

its manhood and womanhood so essential in defending our American ideals.

These fine American attributes constitute our greatest armor against the defiant declaration of Nikita Khrushchev that our grandchildren will live under Communist rule.

This is a challenge we cannot dismiss lightly.

In fact it should provide on this occasion a compelling reason for rededicating ourselves to the enduring American ideals of liberty and freedom under God.

It has been a real pleasure to participate in this program in observance of Pioneer and Homecoming Day and I am pleased it was possible to accept your kind invitation.

The Late Ed Koterba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 6, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of the Congress share my grief over the untimely death of Ed Koterba.

Ed had a brilliant future as a newspaperman and his humor, perception, and ability to write a human interest story with a light touch will be greatly missed.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 7, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, S.T.D., minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer.

Almighty God, we thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every morning. Deliver us now from the clash and clamor of the world about us, from the turbulent concerns confronting us on every continent of the world, and from the pressure of daily duties, that we may "be still and know that Thou art God."

Bestow upon Thy servants here assembled the gift of the quiet soul, the serene spirit, and the disciplined mind, that all deliberations may be lifted into the higher order of Thy kingdom. Grant to all of us the wisdom and the will to seek first Thy kingdom and Thy righteousness, in the certain confidence that all else shall be added thereto.

Bless this Nation which Thou hast given us, and renew within us pure religion and high patriotism, that we may be good enough and great enough to be the servants of Thy purposes upon the earth.

In the dear Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

I shall always remember the day Ed strolled into my office with his big smile and said:

Congressman, I'm Ed Koterba. I have just returned from Sharon, Pa.—

In my district—

and had the most delicious potato soup I have ever eaten at the Shenango Inn there. The recipe should be made famous.

So began the "potato soup" stories in Roll Call and other papers all over the country. The recipe is still used whenever potato soup is served in the House cafeteria.

That is only one example of Ed's imagination and initiative, and how he could take a simple event and make an interesting story out of it.

The world needs people like Ed. It is sad to lose them in their prime.

National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 6, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress persist in refusing to capitalize

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, July 5, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 6, 1961, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 1342. An act to provide that participation by members of the National Guard in the reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas shall be held and considered to be

on the natural gambling spirit of the American people and while we stubbornly continue to ignore the tremendous revenue-producing features of a national lottery in the United States, most of the countries throughout the world continue to treat and respect gambling as an instinctive and universal human trait which brings pleasure to the people and financial benefits to government treasuries.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the Members of this House some interesting facts and figures which I have gathered from some of these countries where the wheels of fortune spin on behalf of the public welfare.

VENEZUELA

This small South American nation, with a population of less than 7 million, last year took in \$48.8 million, of which \$30 million was given out in prizes leaving \$18.8 million as revenue for the treasury.

Venezuela uses this income from gambling wisely. The great bulk of this revenue was used for the benefit of hospitals and schools, and the remainder was devoted to other Government purposes.

Mr. Speaker, with our taxes rapidly rising and with the need for new sources of revenue to meet our public demands becoming more pressing, is there a more painless or sensible way of raising government revenue than a national lottery? Venezuela does not think so.

full-time training duty under section 503 of title 32, United States Code, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution transferring the management of the Senate restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twelve postmaster nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the executive calendar will be stated.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gerald Johnson, of California, to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of May 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AGREEMENT FOR FACILITATING INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF VISUAL AND AUDITORY MATERIALS OF AN EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL CHARACTER

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give effect to the agreement for facilitating the international circulation of visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific, and cultural character, approved at Beirut in 1948 (with

an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance

REPORT ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SPAIN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the military assistance program for Spain (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN DETAILED ESTIMATES IN ANNUAL BUDGETS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the requirements for certain detailed estimates in the annual budgets (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL ACTIVITIES OF ATLANTA REGIONAL OFFICE, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities of the Atlanta regional office, Housing and Home Finance Agency, September 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT OF IDLE PRODUCTION EQUIPMENT WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of management of idle production equipment within the Department of Defense, dated June 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TECHNICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM AT PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that title to certain scientific equipment purchased under contract with Government funds has been vested in the Pennsylvania State University; to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, BULLY CREEK EXTENSION OF VALE PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Bully Creek extension of the Vale project, Oregon, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

A letter from the Assistant Director of Administrative Services, Civil Air Patrol, Ellington Air Force Base, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that patrol, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF A CERTAIN IMMIGRANT

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a

copy of an order relating to the adjustment of the immigration status of Raj Kumar Mallick (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 34

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed cutting down of trees in the Presidio

"Whereas it has been reported that the U.S. Army intends to cut down 26 acres of beautiful and hand-planted eucalyptus, acacia, pine, and other trees in the Presidio in San Francisco in order to expand a cemetery; and

"Whereas the felling of these trees and removal of the shrubs from these rolling acres in the Presidio will remove an area of rare beauty which has laboriously been planted and maintained since the first planned reforestation, on a large scale, in 1882, and would put off, probably forever, the release of any acreage of the Presidio to the city of San Francisco for a new and unique San Francisco residential area; and

"Whereas with the Armed Forces declaring their various real estate holdings surplus at a growing rate, it is indeed appropriate to ask if among these other properties an appropriate site for a cemetery could not be found without permanently destroying or impairing the historic beauties of the Presidio: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of Defense to take appropriate executive and legislative action to prevent the removal of trees at the Presidio in San Francisco for the extension of a cemetery, to direct the U.S. Army to seek another more appropriate site among its vast real property holdings for such a cemetery, and to take such other action as will insure that the historic and carefully nurtured natural beauties of the rolling acres of the Presidio will remain for the enjoyment and appreciation of the people of the entire Nation as well as the citizens of the State of California and the city of San Francisco; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Department of Defense, and to the Secretary of the Army."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 47

"Joint resolution relative to the future use of military airports

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the California Legislature that H.R. 6178 has been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives to provide for a joint study by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Secretary of Defense of the disposal and future use of military airports expected to be surplus to the needs of the Department of Defense; and

"Whereas California now has several dozen military installations which have aviation facilities; and

"Whereas the inventory of military aircraft has gone in 7 years in excess of 54,000 to something less than 27,000; and

"Whereas there have been tremendous reductions in manpower trained to use military aircraft; and

"Whereas the State of California, through its Aeronautics Commission stands ready and willing to cooperate in any such study of future disposal of military airports by civilians as well as by military activities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby endorses and urges the adoption of H.R. 6178 by the U.S. Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges that the study undertaken pursuant to H.R. 6178 include the problem of how to prevent the leasing of space for military fields to private persons, firms and corporations and the civil operation of aircraft by such persons, firms and corporations on the military fields in competition with civil airports; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Secretary of Defense."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 42

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider cancellation of turbojet flights from Redding to San Francisco and from San Francisco to Redding

"Whereas Pacific Airlines has decided to cancel its midday turbojet flight numbers 725 and 758 from Redding to San Francisco and from San Francisco to Redding, with stops at Chico and Sacramento; and

"Whereas said curtailment of services was decided upon by the company without informing interested local parties in the affected area prior to the company's decision to drop the above-mentioned flights; and

"Whereas flight 725 is the principal flight from Redding to San Francisco and is used by more passengers than any of the other flights now serving Redding; and

"Whereas Pacific Airlines is the only airline presently certified to serve this area; and

"Whereas the elimination of these flights would cause considerable inconvenience to airline travelers using these flights; and

"Whereas this rapidly expanding area of northern California has great and continued need for a dependable airline service which connects it with flights to San Francisco and the Midwest, East, and South, as does flight 725; and

