. It is the end of the fiscal year in which the Government operates—June 30. Most of the appropriations bills for the next fiscal year—establishing how much the agencies and departments may spend—have already been passed by the House or are under active consideration. The Senate has not kept up with this pace, and it may be necessary to pass a resolution permitting those agencies which have not had appropriations voted to continue into the new fiscal year until a decision is reached.

These problems always bring money to the forefront of Washington discussions at this time of year. The extension of certain tax rates to produce the necessary revenues—the provision of a slightly higher ceiling on the national debt—the occasion soon to total up spending and revenues in the last fiscal year and determine just where we stand—all of these things focus attention on our governmental finances.

Basically, the problem is one of making sure that we have mobilized all our resources and use them wisely. This is the issue with which Congress is faced each year. As a former municipal administrator, I know how even the smallest departments tend to grow unless they are carefully watched. And as a taxpayer, I am deeply conscious of the impact that unnecessary spending has on everyone's life. It is one of the most serious obligations of any Congressman to review policies and programs carefully to make sure that they are necessary to a better and well-ordered Government.

Do we have the instruments, both public and private, to insure such care? In this past week in Washington, one of the most vigorous and thorough reports on this question filed in years has been the subject of discussion. It is the report of the Commission on Money and Credit of the Committee for Economic Development, a widely respected organization of businessmen. Chairman of this special group was a Hartford man, Frazar B. Wilde of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. In the coming years, this report will stand as a useful guide to future discussion.

This report is the first thorough and comprehensive study in 50 years—half a century—of the policies and practices of public and private financial institutions in the United States. The last such examination of the Nation's monetary and credit system was made by the Aldrich Commission in 1908. Their recommendations led to congressional action setting up the Federal Reserve System in 1913—one of the keystones of the American economy.

Since that first Aldrich study, there have been two world wars, a major depression, and astounding national economic growth. In 1946, the Congress set out a basic Government policy that high and stable levels of production and employment must be fostered and nurtured. It was obvious to all in the 1950's that these developments had a profound impact on our banking and financial institutions, but a detailed study was needed. It was characteristic of the deep sense of responsibility of the Committee for

Economic Development and such members as Mr. Wilde that the C.E.D. assumed the task.

Among the points which are brought out by the report are that almost 10 percent of the assets held by financial institutions in the country today are held by three types that weren't even in existence in 1913 when banking regulations were established, private pension funds, investment companies, and credit companies.

But such instruments—and the regulations that are adopted by Congress to make them effective—must be judged by whether they help to reach the national goals we have set for ourselves. The report of the Frazar Wilde Commission lists our economic national goals basically as improving our standards of living through low levels of unemployment, high levels of production and productivity, an adequate rate of economic growth, and reasonable price stability. These are goals which, in turn, should contribute to achieving other national goals such as enhancing the freedom and dignity of our citizens and insuring the survival of our country and its system of government.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the men and women—both the principals and the staff—who labored for more than 2 years to compile and complete this report. Many of them brought to it as well a heritage of years of business or academic experience through which they could temper their conclusions. It is not always widely recognized how much Congress welcomes such informed opinion as a guide to further effort. We are the beneficiaries here of much advice, ranging from the letters from home, with serious and thoughtful opinions, to the testimony of large and small organizations with representatives in Washington.

A major part of the congressional responsibility is sifting this advice and counsel, measuring it against the practical realities of the situation, and trying to mold it into better laws for our country. The report of the Commission on Money and Credit should be a major contribution to national thinking on economic affairs.

Censorship in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, my distinguished fellow Oklahoman, Senator Mike Monroney, recently was invited to make the principal address at the annual dinner of the Washington professional chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalistic society. The Senator, a former newspaperman, has long demonstrated that he understands the role of the free press in our system of government. His remarks before the assembled newsmen and newswomen of this city, though critical of some of their practices, won their enthusiastic applause.

The documentary evidence of Senator Monroney's constructive rapport with the fourth estate, it would seem to me, is worthy of our study. To that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Monroney's remarks heretofore described be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, OF OKLAHOMA, DELIVERED AT SIGMA DELTA CHI DINNER, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 7, 1961

It has been suggested that I speak on "Censorship in the Cold War." This was kicked off by President Kennedy in his speech to the bureau of advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association on April 27.

While the President was expressing his concern that vital information not reach our potential enemies, a rereading of the speech shows how expressly he opposed any type of censorship. He spoke only of the problem and offered no solution. In fact he said: "Perhaps there is no answer to the dilemma faced by a free and open society in a cold and secret war." His only plea was for self-restraint and a sense of sacrifice in publication of news that might be helpful to our enemies.

I know the leaders of the newspaper profession have thoughtfully and prayerfully considered his appeal. Like the President, they find it difficult if not impossible to come up with a workable solution.

I agree with them that once the news is in the public domain, it is like trying to sweep back the sea to manage or control it by voluntary censorship. I likewise think it would be grossly unwise.

For a free press is also an independent press. Editors, managing editors, correspondents and reporters on the same paper can, and often do, disagree on the value of news and its display. Certainly what constitutes a breach of security would be debatable among those on the same papers, and even more debatable among the thousands of publications with which this Nation is blessed.

And even if all newspapermen agreed, as they are unlikely to do, someone in Congress, or some general in some hearing would then bring out the very fact that might have been withheld from publication.

We must never believe that we can achieve results that would compensate our society for the loss from any form of censorship. As the President has said: "I am not suggesting any new forms of censorship or new types of security classifications. I have no easy answer to the dilemma that I have posed, and would not seek to impose it if I had one."