"Whereas citizens of this area feel that should Pacific Airlines cancel these flights, necessary steps should be taken to request the Civil Aeronautics Board to consider certifying one or more airlines to serve this area in the public interest, to insure adequate and dependable airline service to the area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Civil Aeronautics Board to take such steps as may be necessary to insure adequate air service to citizens of this area in the public convenience and necessity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this

resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 38

"Joint resolution relative to Fort Funston

"Whereas Fort Funston in San Francisco has been declared surplus Federal property by the General Services Administration; and

"Whereas this land, comprising about 116 acres of sand dunes and beach, would make an excellent public park and recreation area along the Pacific Ocean; and

"Whereas a public auction to sell part of the land to private developers could be scheduled at any time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the National Park Service is requested to recommend the development of surplus Fort Funston property for a State park and recreational area; and be it further

"Resolved, That the General Services Administration is requested to take no action to dispose of the Fort Funston property until the State of California has an opportunity to take such action as may be necessary to acquire the property for a public park and recreational area; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the National Park Service, and to the Administrator of General Services."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 50

"Joint resolution relative to the King Range National Conservation Area

"Whereas there is pending in the U.S. House of Representatives a bill, H.R. 6793, to provide for the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in the coastal area of northern Mendocino County and southern Humboldt County; and

"Whereas this bill, authored by the Honorable CLEM MILLER, Congressman representing California's First Congressional District, provides for conserving and developing the lands and other resources in the area under a program of balanced usage providing for the long-range development of the area; and

"Whereas the King Range National Conservation Area will be acquired by donation, by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or by land exchange, but not by eminent domain; and

"Whereas the conservation program is designed to enhance the economic climate of the local area, the State of California, and the United States, through sound conservation practice; and

"Whereas the King Range National Conservation Area is an important implementation of the advance conservation concepts in all resource fields, in keeping with the vision of the New Frontier: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges Congress to enact H.R. 6793, providing this much needed conservation area for the use and benefit of the people of the State of California and of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in Congress."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 44

"Joint resolution relative to water resources development

"Whereas the Federal Government is presently engaged in the construction and operation of the Central Valley project in the State of California, which project has resulted in great benefits to many areas in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys in this State; and

"Whereas one of the units of the Central Valley project is the Tehama-Colusa Canal which will deliver water from the Shasta and Trinity units of the Central Valley project to service areas in the western portion of the Sacramento Valley; and

"Whereas there is an urgent need for water for agricultural purposes in Yolo and Lake Counties in this State, which regions have not been included in the service areas of any existing or proposed Federal or State water development projects; and

"Whereas the need for water in these regions has resulted in studies of methods of developing the necessary water supplies, culminating in the recent report with respect to the proposed multipurpose Wilson Valley project contained in Bulletin 90 of the State department of water resources, dated March 1961; and

"Whereas it would appear that either an extension of the Tehama-Colusa Canal through Yolo County to a terminus in the vicinity of Putah Creek or the Wilson Valley project, or both, might be appropriate and feasible additions to the Central Valley project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to make funds available for a study of the feasibility of either extending the Tehama-Colusa Canal through Yolo County to a terminus in the vicinity of Putah Creek, or constructing the proposed multipurpose Wilson Valley project, substantially as described in Bulletin 90 of the State department of water resources, dated March 1961, or both, as a part of the Central Valley project for the benefit of both Yolo and Lake Counties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 43

"Joint resolution relative to amendments to the National Bankruptcy Act

"Whereas the State of California has enacted laws licensing and regulating companies and persons engaged in the business of selling various types of investments to the public and as a part of such licensing and regulation the State law authorizes the particular licensing and regulating agency to take possession of the affairs and assets of such company or person under a conservatorship whenever it appears that the licensee is operating contrary to law or is in a hazardous financial condition; and

"Whereas at the present time there are some 11 trust deed investment companies

which are licensees of the State, and in which the public has invested millions of dollars; and

"Whereas these companies are in receivership or bankruptcy under the provisions of the National Bankruptcy Act (title 11, United States Code); and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California has before it legislation which would grant the agency having licensing jurisdiction over trust deed companies to take possession of a company if it was found to be operating contrary to law or in a hazardous and unsafe financial condition, for the purpose of rehabilitating or liquidating the company in order to safeguard the funds and property of the investing public; and

"Whereas in the past, under similar laws granting conservatorship and liquidation authority over licensees engaged in the investment of the public money, the State has been ousted of its conservatorship and jurisdiction by the licensee company petitioning for relief under the various provisions of the National Bankruptcy Act; and

"Whereas it is highly desirable and beneficial that State agencies, which are fully informed concerning the operations of the particular business of a licensee and are able to rehabilitate or liquidate the licensee, should not be stopped in the process by the intervention of Federal authority under the Bankruptcy Act; and

"Whereas the State of California believes that such interruption of the conservatorship or liquidation proceedings not only delays the marshaling of assets but increases the cost and expenses to the detriment of both creditors and investors and as well deprives the licensing agency of applying its expert knowledge to the affairs of the said licensees; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact appropriate amendments to the National Bankruptcy Act to exclude from the provisions of that act any person or company with respect to which the regulatory laws of the State applicable to the business in which the person or company is engaged provides for the conservatorship or liquidation of the licensed business, under the jurisdiction of a State court, and over which the conservatorship authority or liquidation authority is being exercised; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 46

"Joint resolution relative to urging the Federal Government to continue to permit employment service administrative funds to be expended for classified advertising in the operations of the placement service of the California Department of Employment

"Whereas for more than 8 years the California Department of Employment has utilized paid classified advertising as an integral part of placement operations conducted under the uniform national system of public employment offices established under Federal law; and

"Whereas the effectiveness of such activity and the resultant benefit to individuals, industry, and the community as a whole far outweighs costs involved, particularly when considered in connection with the additional free public-service advertising it has tended

to cause publishers to make available to the department; and

"Whereas this method of communicating job opportunities has always been utilized in California only to a modest extent involving a comparatively minor portion of the administrative expenditures connected with placement operations, and has been strictly limited always to advertising to obtain applicants in shortage occupations, and not to advertise jobs for which applicants are available from the active application file; and

"Whereas the filling of a few such key jobs through classified advertising has frequently resulted in affecting the subsequent placement of substantial numbers of active file applicants in related positions; and

"Whereas though the administrative expense funds for the State's placement operations are provided by the Federal Government, they are in fact collected from California employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; and

"Whereas statements contained in House Report No. 392, accompanying proposed legislation embodied in H.R. 7035, the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies indicates that it is contemplated that measures be undertaken to impose restrictions which would prohibit expenditures of administrative funds for such classified advertising: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is urged to permit continuation of the utilization of classified advertising as an integral part of State placement operations in the national system of employment offices; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States representing the State of California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 39

"Joint resolution relative to a commemorative stamp honoring John Muir

"Whereas the year 1964 will mark the 50th anniversary of the death of John Muir, one of the great naturalists of our Nation and a lifelong advocate of the need to preserve the great natural resources of our scenic forests and wilderness areas; and

"Whereas born in Scotland, John Muir came to the United States at an early age and as a young man settled in 1868 in California, the State he later came to call his home; and

"Whereas John Muir thereafter spent his life exploring, largely on foot, the mountainous and wilderness areas of California, the United States and Alaska and writing stirring poetry and numerous articles and books extolling the beauties of nature, recounting his travels, and seeking to acquaint his countrymen with the great inheritance available to all in the natural resources of our scenic forests and wilderness areas; and

"Whereas it was to a great extent through these explorations and writings of John Muir that our country was awakened to the heritage of our great forests and mountains and the great need for national parks and reservations to preserve all these for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of John Muir's death; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of

this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 36

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law proposed legislation to authorize the use of the airspace above and below the gradeline of highways within the Interstate System

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States legislation authorizing a more beneficial use of the airspace above and below the established gradeline of highways within the Interstate System; and

"Whereas the enactment of legislation to accomplish this purpose will result in greater financial benefits to the State of California and its political subdivisions without in any way impairing the full use and safety of the highways, or in any way interfering with the free flow of traffic on the Interstate System: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress and the President of the United States to enact into law the legislation to authorize the more beneficial use of the airspace above and below the gradeline of highways within the Interstate System; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 41

"Joint resolution relative to optimum development of the Central Valley Basin and San Francisco Bay region of California, including multipurpose development of certain watersheds therein

"Whereas the settled policy of the Congress of the United States in the field of water resources activities and basin planning is stated repeatedly in the symposium of 31 reports of the Select Committee on Natural Water Resources, United States Senate, established pursuant to Senate Resolution 48, 86th Congress; and

"Whereas in Committee Print No. 15 of said reports it is specifically stated that, 'the obvious way to achieve such coordination is to require that all developments within a basin shall fit as nearly as possible into and constitute an integral part of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the basin's resources. This concept is now well established and the Congress has taken a number of steps to implement it. One important step in this direction is the efforts the Congress has, in a number of instances, authorized the Federal agencies to develop overall plans for important regions. At the present time comprehensive plans have been completed or are being completed under the leadership of the Corps of Engineers, and in full cooperation with States and other Federal agencies, in the Delaware and Columbia River Basins, and are being developed for river basins in the Southeast, and for the Texas basins, by "study commissions" established by Congress for the purpose. Such developments indicate that the Congress is willing to do its part to implement the concept of comprehensive and coordinated development plans'; and

"Whereas the State of California has benefited greatly in past years from the coordinated activities of Federal agencies in the construction of projects to control floods, conserve water, and to provide other water-associated benefits as carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army; and

"Whereas the State of California looks forward to continued activity by these two agencies toward the fuller development of the State's water resources; and

"Whereas major projects such as the San Luis unit have been authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and other major units such as Auburn Dam, Folsom south unit, and the east side division of the Central Valley project are approaching the authorization stage; and

"Whereas virtually no multiple-purpose projects remain to be constructed in California which have been authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas a number of proposed flood control and water development projects do remain in California which may be susceptible of development by the Corps of Engineers on the upper Sacramento River, Cache Creek, the Fresno River, Chowchilla River, Eel River and other north coast streams, Cosumnes River, and streams in the San Francisco Bay area; and

"Whereas the Congress throughout the decades has assigned to the Corps of Engineers the tasks of planning and developing systems of public works, for the control of floods in the rivers of the Nation; for the improvement of navigation in rivers, canals, and harbors of the Nation; for the protection of riverbanks and coastal shores; for the planning of highways and systems of transportation needed for the military defense of the Nation; and the making of coordinated basin plans for public works: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and provide funds to authorize the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources, and in conjunction with a study commission and other Federal and State agencies, to make studies which would lead to multipurpose development of these basins; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Army, and to the Chief of Engineers."

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 45

"Joint resolution relative to establishment of a Federal water pollution control research facility in California

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering legislation for the establishment of several regional laboratories and research facilities for the conduct of technical investigations, experiments, field studies and training relative to the prevention and control of water pollution; and

"Whereas, one of said research facilities is to be located in the southwestern area, and insofar as practicable, said facilities are to be located near institutions of higher learning in which graduate training in such research might be carried out; and

"Whereas regional research facilities are urgently needed to supplement the activities of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, in providing tech-

nical assistance to the States and local agencies on the mounting problems of water pollution control and water resources management; and

"Whereas it is both logical and desirable that a regional research facility be established in California, not only because of the magnitude of water pollution and water quality problems in this State but also for the reason that California agencies have been conducting a substantial portion of water pollution control research at the State level; and

"Whereas California is one of the areas of the United States in which the problems of water quality management are both critical and of great magnitude as evidenced by the fact that the State's present population of over 15 million is expected to almost double in the next 20 years and, to make possible this growth, the people of the State last year voted a \$1,750 million water bond proposition initiating the greatest water development project ever conceived in any State of the Union; and

"Whereas California is ideally located for studying the ground water quality problems that are unique to the Southwest, since one-third of the Nation's ground water supplies are developed here and since California has been the forerunner in conserving and augmenting water resources by recharging ground water basins; and

"Whereas ground water problems associated with sea water intrusion also can be studied in California for the reason that 13 ground water basins along the State's coastline already have been damaged by the encroachment of saline waters and other basins are now being threatened; and

"Whereas California has the added geographical advantage of being situated where studies of marine waste disposal problems can be undertaken since two-thirds of the State's sewage and industrial wastes are discharged into ocean waters; and

"Whereas the State has, in the University of California, an institution of higher learning that provides graduate education in the fields of research to be carried out in the proposed regional research facilities; and

"Whereas the extent of said university's educational and research activities in the field of water pollution control is documented by the following facts:

(1) It has the oldest sanitary engineering program on the west coast, with the largest full-time academic staff in the United States, the greatest number of resident graduate students, and the largest number of sanitary engineers working for doctorates;

(2) It has the Nation's most extensive academic research program in the field of water pollution control, operating research laboratories with a paid staff of 115 and undertaking over \$750,000 annually on research studies, including, but not limited to, waste water reclamation, marine waste disposal, ground water pollution problems, and waste treatment processes;

(3) It has a school of public health with internationally recognized competence in the field of radiological health sciences—a field of increasing significance in water pollution control programs; and

"Whereas a research facility located near the University of California would be able not only to draw upon a large reservoir of academic personnel and graduate students but would also benefit from the extensive research being conducted by the university in the fields of water pollution control and water resources management: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing regional water pollution control research facilities and to lo-

cate one of these facilities near the University of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 40

"Joint resolution relative to Project Mohole

"Whereas the drilling barge *Cuss I*, named after the Continental Union, Shell, and Superior Oil Cos. which were responsible for its construction, and now owned and operated by the Global Marine Exploration Co., recently successfully drilled in the deepest ocean depths ever achieved and opened new vistas for exploring the earth and its origin, and thus vindicating the dedicated scientists who conceived this daring and improbable object; and

"Whereas this unprecedented drilling took place as part of a scientific project called Mohole under the able sponsorship, guidance, and direction of the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Global Marine Exploration Co.; and

"Whereas some of the major achievements of this scientific experiment included the unusual engineering design of the ship which made Project Mohole possible in the first place, the positioning of the ship in a stationary spot on the ocean through an intricate system of radar and sonar buoys, the completion of permanent undersea anchored buoys at depths of 12,000 feet, the securing in place of 12,000 feet of drill pipe in the ocean through the device of a guide shoe assembly which prevents bending in the pipe at the surface, and the gathering of cores from the earth's ocean bottom; and

"Whereas the success of this scientific gamble was brought about only through the untiring and coordinated efforts, the technical ingenuity, and the courageous faith of the many scientists who participated in this extraordinary achievement; and

"Whereas the knowledge gained from ocean sediments alone will greatly enhance our understanding of the history of the oceans, climatic changes, and the evolution of life, and Project Mohole is one of the most important scientific undertakings of modern times, for it will probe into new and totally unknown regions of the world; and

"Whereas the scientists' goal is to drill a hole all the way down to where the light crust of the planet rests on its dense mantle, known as the Moho, after Andrija Mohorovic, a Yugoslav who discovered it in 1909 by a brilliant analysis of earthquake vibrations; and

"Whereas drilling through the sea is the only feasible way of reaching the Moho, and the result of reaching the Moho should bring back cores of ages-old material rich in information about the earth's beginnings and its structure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature highly commends and congratulates the many scientists, workers, and members of the petroleum industry who made this achievement possible, and expresses its deep interest and encouragement in the furtherance of Project Mohole; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislature respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to support Project Mohole so that the scientists may achieve their ultimate goal; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 202