To impose restraint at the point of publication is like trying to dam the Mississippi at the mouth instead of at its source. There can be no halfway point of censorship. In fact, you could boast that 99.44 percent of the news was uncensored, but if 0.56 percent was withheld, this fact would still undermine the credibility of the whole. The slightest withholding of information would cause public doubt, and folks would begin to wonder how much and in what manner their information, now considered accurate and complete, had been denatured, deleted or mixed with propaganda additives.

Many of you realize the good job done by Byron Price, Ted Koop, and Johnny Sorrells during World War II. But censorship or a reasonable facsimile thereof in a cold war is another matter—as far apart from a shooting war as the two poles.

The immediate and universal danger to the Nation and to some member of almost every family imposes a self-discipline and compliance that is totally lacking short of war. Does any of you believe that with the present inflationary danger in the cold war that price and wage controls would be permitted? Yet suspending economic incentives is a far less sweeping measure than suspending the right to know of the people

in a democracy. The latter could destroy our greatest source of strength.

Inherent in our democracy is the fact that we trust our people to know and to understand both the good and bad. Recognizing this as a historic fact, we act with a strong will that is based on knowledge and trust that our information about our strengths and weaknesses is straight and unadorned—unadulterated by the slightest degree of censorship or control of the press.

Whatever gains might be made in denying bits of information to our potential enemies through the press would be small indeed compared to the loss to ourselves.

I am certain that no one in this administration has in mind this type of censorship—but baby tigers have a habit of growing from kittens into man eaters.

And the fact remains that in many areas of government today the senseless carryover of World War II classifications still makes honest reporters question their right to use information that has been in the public domain for the past 15 years.

Disclosure of information that might damage our security can be handled far better and easier through proper training and discipline within the military services and the exercise of sound judgment against publication of genuine military secrets. Some of the worst examples of security leaks come from the services themselves, through misunderstanding and carelessness—sometimes to prove their superiority over their rivals in the race for national prestige, sometimes to boost appropriations for certain projects or from a desire for exclusive control over certain types of weapons or weapons systems.

I don't think the press will quarrel with a genuine classification of real secrets or the temporary withholding of news of breakthroughs in weapons systems. But they do object to the leaks of information to the scientific and trade publications—or from the advertising of manufacturers, boasting of new developments or new weapons in order to get public credit for their innovations.

Within a well disciplined Department of Defense, adequate power to classify and to keep secret these items now exists. But leaking from the inside cannot and should not be corrected by censorship on the outside.

Technically trained officers, working under proper supervision, should and can prevent many of the disclosures that concern us all—newspapermen and Government officials alike. True technical secrets and war plans have always been subject to classification without objection. But they should be restricted for all—and not leaked to the few.

Nontechnical fields of political activity and policy, our relations with other nations—these are in the public domain and should remain there. In the event of some immediate crisis, information should be given to editors and wire-service managers with adequate warning as to the possible consequences of premature publication. I feel that in this field most newspapermen agree that publication then should be at the discretion of the publisher.

I have been suspicious of programs of some organizations which insist that we must adopt Communist methods to combat communism. Stifling of freedom of the press would not only weaken us at home, but would deal the most serious possible blow to American prestige abroad. For this is the first test applied when we consider whether a government has yielded to dictatorial control.

What we need in today's grim struggle is more news—not less news. We need more of the kind that will guide the public into a full knowledge of the depth of the conflict, the reasons and points of disagreement, and an intelligent and deep discussion of our courses of action as a free people. This

applies particularly to this revolutionary age in which we live. It is revolutionary politically, morally, scientifically, and militarily.

The issues of the old days in government were simple and easy to understand. Hence they could be explained in small headlines and with a few paragraphs. Today the complex issues involving thermonuclear weapons, outerspace exploration and regulation, scientific education, and world and national finance, require more searching reporting and editorial discussion.

In my earliest days on an Oklahoma City newspaper, the late and great Deak Parker, then editor, and for many years editor-in-chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, used to tell me: "Remember, Mike, that a dogfight on Main Street is bigger news than a new war in the Balkans."

But this was 1920. Deak Parker changed as all publishers have changed. Laos or Iran is no longer downplayed to a city hall story. Yet the details of Laos and Iran are confusing to the public who hear talk of threatened military involvement in faraway corners of the world without knowing the background or how it got that way.

The Russians now demand a right of veto, not only in the United Nations, but over atomic inspection, truce supervision, etc. The implications of this new policy are not understood by most of my constituents. Yet the impossibility of open and unfrozen negotiations on this little-understood Soviet position may overshadow the cold war for several years to come.

The peaceful uses of outer space are many—such as the communication satellites. Yet failure to negotiate international agreements as to their use could postpone this vital step forward. Even these latest steps forward of scientists can be jammed by one noncooperating member.

You can fill in 100 of the prickly problems that require a broad base of public decision, including international banking relations, the outflow of gold, the problem of developing nations, all marked with a crying need for a broad-based public understanding.

I feel that the precious freedom of the press, which we enjoy, also implies a responsibility to print the dull but informative news stories essential for the enlightened functioning of a democracy.

It's easy to hit a page 1 headline in an extemporaneous debate on the Senate floor accusing the minority leader of "loquacious verbosity." But the real subject of Senator Goetz's talk was never mentioned, which was a discussion of the wisdom of the Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting. Other matters, including TV scandals or boxing frameups, can command better space than a discussion of foreign trade.

I do not doubt that public interest is higher in these fields than in the reporting in depth that I am suggesting. But it comes in poor form, then, for the newspaper critics to bemoan the "good guys—bad guys" two-gun westerns as banal and then deal so casually with the solid news and consign it to the want ad pages.

Perhaps one of the reasons for this situation is the strange inversion that is occurring in the field of publications. It was noted some time ago by Louie Selzer, bishop of the Ohio Scripps-Howard papers, who said that the newspapers are attempting to become magazines and the magazines newspapers.

There is some truth to this switch, as more and more magazines center on reporting in depth while the newspaper features seek to preempt the magazine field. When I strip the magazine type inserts and special sections from most Sunday papers, I have a rather thin diet of solid news.

Maybe there is an answer to it. It has always seemed to me that there are special sections of special interest available for almost all types of newspaper readers. We

have in most papers full sections of comics, for the fathers, but very little news about space for their children.

We have entire sections devoted to recipes, styles, home decoration, and social news, but no serious discussion of the reasons for juvenile delinquency. The speculators in the markets can command double spreads in most papers on the latest market prices, but the coming trade war between the Communist bloc and the free world goes almost unnoticed.

Sports can, and should, command their own special section, but there should be some space reserved also for a simplified discussion of atoms for peace or for desalination.

Maybe what we need is some regular space reserved for the dull but essential facts of the world as it undergoes revolutionary change. I don't care what you call it—an "egghead page" or what you will. Daily papers of general circulation should supply well-written and understandable copy on the facts of life in the world of today.

I'm not asking for page 1 or even the inside section page—but I do believe that in its relationship to the problems we face today, more space and more reporting in depth will arm our people with the understanding necessary for charting democracy's future course.

The Democratic Party and the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, for the past 14 years, the University of Michigan has sponsored an annual conference on aging, an event that has taken on national prominence over the years, under the productive leadership of Dr. Wilma Donahue, of the university's division of gerontology.

This year the theme of the conference was the "Politics of Aging," and one of the major speeches delivered was by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey—a member of the Special Committee on Aging.

Because I believe his remarks on the position of the Democratic Party regarding our aging population deserve wide circulation, I ask permission to print them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE AGED

(Speech by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, before 14th Annual Conference on Aging, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., June 20, 1961)

I have been asked, in a brief 20 to 25 minutes, to present to you the philosophy of the Democratic Party concerning the older population of our country.

This conference, I believe, provides the perfect setting in which to lay before the American people a summary of what I see as the Democratic Party's philosophy on this topic. In doing this, I will refer to specific issues and proposals only as a means of illustrating the special features of this philosophy.

My first observation is that for several decades—in particular, since urbanism and in-

dustrialism really and truly became the dominant pattern of American society—the Democratic Party, in sharp contrast to its rival party, has consciously and almost systematically reflected, absorbed, and faced up to the issues of the urban-industrial world—to the problems created or intensified by the subtle and the not so subtle changes in our various technologies—industrial, agricultural, medical, and even our social technology.

The strength of the Democratic Party—and to be perfectly candid, the basis of its internal tensions as well—lies in its function as a barometer of the timeliness of the issues of our society in a given period of history.

More pointedly, to quote from Samuel Lubell's "Future of American Politics": "Since 1932, it has been within the Democratic Party that the issues of our times have been fought out, for better or worse. Civil rights, how to balance the interests of the newly emergent labor power against those of the rest of society, the yearning for security against another depression, the hunger for social status of the climbing urban masses—these have been do-or-die problems for the elements in the Democratic coalition. They have not been the issues which agitate most strongly the Republican voting elements. This lack of timeliness * * * has been the basic reason for the 'negative' Republican attitude to so many major problems. There has been one instinctive Republican program, in whose favor all doubts have been resolved, to turn the clock back to an earlier era."

Lubell's point is that throughout American history one of the major political parties in each important stage of our development has served to draw together, in some fashion or other, a variety of social elements whose problems and social and economic position reflect the basic characteristics of American society in that stage of development. He goes on to discuss the fascinating question, Can the Republicans come to grips with the problems of our times? or will it continue to ignore these problems—thus strengthening the vigor and unity of the Democratic majority?

The relationship of this general idea to the subject of your conference in Ann Arbor should be obvious.

I need not tell this particular audience that we are witnessing the emergence of the problems of a fast-growing population of older Americans as a national phenomenon. Nor do I need to elaborate on why this is so.

But because of the Democratic Party's very nature—its constant assimilation of emerging social elements seeking greater status or assurances of security, and its sensitivity to the problems of such groups—it cannot help being the major instrument or spokesman, or arena, for thrashing out the dilemmas, the plight, and the challenges and opportunities confronting our senior citizens.

Small wonder, then, that the Democratic Party had a vigorous and active national organization of Senior Citizens for Kennedy, headed by a man who has become a symbol for the goals and aspirations for millions of older Americans, Aime Forand.

In a way, it's too bad that we don't have elections every year, because the effect upon the thousands of older citizens who participated in the recent presidential campaign was precisely the kind of antidote against the feeling of not being useful, of feeling unwanted and neglected by the rest of society which seems to be obsessed with youth and with status derived only from the pursuit of a gainful occupation in the production side of our lives.

Americans, young and old alike, seek and deserve not only recognition, security, and dignity from the society at large. They also aspire, as part of our emphasis on the democratic process, toward active participation in the organizations that make decisions affecting their welfare.