"Resolution relating to a Federal fish hatchery in Nevada

"Whereas a proposed fish hatchery in Douglas County, Nev., would provide fish for planting not only in Nevada but all of the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range; and

"Whereas this area presently is used by thousands of Californians and Nevadans for public recreation but is inadequately supplied with proper fishing facilities due to the lack of adequate hatchery production in certain areas; and

"Whereas the Federal budget as adopted by the Senate of the United States presently provides for \$150,000 for the start of a fish hatchery project in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate sufficient money to commence the construction of a fish hatchery project in Douglas County, Nev., for the benefit of the people of the State of California and Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 412

"Resolution relative to H.R. 1774

"Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, at its present session, H.R. 1774, by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, Representative, 19th District of California; and

"Whereas H.R. 1774 would amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide that any person who has lived in the United States for 20 years and is over 50 years of age may take his examination for citizenship in the language of the country of his origin; and

"Whereas this would liberalize a provision in this act which permits a person to take his examination for American citizenship in the language of his country of origin if he were 50 years of age or over at the time of the enactment of the act; and

"Whereas this bill is supported by many worthwhile groups and individuals in California, including the Catholic Labor Institute, East Los Angeles Branch, and the Community Services Organization, and would be a beneficial change in the law enabling many longtime residents of the United States to become citizens and thereby participate more fully in the privileges and responsibilities of life in a democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the Legislature of California does urge the Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 1774 into law; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, Congressman, 19th District, all Members of Congress and the U.S. Senate from California, and the Vice President of the United States

and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The petition of John F. Drac and William Kona, of Chicago, Ill., relating to the extension of the right of self-determination to the Slovakia and its Slovak people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF ENACTMENT OF THE HOMESTEAD ACT—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 7, 1961, my colleague from Nebraska [MR. CURTIS] introduced a joint resolution which provides for the observance next year of the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act. The joint resolution is highly meritorious and appropriate, as perhaps no piece of Federal legislation contributed more to the development of the West and to the recovery of the Nation following 4 years of civil strife than did the Homestead Act, signed into law by President Lincoln on May 20, 1862.

I joined my colleague in cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 98 and express the hope that it will be passed in timely fashion at this session of Congress. Nebraska has a special interest in the centennial because the first homestead entryman is located near Beatrice in Gage County, Nebr. On June 19, 1961, the Nebraska State Legislature adopted a resolution supporting this measure together with S. 2027, which provides for the issuance of a series of stamps commemorating the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Homestead Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Legislative Resolution 40 be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION 40

Whereas the year 1962 is the centennial of the Homestead Act, and

Whereas the monument of the National Park Service to the Nation's first homestead entryman is located near Beatrice, Nebr.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 72d session assembled:

1. That the Members of Congress are hereby memorialized to support the bills in Congress directing the President of the United States to designate the Homestead Centennial in the year 1962, and the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a commemorative stamp of the 100th anniversary of the Homestead Act.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS CONFERENCE STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Conference Student Association, which is composed of representatives

from religious sponsored colleges in Kansas, at its spring meeting adopted a resolution endorsing the Peace Corps program. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the president of the Kansas Conference Student Association, containing the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

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

KANSAS CONFERENCE STUDENT ASSOCIATION,

June 16, 1961.

Mr. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

HON. MR. CARLSON: The Kansas Conference Student Association in its spring 1961 conference, with delegates from Baker University, Bethel College, College of Emporia, Friends University, McPherson College, Ottawa University, Southwestern College and Sterling College, recommended the continuation of plans for and support through Congress of the Peace Corps program.

We support the following Peace Corps philosophy:

That U.S. citizens be sent by the U.S. Government to underdeveloped countries for the purpose of helping underdeveloped countries help themselves, emphasizing academic fulfillment and technical skill while omitting political and cultural issues.

Yours very truly,

J. E. LANSDOWNE,
President.

CONTROL OF RAILROAD PIGGYBACKING—PETITION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have received a petition signed by 575 members of Local Union 147, Over the Road, City Transfer Drivers, Helpers, Dockmen & Warehousemen, Des Moines, Iowa, in support of legislation to control railroad piggybacking. The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned, depend on the trucking industry for our livelihood. Piggybacking has become a menace to our industry through low rates granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce to be made a matter of record in the consideration of the bills now before that committee on this subject.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment: H.R. 5490. An act to provide for more effective participation in the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 498).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 4324. An act to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to re-enlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 499).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 845. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special

pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 500).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 879. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 501).

WHEAT REFERENDUM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 502)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report an original joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. This resolution would simply extend the latest date for holding the wheat referendum from July 25 to August 26. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is busily engaged at the present time in attempting to produce a wheat bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, the request was for unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 116) was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1962, may be conducted not later than August 26, 1961."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Louisiana makes his explanation, is my understanding correct that the action taken by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on a 1-year wheat program is such that it is necessary that there be a postponement of the referendum date in order actually to make that program effective and feasible, and that the purpose of the joint resolution, on which the Senator has asked for immediate consideration, proposes nothing more than the postponement of that date?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. Under the law, as Senators know, the referendum must be held not later than July 25. The joint resolution advances the date to August 26. That is the only change made. As I said, it is likely—in fact, I hope it will be so—that the committee will report a wheat bill to the Senate next week.

So it is important that the date for the referendum be extended from July 25 to August 26, in order that the referendum may be submitted under the regular procedure. This is important in connection with the wheat bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my further understanding that the joint resolution had the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,

of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have just now entered the Chamber. Do I correctly understand that the joint resolution purports to do nothing except advance the date for the referendum, which, unless the date for holding it is advanced, is to be held in the latter part of July?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. In other words, under the law, the referendum should be held not later than July 25. This joint resolution will extend the date to August 26; that is all it will do.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I certainly shall not object to immediate consideration of the joint resolution, because I believe it is absolutely necessary for the referendum to be held. But I urge the distinguished chairman of the committee to give serious thought to the desirability of not reporting to the Senate any measure which would require a cut in the wheat acreage this year. I make that recommendation based on the production this year and on the drought which is occurring in some of the great wheat-producing States. In addition, consideration should be given to the importance of wheat in connection with the food-for-peace program, which I believe to be one of the most important programs our country has in connection with the improvement of international conditions.

As the chairman of the committee knows, this year we have exported approximately 675 million bushels of wheat, and our domestic consumption is 625 million bushels. In other words, this is the first time in our history when we have exported more wheat than we have used domestically. I believe it important in connection with both the domestic situation and our international program that the committee give serious consideration to the necessity of making no cut this year in the wheat acreage. In that respect, I refer again to the importance of that matter in connection with our international relations. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee will give serious consideration to that situation; but I did not wish this opportunity to pass without making some reference to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course the Senator from Kansas knows that our committee is giving thought to that matter. As soon as the wheat bill is reported to the Senate, the Senator will see that the committee did take into account the suggestions made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 116) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the joint resolution taken from the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

This resolution would extend the time within which the 1962 wheat marketing quota may be held until August 26, 1961. The national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1962, was proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture on May 10, 1961 (26 F.R. 4143). Section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, requires that a referendum with respect to such marketing quota be held not later than July 25, 1961. In view of the fact that there is pending before the Congress legislation which would affect acreage allotments and marketing quotas for the 1962 crop of wheat, it is important that the time within which the referendum must be conducted be extended in order that wheat producers will know at the time they vote the type of program which will be in effect.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