The Democratic Party, therefore, has not been content merely with writing platform statements and legislative proposals about specific problems of the aged. It has actively encouraged the participation of older individuals and of senior citizen groups in the formal structure of the party.

No organization can assure itself of the loyalty of its actual and potential members without also making it possible for such members to participate actively in the program of that organization.

The statements in the 1960 platform of the Democratic Party regarding the problems of the aged are partly the product of such participation and consultation. Let me read only one paragraph from the platform: "The Democratic administration will end the neglect of our older citizens. They deserve lives of usefulness, dignity, independence, and participation. We shall assure them not only health care but employment for those who want work, decent housing, and recreation."

The specific recommendations of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging—under the chairmanship of Senator PAT McNAMARA of this State of Michigan—the specific bills introduced (some of which have already been passed)—such as the senior citizens service training program; a U.S. Office of Aging; the recent improvements in social security benefits and eligibility; the provisions for housing for the elderly in the recently passed omnibus bill; as well as the more widely publicized proposal for financing adequate health care through the social security system—all of these (and more) are concrete actions taken to make real the promise of the Democratic Party in our 1960 platform.

Equally important is the Hill-Harris bill for the improvement of community health services to the chronically ill, or aged persons.

In describing the distinguishing characteristics of the philosophy of my party, it is not necessary for me to hark back all the way to the stand it took by initiating the Social Security Act in 1935 and to the rigid opposition to that act on the part of the Republicans.

The list of "I-wish-I-never-said that" quotations from the Republican Party on the early fight for the establishment of our social security, and since then, is quite long. Let me cite only two brief quotes: "Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought in here so insiduously as to prevent business recovery, to enslave workers, and to prevent any possibility of the employers providing work for the people." (JOHN TABER, Apr. 19, 1935.) (Ninety percent of the Republicans voted against the Social Security Act.)

"The old-age and survivors insurance is grossly unjust and ineffective. Our social security program is totally unmoral." (From Republican minority report on social security bill, 1949.)

But more recently, the inability or unwillingness of the Republican leadership to recognize the continuing and the newly emergent problems of an aged population has been demonstrated time after time.

Let me illustrate this by referring, for example, to a rather revealing statement in the report by the minority on the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, in 1960: "The majority's report would continue the practice which the 86th Congress had adopted of segregating our citizens into special categories, ranging from (listen to this) juvenile delinquents and the unemployed to the aged. This is destructive of the unity of American society. The problems of older Americans are basically no different from those of other citizens." (Aged & Aging in the United States p. 174.)

I doubt that any extended commentary is needed on this rather bizarre point of view. But are they really serious in saying

that if we call attention to, and introduce action on, such phenomena as juvenile delinquency, we are segregating the juvenile delinquents? Does anyone here deny that there is a problem of juvenile delinquency? Are the Republicans really serious in saying that if we publish facts, and start action on unemployment, we are segregating the unemployed workers? Does anyone here deny that 7 out of 100 people in the labor force today are without jobs?

The Republican minority's wholesale rejection of every single recommendation by the majority on the McNamara subcommittee (which included John F. Kennedy) is perfectly logical in the light of such an ostrich viewpoint. How could the Republicans approve of those recommendations when their leadership refuses to recognize the very existence of an aged population and its problems?

From the viewpoint of the Democratic Party, the very purpose of concentrating on the juvenile delinquent, the unemployed, and the aged, is to create those material and social conditions that will bring them back into the mainstream of normal American society, to integrate them, not to segregate them.

This brings me to another significant facet of the Democratic Party's philosophy. It seems to me that if we as a nation tolerate a policy and pattern of neglect and rejection of our senior citizens—a trend which truly results in segregation—by pretending they are not problems, by pretending that the society of the 1960's is no different from the one of the 1860's, and that any solutions are to be found in the society of 100 years ago, we will find that demagogues and political opportunists will jump into the vacuum—ready with single-minded, unscrupulous appeals to millions of our senior citizens. Our fellow Americans now in their sixties, seventies and eighties might, because of our turning our backs on them, have no recourse except to join up with such demagogues in the false hope that their plight will thereby be alleviated.

But no demagog, no self-styled leader of forgotten men and women, can be successful if the rest of society takes effective action to prevent the aggravation of the social and economic conditions in which large numbers of the aged find themselves.

Let me make this clear: We have no right to condemn either the self-seeking demagog or those older Americans who succumb to his appeals. The success of any demagogic movement is a measure of our own failures to recognize and to cope with the conditions that make that success possible.

Our growing population of senior citizens are seeking, more than ever before, from existing organizations in their community, their States, and on the national level, a sign of recognition and sincere appreciation of their problems. If they find no such sign, their natural adjustment to such neglect can and will take the form of a variety of reactions, from lethargy and senility; cynicism and pessimism; withdrawal and isolation; even psychosis and suicide.

I need not document such a statement before a professional audience like yours. You all know that the aged have a disproportionate rate of admissions into our mental hospitals, and that they have the highest rate of suicides.

And some of you might be aware of these cases where, in local elections, say on school bond issues, the aged express their collective resentment toward feeling left out of things by voting against such proposals.

"Status anxiety," to use the jargon of the political sociologists, can be a very real thing, and if we permit the problems of the aged to go unresolved, or if we indulge in hypocritical token gestures at solving them, we will certainly leave open a wide door for the ruthless manipulators of such anxieties

among the aged, to feed upon their dissatisfactions in order to promote their own personal interests.