SEC. 336. Between the date of the issuance of any proclamation of any national marketing quota for wheat and July 25, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers who will be subject to the quota specified therein to determine whether such farmers favor or oppose such quota. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum oppose such quota, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of such quota, by proclamation suspend the operation of the national marketing quotas with respect to wheat. *Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1962, may be conducted not later than August 26, 1961.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2199. A bill to permit the use of certain construction tools actuated by explosive charges in construction activity on the U.S. Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2200. A bill for the relief of Benarsi Dass and wife, Gyano Peganyee Dass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2201. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for reimbursement of services performed at special places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 2202. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jen Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2203. A bill for the relief of Jozef Budny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2204. A bill to increase U.S. productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, by promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management, encouragement of public responsibility in the private economy, and maximization of technical and managerial progress, through the establishment of a Peace Production Board and the support of local and industrywide boards; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2205. A bill for the relief of Josefine Lepschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2206. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to study the feasibility of development of lakes at Winnebago and Snyder Bends, on the Missouri River, for recreational purposes, and to conduct the necessary construction therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2207. A bill to amend section 117(b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relative to scholarship and fellowship grants; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2208. A bill for the relief of Su-Fen Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2209. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist in the controlling of grasshoppers on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to treat as an involuntary conversion the sale of livestock on account of drought during 1961 and to treat any gain from such sales as capital gain; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1962; considered and passed.

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

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF SERVICES PERFORMED AT SPECIAL PLACES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for reimbursement of services performed at special places, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 5 days so that any Senator who may wish to do so may cosponsor it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

The bill (S. 2201) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for reimbursement of services performed at special places, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER, was re-

ceived, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PEACE PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a 25-member Peace Production Board.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2204) to increase United States productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, by promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management, encouragement of public responsibility in the private economy, and maximization of technical and managerial progress, through the establishment of a Peace Production Board and the support of local and industrywide boards, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during World War II, in order to assure the most effective mobilization of our resources, we established a War Production Board. With the stakes as high and the problems of mobilization even more crucial in what is technically peacetime, I propose today that we establish a Peace Production Board whose job it would be to forge all of our country's resources into an all-out effort to decisively win the economic cold war.

It is the responsibility of the United States under present international conditions, to require the most effective mobilization and the maximum utilization of all elements of the Nation's productive forces—the urgency of the need is analogous to its urgency in war.

The Peace Production Board's objectives would be to accelerate national productivity by: Promoting cooperative labor-management relations; developing the fullest use of manpower and machine power; eliminating featherbedding in both management and labor; establishing better procedures to avoid national emergency work stoppages; achieving maximum employment; reducing waste and absenteeism; promoting sound wage and price policies; fostering higher worker morale; dealing with problems of workers and management adversely affected by automation or relocation of industries.

The Board would be authorized to make recommendations to the President regarding legislation for standby price and wage controls to be used during periods of emergency.

I hasten to point out that we are not talking about controls and allocations or wages and price ceilings and the other wartime indicia of industrial mobilization as we did in the War Production Board. We are talking about extended—perhaps decades long—efforts to marshal as nearly as possible within the confines of peacetime operation the full productive capacity of our Nation for the victory of freedom against communism, under the patriotic impetus that a Peace Production Board could give.

Chairman Khrushchev recently compared the United States to a wornout runner living on its past performance. He also predicted that the Soviet Union would outproduce the United States by 1970. Last week, President Kennedy wisely accepted this challenge and invited the U.S.S.R. to engage us in this peaceful competition. The President spoke confidently of our ability to increase our productive development. But is this to be another case where we have only brave words but no deeds; ringing rhetoric but no decisive leadership or creative boldness?

Unlike the utterances he made during the campaign, the President now seems to be saying that the United States is not imperiled by the rapid growth of U.S.S.R. productivity. Last week, the President said:

If our growth rate is increased to even 4½ percent, which is well within our capability, it is my judgment that the Soviet Union will not outproduce the United States at any time in the 20th century.

In the first place, this administration has come up with no programs to insure that the U.S. growth rate will rise 4½ percent. And second, the experts say that if we take away consumer goods, Soviet production could outrun the United States by 1970.

Indeed, a Government study has reported that as the result of Soviet emphasis on its total investment in industry, the U.S.S.R. achieved parity of annual industrial investment in 1958 and has subsequently outstripped the United States. This study has warned that unless U.S. industrial investment shows a significant increase by the mid-1960's, the Soviet industrial investment program will be double that of the United States.

In the face of this formidable challenge, it is the responsibility of the United States as peace leader of the free world to require the most effective mobilization and the maximum utilization of the Nation's working force.

We are today trying to wage this struggle restricted by problems that have prevented this country from applying its full potential to the economic struggle with the Communist bloc.

Our industrial plant led by steel production is estimated to be underutilized by 30 percent. Last year 20 million man-days of work were lost as the result of labor-management disputes. The Nation recently has been shocked by disclosures of featherbedding in the missile base building program, which has resulted in 132,872 man-days lost in the last 5 years—an example of the sort of make-work arrangements that impose, where they do occur, undue restrictions on automation and efficiency, that dangerously slow our production rate and unduly increase costs. Also, featherbedding in management, disregard of the antitrust laws and of business ethics, nepotism, excessive expense accounts, and inertia have reduced our production growth and our competitive position.

Aside from this waste, nearly 5 million Americans who want to work are unemployed today—and much of this unemployment is being accepted as practically permanent.

Every time the United States has a recession, the Soviet Union gains in the economic struggle. Our Government has reported, for example, of the 46 percentage points that the U.S.S.R. gained in total annual investment in production facilities from 1950 to 1959, 20 points were gained during the recession years of 1954 and 1958.

I believe Americans must face the fact that we cannot hope to win the decisive cold war unless we deal with deficiencies that have been slowing the U.S. productivity rate in costs and in efficiency.

Under my bill the Board would be comprised of the Vice President as Chairman; the Secretaries of the Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; the Attorney General; the Administrator of the Small Business Administration; also, four members from business; four members from labor; two members from agricultural management; two members from agricultural labor; a labor-management expert; and three representatives of the public.

The bill would authorize the Board to form labor-management-public boards on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis to achieve its objectives. The Board would also be empowered to develop apprenticeship, training, and other programs for employee and management education to develop more diversified skills; formulate programs to reduce waste and absenteeism; aid in the revision of building codes, zoning regulations, and other local ordinances to keep them responsive to changing economic conditions; provide for adequate transportation for the labor force; promote employee safety and health; encourage courses in industrial relations in colleges; develop productive incentive programs; and disseminate technical information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

A bill to increase United States productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, by promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management, encouragement of public responsibility in the private economy, and maximization of technical and managerial progress, through the establishment of a Peace Production Board and the support of local and industrywide boards.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Peace Production Act of 1961".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDING

Sec. 2. Congress hereby finds and declares that the national interest requires a productivity drive in order to meet the continuing responsibilities of the United States for the development of its own domestic economic strength and that of the free world; and in order to meet the threat of the growing and aggressive Communist-bloc economic power. The Congress further finds that the major problems facing such a national productivity drive are an unacceptable rate of chronic un-

employment, the underutilization of production facilities, a too frequent incidence of recessions, and the inadequacy of means for resolving labor-management disputes resulting in the loss of production vital to the national economy. The Congress declares that efforts to achieve success in a national productivity drive will be advanced through the acceleration of automation, the elimination of featherbedding in both management and labor, the reduction of absenteeism, the establishment of better procedures to avoid national emergency work stoppages, and the promotion of higher morale, which can best be achieved through cooperative action among labor, management, farmers, voluntary organizations, consumers, and all levels of government, while preserving the traditional areas of responsibility and interest of each. The Congress also declares that it is the responsibility of the United States under present international conditions to require the most effective mobilization and the maximum utilization of all elements of the Nation's productive forces.