One does not need to be a trained social scientist to imagine some of the long-run implications of the quiet population revolution taking place in America. Consider this, for example: "About one out of every three Americans who are now aged 25 or over will be living in the year 2000. In other words, there will be, only 40 years from now, at least 30 million people over the age of 65. Sixty percent of them will be women.

"What do the 36 million men and women now between the ages of 25 and 40, for example, expect when they (or most of them) reach the age of 65 or over in the year 2000? In what conditions do they want to be living 25 or more years from now?" (From Senate Subcommittee Report, "Aged and Aging in the United States," p. 18.)

I doubt very much that they will tolerate the same social and economic status in which so many older Americans live today. Their expectations out of life and from society will be even higher than those of the present generation of senior citizens.

I have quoted from the 1960 report of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging in order to provide you with one more indication of the perspective assumed by the majority party of Congress.

And also to point out that in our work in the Senate we have consciously chosen to seek out the advice and knowledge of experts in the field of gerontology—of men and women who have devoted their scientific lives to gathering and digesting reliable knowledge concerning this newly emerging segment of our total population—just as, a generation ago, we created policies and programs in the area of child care on the basis of research and tested ideas derived by child behavior experts.

Many of you attending this conference have been among the contributors to the philosophy of the Democratic Party on aging—knowingly and unknowingly. I stress this point about consultation with experts—and hiring them on our staff—because I think it is essential to show that, in writing our platform, in working out legislative recommendations, we have not resorted to mere personal biases and unfounded stereotypes about the 17 million aged Americans, and about the implications of the population trends taking place in modern America.

Finally, I cannot end my remarks without touching upon the current issue of financing medical care in our old age. I stress "our" old age, because too often the discussions about the aged are carried on under the assumption that we are talking about somebody else, that we ourselves will never someday become eligible for membership in the club of senior citizens.

You already know the contrasts between the positions of the leadership of the Democratic Party and of the leadership of the Republican Party, as to whether or not there is a special health problem among the aged, and if so, how to finance their medical care.

Even when the Republicans do accept the facts about the health status of the aged, their antiquated philosophy still prevents them from coming to the same conclusion that the Democrats have arrived at.

That conclusion, of course, is that the most rational, the most effective method of financing basic health care in the retirement years, is through the use of the social security system.

Regrettably, each time we Democrats suggest improvements and innovations in this system, we have to start all over again and clear up the distortions and undermining attacks upon the principle of the system.

That principle, or philosophy, has to do with the idea of self-reliance and the prevention of dependency. When our Nation

was predominantly an agricultural society, it was believed that self-reliance was of major concern to the individual alone. In that period of our social history, the Government and the community acted only in those rare cases of individual trouble—and then only with much reluctance. We did not then have the concept of Government playing a positive role in preventing dependency and in maintaining self-reliance.

Instead, the Government acted only in a last-ditch form of paternalism. Thus, self-reliance versus paternalism were thought to be the only alternatives. And anyway, the numbers of people involved were relatively few, and to a great extent, these two alternatives seemed to work.

But with the fantastic changes in the numbers of retired—and hence, potentially dependent—aged in our world of today, those two approaches have proven to be inadequate—and unacceptable to more and more Americans. It is my conviction that when a man or woman in America today knows that better arrangements are possible, he or she will reject charity from the State or the community.

There is a better arrangement. And it was embodied in the original Social Security Act of 1935.

Unfortunately, it seems to be sadly misunderstood by many individuals and pressure groups today—and that is the concept of a "cooperative contract" to use the words of Douglas Brown, of Princeton University. In our kind of industrial society of today, Dean Brown states, the Government—

"In order to assure a self-reliant and responsible citizenry necessary for democratic government, agreed to enter upon a mutually advantageous contract with each productive citizen. In effect, a contract of cooperation replaced an age-old paternalistic obligation, at least for a large segment of our people." ("The Role of Social Insurance in the United States," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, October 1960, p. 107.)

In replacing the age-old obligation of paternalism we have, in a sense, deprived the state and also an aristocracy of the pleasure of indulging in a noblesse oblige. Just as the New Deal measures, you might say, deprived our citizens of the freedom to starve.

Furthermore, in making social security a substitute for state paternalism, the Democratic Party took a stand and still does, against the means test.

The means test is, or should be made, an anachronism in modern industrial America for those persons subjected to the hazards of old age, such as loss of income upon retirement and illness.

Besides, it is a less rational approach toward meeting these risks and hazards. The means-test philosophy also raises this question: Should a lifetime of work, effort, conscientious planning, and savings be penalized in old age by the punishment of non-eligibility for medical care programs, for example?

The inadequacy of the means test can be seen in the meager program accepted by less than one-half of our States to implement the program of medical assistance for the aged, popularly known as the Kerr-Mills program.

To me, one of the tragic features of this program has been that it was widely advertised by the American Medical Association, which seems to be an outpost of the Republican Party, as the perfect solution to the problem, that is, if there really is a problem. But the truth is that very few people, in no more than 25 of our 50 States, will be truly protected by the end of this year. The Special Committee on Aging has just released a staff report, based on replies from all the 50 States, and the facts point to the

continued justification of the need to extend basic health care protection to all the aged, without any restricting and humiliating means-test investigation.

Finally, it appears that the majority of the American people, young and old, agree with the position of the Democratic Party in this controversy. A little more than 1 week ago, the Gallup poll reported that 67 percent of America's voters favor an increase in the social security tax in order to pay for old-age medical insurance. Only 26 percent opposed such an increase. Even among those aged 21 to 29 years, the percentage favoring the proposal is 63 percent.