PEACE PRODUCTION BOARD

Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch an independent agency to be known as the "Peace Production Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of twenty-five members as follows:

(1) The Vice President of the United States, who shall be the Chairman of the Board;

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury; the Attorney General; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(3) Four members who shall be representative of management in large and small businesses (as defined by the Small Business Administration) in manufacturing and service industries (including transportation);

(4) Four members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(5) Two members who shall be representative of management in extractive and agricultural industries;

(6) Two members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(7) Two members who are recognized experts in labor-management relations, at least one of whom shall be from the academic field; and

(8) Three members shall be representative of the general public, and who shall be selected without regard to any interest or connection they may have with any of the foregoing areas.

(b) Members of the Board referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall be appointed by the President for terms of six years, except that of the members first appointed six shall be appointed for terms of two years, six shall be appointed for terms of four years, and six shall be appointed for terms of six years. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments, except that a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of such term.

(c) The Board shall meet at least four times each year at such times as it shall determine or at the call of the President. A quorum shall consist of thirteen members.

(d) Members of the Board referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per diem while performing services for the Board, and while away from their homes in connection with attendance at meetings of the Board shall be entitled to transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence

at the rate prescribed by, or established pursuant to, section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2).

(e) The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Executive Director of the Board. The Executive Director shall be the principal executive officer of the Board and shall be paid compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum. The Board is authorized to appoint, in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations, and fix the compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such other officers and employees as may be necessary.

(f) With the consent of the heads of other departments and agencies of the Government, the Board is authorized to utilize the personnel, services, and facilities of such departments and agencies in carrying out its functions under this Act. Such departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Board to the greatest extent practicable for such purpose.

(g) The Board shall transmit to the President and to the Congress an annual report of its activities under this Act.

OBJECTIVES OF BOARD

Sec. 4. It shall be the objective of the Board—

(1) to enlist the cooperation of labor, management, and State and local governments, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, toward the implementation of the national policy declared in the Employment Act of 1946 to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment activities, including self-employment, for those willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power";

(2) to promote peaceful labor-management relations;

(3) to promote free and responsible collective bargaining;

(4) to promote sound wage and price policies;

(5) to promote a climate of cooperation and understanding between labor and management and the community, and the recognition by labor and management of the public interest in harmonious labor-management relations;

(6) to promote the maintenance and improvement of worker morale and to enlist community interest in increasing productivity and reducing waste and absenteeism;

(7) to promote the more effective use of labor and management personnel in the interest of increased productivity;

(8) to stimulate programs through which the social and economic problems of individual workers and of management personnel adversely affected by automation or other technological change or the relocation of industries may be ameliorated; and

(9) to promote policies designed to insure that American products are competitive in world markets.

FUNCTIONS OF BOARD

Sec. 5. (a) In order to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4, the Board shall encourage and assist in the organization of labor-management-public boards and similar groups designed to further such objectives, on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis, and to provide assistance to such groups, as well as existing groups organized for similar purposes, in attaining such objectives. Such assistance shall include—

(1) aid in the development of apprenticeship, training, and other programs for employee and management education for development of greater and more diversified skills;

(2) aid in the formulation of programs designed to reduce waste and absenteeism;

(3) aid in the revision of building codes, zoning regulations, and other local ordinances and laws, in order to keep them continuously responsive to changing economic conditions;

(4) aid in planning for the provision of adequate transportation for the labor force and the promotion of employee safety and health;

(5) the encouragement of attendance by members of such groups at courses in industrial relations at institutions of higher education, and the fostering of close cooperation between such groups and such institutions for the purpose of developing such courses and for other purposes;

(6) the encouragement of studies of techniques and programs similar to those in paragraphs (1) to (5) of this subsection, as they are applied in foreign countries;

(7) aid in the development and initiation of production incentive programs;

(8) the dissemination of technical information and other material to publicize its work and objectives; and

(9) the dissemination of information and analyses concerning the economic opportunities and outlook in various regions and communities, and of information on industrial techniques designed for the increase of productivity.

(b) The Board is authorized to make recommendations to the President regarding legislation for price, wage, commodity, and materiel control, and commodity and materiel allocation, authorized to be exercised during periods of emergency, as it may deem necessary from time to time.

(c) The Board shall perform such other functions, consistent with the foregoing, as it determines to be appropriate and necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4.

POWERS OF BOARD

Sec. 6. (a) The Board shall carry out the functions referred to in section 5 through—

(1) the utilization of the services and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and of such other governmental agencies, private groups, and professional experts as it deems necessary;

(2) the coordination of such services and facilities in order to supply technical and administrative assistance to labor-management-public groups designed to further the objectives set forth in section 4;

(3) grants to groups or individuals for financing up to 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out any project or program, including the setting up of local, regional, or industrywide labor-management-public boards, in furtherance of the objectives of the Board, but financial assistance shall not be provided under this paragraph in connection with any one project or program for a period in excess of three years, and not more than a total of \$----- shall be expended in any year for such purposes; and

(4) establishment of regional or industrywide advisory committees to advise the Board on ways and means to best fulfill its functions and to convene regional and industrywide conferences to formulate ideas and programs for the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in section 4.

(b) The Board may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs which it deems desirable or for its general activities.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

STUDY OF FEASIBILITY OF DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN LAKES ON MISSOURI RIVER FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize an immediate study under the direction of the Chief of Engineers to determine whether modification is warranted in the case of the project for improvement of the Missouri River to provide for construction of impervious levees to preserve the Oxbow Lakes at Winnebago and Snyder Bends for recreational purposes; also to authorize such construction if determined to be justified by the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. President, one of these lakes has already been formed as a result of the change in the Missouri River channel by the Corps of Engineers and the other will be formed by a further change which is scheduled for completion early in 1962. Immediate action is indicated if these lakes are to be protected from silting and if costs of the necessary construction are to be kept minimal. Recreational resources in this area are few and far between, and preliminary surveys by the Corps of Engineers and the Iowa Conservation Commission indicate the feasibility and desirability of this construction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2206) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to study the feasibility of development of lakes at Winnebago and Snyder Bends, on the Missouri River, for recreational purposes and to conduct the necessary construction therefor, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, JAVITS, LONG of Hawaii, NEUBERGER, SCOTT, and WILEY, I submit an amendment to the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges. I ask that the amendment be printed, under the rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to identify myself with the amendment my colleague is submitting to continue the alien orphans program. It is among friends. The program has now expired by lapse of time, but I hope very much that Senators will interest themselves in the program and get behind it.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with respect to the alien orphans program, my understanding is that the program can go forward administratively so that it will not be too badly impaired. I made some inquiry, for, as the Senator knows, I did make a statement and did submit a bill for that purpose only, but discovered that it would be opposed in the House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We can discuss the program a little later.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators KEATING and KUCHEL, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 2084, the bill to make major revisions in Federal-State unemployment compensation programs and in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. This amendment would permit coverage of nonprofit organizations' employees on a reimbursed cost basis, if a participating State wishes to establish such a program. At the present time, the States have a choice only between coverage based upon a payroll tax or no coverage at all, since a State's entire program becomes ineligible if it extends coverage without imposing a payroll tax, except in the case of municipal employers. The result has been that employees of nonprofit organizations have been denied unemployment compensation coverage in many States because a payroll tax imposes costs which are prohibitive for nonprofit organizations.

The State of New York first suggested these provisions, which I have also introduced as S. 499. In addition, the State of California has expressed deep concern with the problem, and its legislature has enacted a program which is contingent upon the enactment of Federal legislation such as the amendment which I am now proposing. I understand that the California bill is now before the Governor of that State, who is expected to sign it in the near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 34, following line 5, insert the following:

"MODIFIED CONDITIONS FOR COVERAGE OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS"

"SEC. 211. Section 3303(c) of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(9) Person—

"The term 'person' shall not include any organization, service for which is excepted

from employment under paragraph (8) of section 3306(c)."

On page 34, line 6, strike out "SEC. 211" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 212".

TEMPORARY REDUCTION OF EXEMPTION FROM DUTY ENJOYED BY RETURNING RESIDENTS—AMENDMENT

VISITORS' GIFT LIMITATION

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for printing an amendment to H.R. 6611, the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning U.S. residents.

This amendment is similar to S. 1280, which I had introduced previously, and to an amendment to H.R. 6611 which I had proposed to the Finance Committee. It differs from these only in that it incorporates two technical amendments recommended by the Treasury Department, which serve to clarify further the purposes of the bill.

The amendment would increase the amount of gifts which foreign visitors to the United States could bring in without payment of duty, in order to equalize the new provisions for returning residents and visitors to this country. Clearly, in considering H.R. 6611, dealing with U.S. tourist imports, we should at the same time act to eliminate the related problem of imports by foreign visitors.

This legislation was first proposed by the Randall Commission, which was established as the result of an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1957 which I proposed and which made a number of recommendations for the improvement of tourism in the United States. Many of its recommendations have already received favorable congressional action.

I was pleased to note that the reports of the Treasury and State Departments on this legislation were favorable, and that the Department of State indicated that enactment of these provisions would remove a source of irritation to visitors to this country and would strengthen present efforts to encourage tourism to the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph 1798(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201, par. 1798(b)), is amended by renumbering subdivisions (2) and (3) as (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting after subdivision (1) the following new subdivision:

"(2) Not exceeding \$100 in value of articles (including not more than one wine gallon of alcoholic beverages and not more than one hundred cigars) accompanying such person to be disposed of by him as bona fide gifts, if such person has not claimed an exemption under this subdivision (2) within the six months immediately preceding his arrival and he intends to remain in the United States for not less than 72 hours;".

(b) Paragraph 1798(g) of such Act, as amended (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201, par. 1798(g)), is amended by striking out "subdivision (2) of subparagraph (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subdivision (3) of subparagraph (b)".

(c) Subdivision (2)(B) of section 321(a) of such Act, as amended (19 U.S.C., sec. 1321), is amended by inserting "(b)(2) or" after "paragraph 1798".

(d) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply with respect to persons arriving in the United States on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Interior Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 698, a bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians, and that the bill be appropriately referred.

In the past this legislation has been before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 698) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPACT—REFERENCE OF JOINT RESOLUTION

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate Judiciary Committee concludes action on House Joint Resolution 225, to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact and to enter such compact on behalf of the United States and for related purposes, that the joint resolution be referred to the Senate Interior Committee for consideration.

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

EXTENSION OF SALINE WATER PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on June 27, 1961, I introduced S. 2156, to expand and extend the saline water program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior. Since the printing of the bill, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] has advised me that he wishes to join in the sponsorship of this legislation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the bill is reprinted that the name of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] be added as cosponsor.

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

TRADE CHALLENGES FROM ABROAD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 29, 1961, the name of

MR. CASE of South Dakota, was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2176) to provide for the inclusion of certain producers and growers of raw materials as interested parties in escape clause proceedings under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, to make mandatory the recommendations of the U.S. Tariff Commission in such proceedings, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and other Senators) on June 29, 1961.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14, SALUTING "UNCLE SAM" WILSON OF TROY, N.Y., AS THE PROGENITOR OF AMERICA'S NATIONAL SYMBOL OF "UNCLE SAM"—COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 11, 1961, at 2:30 p.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, saluting "Uncle Sam" Wilson of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's national symbol of "Uncle Sam."

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself, as chairman.

Mr. President, I am informed that a very substantial delegation from New York will be in attendance at the hearing. It is only for that reason that I now ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the session of the Senate on Tuesday next, the subcommittee may be permitted to meet.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS TO BE CONDUCTED JULY 25 ON S. 1747

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on several occasions I have advised the Senate of the economic straits in which the U.S. lead-zinc industry finds itself because of excessive imports. The price of these two metals today, and for the past several months, is 11 and 11½ cents per pound, respectively.

This industry has followed the Trade Agreements Act in seeking relief from the volume of imports which have depressed its market prices. On three different occasions, beginning in 1955, it appeared before the Tariff Commission and presented its case to prove its contention, namely that imports greatly in excess of our requirements were destroying that industry. On each of these occasions the Tariff Commission found with the petitioners, namely that the

lead-zinc industry was being substantially injured by too great a volume of imports.

The Tariff Commission recommended action to the then President who declined to accept these recommendations which included increased duties on imports. Instead, a stockpile program was inaugurated, and barter of surplus agricultural products for foreign-held lead and zinc was established. These policies were at best temporary palliatives.

When, in 1957, the stockpile program was abandoned and lead and zinc were removed from the list of items eligible for barter, the lead-zinc markets, which had improved while these programs were in operation, immediately plummeted. Imports in greater volume than ever before poured into this country.

In an effort to aid this industry, which I consider vital to our security and national economy, I introduced, as you know, S. 1747, a bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States. This bill, among other things, would provide an increase in duty on lead-zinc imports. There has been much discussion and delay concerning the plight of the lead-zinc industry and little action. In an effort to change inaction to action, I wish to announce that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will hold a hearing July 25 on S. 1747. The hearing will be conducted in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m., by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels, which is chaired by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] who is a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the very able chairman of the Senate Interior Committee. Also, I want to say to him and to the Senate here today that I am looking forward to presiding over the hearings called for July 25, and I shall await with much anticipation the testimony of the officials of the Department of the Interior on this perplexing problem which has, up to now, eluded favorable solution.

As Senator ANDERSON has stated, these hearings will seek to change inaction to action. Let me trace this failure on the part of the executive branch to support a plan which would permit the lead and zinc industry to escape from the strangulation caused by excessive imports.

Senator ANDERSON has already referred to the repeated attempts to seek reasonable relief from excessive imports through the machinery provided for in the Trade Agreements Act. This machinery has failed the industry because the former President declined to accept the Tariff Commission's recommendations for reducing import quotas on four separate occasions.

My colleagues on the Senate Interior Committee and I have become convinced that the only road to assistance for the lead and zinc industry is legislative action.

In January of this year, the chairman of the House Interior Committee introduced a bill, H.R. 3416, which encompasses the concept of a subsidy to be

paid to domestic producers, to be derived from a fund made up of revenue from an increased duty to be imposed on foreign imports. A companion bill was introduced in the Senate in April by Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee. This bill is S. 1747. I joined with him in sponsoring this bill, as did Senators BENNETT, METCALF, and MOSS.

On March 9 and 16 the House Interior Committee held hearings on the overall problems facing the domestic mining industry. It was not considered appropriate at that time to hold hearings specifically on H.R. 3416 or H.R. 84, a bill to provide subsidies for the small producers, because the Department of the Interior had not submitted a departmental report on these bills. Pertinent and earnest testimony was received from representatives of all aspects of the lead and zinc industry attesting to the serious plight of the industry.

On May 4 and 5 the Senate Interior Committee held similar exploratory hearings and again heard representatives of the entire industry describe the hopelessness of the situation. As of that time, the executive branch still had not furnished the requested reports on this proposed legislation.

In response to entreaties from the two committees and spokesmen for the industry, the administration promised to formulate a policy on domestic mining. The first part of June was given as the target date for announcing this policy.

On June 16, although no official word had been received by the committees, the House Interior Committee announced that public hearings would be held on H.R. 84, introduced by that stalwart champion of domestic mining, Congressman EDMONDSON of Oklahoma. This bill is limited to assistance to the small, independent producer, but it was hoped that the occasion of this hearing would bring forth from the administration some hint, at least, of what policy would be established with respect to mining. Unfortunately, the invited officials from the Department of the Interior did not appear to testify. The Department officials explained that they had not had sufficient time to formulate the promised policy.

Mr. President, about this time the Interior Department offered a new proposal for stockpiling lead and zinc and for financing the purchase of the metals for stockpiling by selling surplus farm products to foreign countries. This proposal was first revealed in an informal meeting held in the White House. Unfortunately, the Senate Interior Committee was not officially represented at this meeting. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert an Associated Press account of the administration's surprise proposal.

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

[From the Denver Post, June 24, 1961]
JFK PROPOSES STOCKPILE PLAN FOR LEAD, ZINC

WASHINGTON, June 24.—The United States soon may begin stockpiling lead and zinc in a move to wipe out the price-depressing sur-

plus hurting the domestic lead and zinc industry.

A White House spokesman proposed this Friday among several plans to relieve the depressed mining industry.

Myer Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel for the President, told Members of Congress from nine mining States the White House is considering a plan to use dollars obtained from foreign sale of American farm surpluses to purchase domestic lead and zinc.

Representative ED EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said Feldman stressed the Federal purchase plan as a means of disposing of some \$60 million worth of lead and zinc now in the hands of producers and smelters. This is equivalent to about 1 year's production.

Other proposals under consideration include permitting a higher silver price, which would help lead and zinc mines indirectly, setting up a task force to draft a redevelopment program for depressed mining areas, and a continuing study of the industry and its problems to search for other solutions to the ailments of lead-zinc producers.

DOLLARS FOR FOOD

EDMONDSON noted that under the proposed plan the Government would have to get dollars in exchange for foodstuffs sent abroad, in order to pay cash to the domestic mines.

This, he said, might involve lowering the price at which farm products are sold abroad, to induce the foreign purchasers to pay in dollars instead of their own currencies.

The net effect in the United States, EDMONDSON said, would be to stockpile metal instead of farm commodities—with a substantial saving in warehousing costs.

He said the group of lawmakers would "think about it," and indicated that industry opinion was divided on whether this or some other plan should be adopted.

An administration official emphasized that the scheme was "highly tentative."

Also tentative, administration sources said, was a second proposal offered for these lawmakers' consideration—permitting a rise in the price of silver. This would help the lead and zinc mining firms indirectly, since silver normally is found in formations containing lead, zinc, and some other metals.

A third proposal was that a task force be set up to study the depressed mining areas with a view to launching a redevelopment program under the newly adopted law providing Federal grants and loans to areas of chronic unemployment.

The fourth suggestion was that a continuing study of the industry and its problems be undertaken, to search for other solutions to the ailments of the lead-zinc producer.

EDMONDSON said Feldman was of the opinion that the lead-zinc purchase program could be undertaken without new legislation, but that some of the Congress Members disagreed.

PRICE ESTIMATE ASKED

"We asked the White House to prepare a memorandum on the proposed plan and on the estimated prices it would expect to pay on the domestic metals," EDMONDSON said.

"That is important, because if the plan does not operate to raise domestic prices, it won't help the domestic industry at all."

Some Members of the congressional group also proposed higher tariffs on foreign metals entering the country, quota limitations on imports, and various types of subsidies, EDMONDSON said.

In addition to EDMONDSON, the delegation which visited the White House included Representatives WALTER BARING, Democrat, of Nevada; HOWARD BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee; JOSEPH MONToya, Democrat, of New Mexico; WALTER L. McVEY, Republican, of Kansas; ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana; GRACIE PFOST, Democrat, of Idaho;

RALPH HARDING, Democrat, of Idaho; VERNON W. THOMSON, Republican, of Wisconsin; RICHARD ICHORD, Democrat, of Missouri. Standins for several Senators were on hand, including spokesmen for A. S. (MIKE) MURONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma; LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana; ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma; HOWARD CANNON, Democrat, of Nevada; ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada; ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, Republican, of Kansas; and FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas.

Mr. CARROLL. With due respect to the good intentions of the administration planners, the stockpiling proposal encountered immediate opposition from the industry. At this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert a news story from the New York Times, dated July 2, 1961, which describes the industry's reaction.

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

U.S. BID REBUFFED BY LEAD-ZINC MEN—MINING INDUSTRY TURNS DOWN STOCKPILING PROPOSAL

(By Peter Bart)

For many years now, domestic miners of lead and zinc have complained bitterly that they have not been able to find enough customers. Yet last week they angrily rebuffed what could have been their biggest customer of all—the Federal Government.

This action may seem perplexing, but then the entire history of the lead and zinc mining industry in this country has been a puzzling affair. For over the last half century when American industry was prospering and expanding, the business of digging these two key metals out of the ground has slowly but steadily deteriorated. Profits have diminished, markets dried up, and imports have mounted ominously.

The solution to these problems advanced by the mining interests was eminently predictable: Increased aid and protection from the Government. The specific form that this aid would take, however, has been a source of continuing controversy and debate.

Last week, the latest chapter in this debate was opened when the White House announced it was considering a new plan to relieve the lead and zinc mining companies. According to Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel for President Kennedy, the plan involved the purchase of domestic lead and zinc, using dollars obtained from the foreign sale of U.S. farm surpluses.

STOCKPILE WOULD GROW

The metal purchased under this arrangement would be added to the Government's supplemental stockpile of metals—a stockpile that, like other Government stockpiles, already is bulging with lead and zinc. But by buying the metal, the Government would hope to reduce near-record stocks of lead and zinc that now are burdening the mining companies and depressing prices.

In addition, Mr. Feldman said, the administration was studying the possibility of freeing silver from its pegged price of 90½ cents an ounce. Since silver is normally found in formations containing lead and zinc, higher silver prices also would aid lead and zinc miners.

Some industries might have snapped up a proposal by the Government that it buy about \$65 million worth of excess stocks. But not the lead and zinc mining companies. By week's end, they had made it quite clear that they wanted no part of the Government's plan.

The industry fired off a telegram to the White House that termed the plan a temporary palliative. The telegram sent on behalf of the industry by the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, said: "Your proposal is

basically the same program tried in 1954 to 1957 with disastrous results. It does not consider the basic problem—reduction of excessive imports." The mining officials, and their Congressmen, let it be known that they were holding out for a higher tariff—in effect, for a doubling or tripling of present tariffs on imports of lead and zinc.

The mining men contend that in the 1954-57 period, when the Government last stockpiled metal, stocks in the hands of producers were reduced and prices improved. But imports continued at a high level. And the moment stockpiling ceased, the industry collapsed once again.

VIEW OF MINING MEN

The mining companies argue that the ailments afflicting their industry are too severe to be treated with a short-term program of Government aid. They note that employment in lead and zinc mining has plunged from 25,000 in 1952 to about 9,000 at present. In the last 5 years alone, the number of lead and zinc mines in operation has dropped from 670 to slightly more than 200. Production of lead fell last year to 244,000 tons, compared with 352,000 tons 5 years earlier and 681,000 in the peak year of 1926. Last year's was the lowest level of output since 1899.

While U.S. mines were having their problems, imports also were trailing off. But domestic miners nonetheless believe that every ton of lead and zinc brought into this country from abroad represents an unfair invasion of their domain.

In 1960, when domestic lead output was 243,000 tons, imports amounted to about 350,000 tons. Domestic zinc output came to 820,000 tons in 1960 while imports were 571,000 tons.

TARIFF RISE SOUGHT

To combat these imports, domestic mining companies want to raise the tariff on lead and zinc to 2 cents a pound (the present tariff is 1½ cents on lead and seven-eighths cent on zinc). If the price on either metal were to go below 13½ cents a pound, the tariff