I'm not really surprised at such results. But I must confess that I was pleasantly surprised to note the following, from the report of the Gallup poll: "Few who oppose the measure seem to be taking into account the AMA's position—spelled out in a nationwide campaign through newspaper ads, posters, and radio commercials—that the move is a step in the direction of socialized medicine."

It should be obvious from this finding that the American people have had enough of scare words and more than enough of any frantic effort to fool them into believing that the problem of medical care costs in old age is not real, or, if it is real, that private insurance, together with charity medicine, can alone provide the basic solution to an ever-increasing problem of physical and human dignity that accompanies the emergence of a sizable population of older citizens.

I represent a political party that is acutely aware of the interrelationships between our progress, or lack of progress, on the domestic scene and the image of America in the eyes of the world, a vital factor in our progress, or lack of progress, on the international scene. We cannot call upon other nations to initiate certain reforms in their domestic policies, if we ourselves do not seek to set an example for them to follow.

Our country will be judged around the world not merely in terms of the size of our gross national product, nor the amount of chrome on our autos, but instead, in terms of how or whether we, the richest nation on earth, use our resources and organizational know-how, for example, toward making real the goals of human respect, security, freedom, and dignity for a major segment of our fellow citizens—our senior citizens.

Blueprint for Socialized Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently a report prepared at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Education came to my attention. I secured a copy of the report, which incidentally is not easy, and was so amazed at the obvious intent to bring control of our educational system under Federal control that I prepared a speech which I intend to deliver in my district in North Dakota.

I believe all Members of the House who have not had an opportunity to read this report will be enlightened by the brief analysis in my prepared remarks.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my own remarks:

BLUEPRINT FOR SOCIALIZED EDUCATION

(By DON L. SHORT, Member of Congress, June 1961)

The controversial, to say the least, Federal-aid-to-education bills may soon come before the House of Representatives for action. Whether they come one by one, or in a package deal of three, or two, seems to be of great concern to those supporting this legislation. However, to those of us who oppose Federal aid to education for public, elementary, and secondary schools, this does not matter. One thing which does matter is the fact that we evidently are going to be forced to forgo an affirmative vote on the very necessary and justifiable legislation which would continue the aid to federally impacted areas. Few of us are without military or Federal installations in our congressional districts, and since these installations provide no property tax revenue to support schools, something must be done. It may be considered by the administration to be a clever political coup to link impacted areas assistance with the completely new concept of Federal aid and control of our educational system—but to those who like to deal in fair and objective fashion with legislative measures, this appears to be nothing more than legislative blackmail. We object, and strenuously, and I am sure that sooner or later this administration is going to receive its just dues from this policy of incorporating bad legislation with good in the same package. The American public is not all brainwashed, they are not all stupid either, and they will resent this dishonest legislative maneuvering when they recognize it for what it is.

Now that I have lodged my protest, I want to go on into another matter. There has recently come into my hands a confidential print prepared by the Committee on the Mission and Organization of the Office of Education (headed by Dr. Homar D. Babidge, Jr.) for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Education. This print is dated April 1961, and I mention the date only to establish the fact that this is not an old pamphlet, but one of current importance.

The title of the report is "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," but I would like to rechristen it "A Blueprint for Socialized Education."

This blueprint of future plans for the U.S. Office of Education is a clear and undeniable indication of what they expect the role of the Federal Government to be in the education field. To prove my point, let me quote from the opening remarks of the report: "The basic mission of the Office, to 'promote the cause of education,' remains unchanged since its establishment in 1867. What has changed is the American public's conception of the role of its Federal Government in education."

Perhaps the educator's concept has changed, but I do not feel the American public's has, because if my mail is any criterion, a majority of the American people have a mortal fear of Federal aid to education.

Now let me quote what the Office of Education foresees: "New responsibilities have fallen to the Office of Education during the past decade, supplementing but not replacing those that emerge from its more historic role. These new responsibilities reflect nothing more or less than a change in public conviction as to the role of the Federal Government in the area of education. The reasons for this are perhaps better analyzed by economists and political scientists; this committee acknowledges it as a fact. The

committee foresees an extension of the active Federal role in education."

I wish the committee had felt free to analyze the reasons. I am sure they know that increased Federal intervention in our affairs has caused excessive taxation to finance this intervention. I am also sure they know that unceasing propaganda has been carried on by the National Education Association and such groups to convince the American people, and educators as well, that our American educational system is in an almost complete state of deterioration.

The booklet goes on to outline two prime examples of how the Federal Government has become an active participant in the effort to promote the cause of American education (meaning the federally impacted areas aid, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958). Let me quote:

"It is estimated that about 60 percent of the total Office of Education staff is now engaged principally in the performance of this function. The Office is responsible for the execution of public policy as expressed in over 20 separate pieces of legislation, with grant and contract responsibilities amounting to approximately half a billion a year. The committee anticipates further extensive growth in this area of office responsibility. Pending before the Congress at the time of this writing are recommendations of the President that would, if enacted, almost treble the grant budget of the Office of Education."

For the curious who might wonder what this trebling would amount to, I have checked with the budget officer of the U.S. Office of Education and find that their grant budget for 1961 is \$546,091 million. A tripling of this figure would make it \$1,638,273 billion. But, let us remember that this does not include administrative costs for salaries, office equipment and space, expenses, etc.

In case you are also curious as to what they intend to do with this tremendous sum of money (even by New Frontier standards), let me quote again:

"It (meaning the Office of Education), is to be responsible for the monitoring (in the communications rather than the schoolmaster's sense of the term), of Federal activities that affect the Nation's educational well-being. As such, it must assume the role of a voice of conscience within the Federal Government, speaking for the long-term national interest in education, in contrast to the voices that speak of a shorter range Federal interest in the many uses to which education can be put."

This should put to rest any illusion you may cherish that such aid, as planned by the present administration, is only to be temporary—until the States and local governments get on their feet financially, so to speak, and can handle their responsibility under the Constitution to provide for and control educational opportunities.

Now for the blueprint of the administrative setup of the future: First, the Office of Education is to be renamed U.S. Education Agency, although the report admits that recommendations of the Hoover Commission would argue for the term "Service" rather than "Agency." I am not splitting hairs over their desire for the term "Agency," as opposed to "Service," but the committee itself feels thus:

"As vital as service is in the traditional sense, the committee feels that it now constitutes but one of the major functions of the Agency."

So this Agency, not Service, is to be headed by a Commissioner, authorized to use the title U.S. Commissioner of Education. The President of the United States is to appoint a Board of Advisers to the Commissioner of Education which will consist of laymen, except that the President might also wish to appoint a few persons of broad experience in the field of organized education. The Board

would be purely advisory, and would report solely to the Commissioner of Education. (This means, of course, that it would have no real authority to back up any advice it might wish to give.)

The President should also, according to the committee, be under no obligation to make the Board "representative" in the sense that various educational and other interested groups are to be represented in its membership, but representative only of the ablest citizens available for such service. (While I hate to interject a partisan note here—is it too much to assume that possibly any President might not object to being a bit partisan in his appointment of representatives?) To continue quoting:

"The function of the Board of Advisers would be, of course, to keep the Commissioner of Education constantly aware of the relationship of his activities to other facets of American life, and to assist him in the formulation of policies that serve effectively the broadest objectives of American society." Translated into everyday language, this means "how are the folks taking it—and do you think we can get them to take any more?"

Quoting again from the report: "The committee feels that the existence of such a Board of Advisers would, in addition to rendering substantial assistance to the Commissioner, offer to the American people an evidence that the U.S. Education Agency was intended to be truly an Agency representing the whole public." (Let me reiterate that this Board of Advisers would have no real authority.)

The major functions of the Office of the Commissioner are to be: (1) the analysis and evaluation of Agency operations, planning and direction of same; (2) the identification of major education problems, and formulations of solutions thereto; (3) the rendering of assistance to the President and others responsible for development of national education policy; (4) serving as a focal point of the Federal Government's long-term interest in education; (5) maintenance of mutually helpful relationships with the public-at-large. (In other words, keep the public happy.)

The Office of the Commissioner will consist of two divisions, which are to have subdivisions called branches: first, a Division of Management with four branches, namely, Management Analysis Branch; Financial Management Branch; Personnel Management Branch; General Services Branch.

The Division of Policy and Program Development will have four branches also—the Estimates and Forecasts Branch; Program Analysis Branch; Legislative Relations Branch (responsible for the preparation, presentation and evaluation of legislative proposals affecting education), and a Federal Education Programs Branch.

The Commissioner is also to have a Commissioner Deputy, more or less serving as his "alter ego." This Commissioner Deputy will have his own personal staff, a field staff, and a Public Information Assistant.

I, of course, was very anxious to learn what the field staff was to do, since this would directly affect the State and local education officials' actions. I found the committee anticipated that the Agency would need an enlarged field staff in various operating areas in the next decade, which indicates to me that such Federal aid will be growing by leaps and bounds. The field staff is to be consolidated, partly to avoid overstaffing and partly so that they might better assume responsibilities in case of national emergency. I can be forgiven for assuming such national emergencies would be plentiful, although what a national emergency would consist of was not spelled out. Another field staff responsibility will be to stimulate cooperative State and institutional efforts toward improvement of education, dis-

seminate educational information, identify educational problems, needs, and trends. Just how they will proceed with this "stimulation" of State and institutional efforts will be clarified later, I imagine—but I suspect it will be somehow tied up with the withholding or distribution of funds.

The Public Information Assistant mentioned before as being under the direction of the Commissioner Deputy is to have under his control a Center for Information Service, which in turn will have two branches, the Publications Services Branch and the Education Information Branch.

Four bureaus are to be under the Agency, with the suggested names of Bureau of Higher Education Assistance Programs, Bureau of State Assistance Programs, Bureau of International Education, and finally, a Bureau of Education Research and Development. The several bureau chiefs would have at their command, according to the plan, adequate resources for the full execution of their duties, with only policy guidance from the Commissioner.

Two of the bureaus are designed to execute established policies of the Federal Government, and to administer its laws. The committee feels that "while it would be possible, under present circumstances, to think of one bureau for all grant programs, the rate of growth of these programs in recent years is sufficient warning not to plan for the accommodation of present responsibilities only." This warning corroborates what I have said many times—that this is just the beginning, once a general Federal aid to education bill is passed. Evidently the committee sees a trend in the thinking of our citizens which may in public life have not acknowledged as yet, but I am convinced that most citizens would prefer to retain some of their money in State and local governments and manage their own educational systems.

The Bureau of Higher Education Assistance Programs will be made up of three parts, all under the direction of the Bureau Chief, consisting of a field services staff, assistant for program operations, and an administrative services staff. In addition, there are to be three divisions, a Division of Student Assistance, Division of Facilities, and a Division of Program Assistance.

The Bureau of State Assistance Programs will have the usual Bureau Chief, the same three-way staff setup as the one described for higher education. It also has three Divisions, to be called Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Division of Vocational Education, and Division of Secondary and Elementary School Assistance (administering programs already authorized under the National Defense Act). It mentions a fourth Division to be responsible for administration of a program of general financial assistance to secondary and elementary education. To quote what they had to say about this possible fourth Division: " * * * if such a program is enacted. Without being able to anticipate the precise nature of such a program, however, the committee is unwilling to foreclose the possibility that a fourth Division—for this purpose—might have to be created." (I think we can safely assume that if the present general Federal-aid-to-education bill is passed, we would indeed have this fourth Division and possibly even a fifth.)

Then there is the Bureau of International Education, whose Bureau Chief would have the usual Administrative Services staff, an Assistant for Foreign Operations, and an Office of Relations With International Organizations. The usual three operating Divisions are included; namely, a Division of Technical Assistance Program, a Division of Educational Exchange, and a Division of International Studies. Being very interested in the title Office of Relations With International Organizations, I found that "this Office would provide educational services and

information to these bodies (meaning international organizations, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organizations, the Organization of American States, the International Bureau of Education, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and others—including certain relationships with foreign ministries of education." Here the thought occurred to me that if a great many citizens of this country object to the further intervention of the Federal Government into educational systems now controlled by State and local governments—how might some of the other countries of the world react to our entrance into their educational affairs? We have been told many times that our educational system is inferior to Russia's, England's, and many European countries. Now are we to start instructing them, or perhaps they are to start instructing us?

At this point I began to feel wearied, but felt I must go on with my "homework" on the Committee report.

The last-mentioned Bureau is to be called the Bureau of Educational Research and Development, and it is the most complicated of all. Under its Bureau Chief there were to be four, instead of the usual three offices—a field operations staff, publications staff, and a program planning and coordination staff, plus an administrative services staff.

This was not to be the end, however. There were listed under these, an Office of Educational Demonstrations and Communications, an Office of Statistics and Records and Re-

ports System, an Office of Educational Research, and a National Library of Education.

Then there were listed three centers. One, a Center for Higher Education was to possess two branches, an Administration Branch, and an Academic Affairs Branch. The second Center for Elementary and Secondary Education also was to possess three branches, the Administrative Organization Branch, the Curriculum and Instruction Branch, and a Pupils and Personnel Branch. The third was to be called a Center for Continuing Education and Cultural Affairs. This was to be the busiest, evidently, for it had four, not three, branches: A Library Services Branch, an Adult Education Branch, a Cultural Affairs Branch, and last but not least, a Special Education Services Branch.

The potential of this center is felt to be, according to the report, the most significant of all the recommendations. To quote: "Freed of the competing claims of staff service and major program administration, assured of extensive educational resources and supporting services, this Bureau could render to American education a degree and kind of service surpassing what we have thus far known. Solidly founded in knowledge and dedicated to unencumbered service, it could become a monument to the established role of the Federal Government in American education."

Mr. Speaker, I can almost feel the weight of this monument pressing down on the citizens of this country. It is with a discouraged and heavy heart that I once more quote, as a reminder to all who feel Fed-

eral funds can be accepted without Federal control, the "Assurance against Federal interference in schools" section in the present Federal-aid-to-education bills: "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."

Why, I might ask, why, if this is true, should plans be laid even before the bills recommended by the President are passed, to set up this elaborate blueprint for the new U.S. Education Agency? Is the American public to be lulled into a false sense of security by the above-quoted disclaimer of Federal interference? Further, can anyone even estimate the cost of the administration of the planned U.S. Education Agency? Since the committee very kindly estimated that the grant budget would be trebled if present legislation recommended by the President were enacted, perhaps someone in the inner circle of the administration would be equally kind enough to estimate what the new Agency is to cost. The American public should at least know where a portion of the extra tax funds they will be assessed will be going before they get back the Federal stipend per pupil which is to completely revolutionize their educational systems.

Why not just admit that this highly complicated, beautiful piece of egghead planning is, in truth, a blueprint for socialized education?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

St. Paul's first prayer after his conversion, Acts 9: 6: *Lord what wilt Thou have me to do?*

Most merciful and gracious God, in the stillness of this moment, set apart for prayer, we are turning our thoughts to Thee in gladness and gratitude, in reverence and humility.

Thou knowest how much we daily need Thee if our life is to have worth and meaning, peace and power, fortitude and faith.

Grant that our life of faith in its very nature and manifestation may be one of personal sanctity and self-denying service for a needy world.

Wilt Thou so transfigure and illumine our minds and hearts with Thy spirit that we shall more eagerly desire to do what Thou dost command and what we know is well pleasing unto Thee.

Hear us in the name of the Master who sought to have His followers experience within their souls the joy of doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4913. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia hospital center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act; and

H.R. 7712. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7577. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KUCHEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 857. An act to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore; and

S. 1725. An act to permit the establishment of through service and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States and to establish a joint board to review such rates.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFERRING MANAGEMENT OF SENATE RESTAURANTS TO THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 106, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

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

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That effective August 1, 1961, the management of the Senate Restaurants and all matters connected therewith, heretofore under the direction of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, shall be under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol under such rules and regulations as the Architect may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said restaurants by such business methods as may produce the best results consistent with economical and modern management, subject to the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration as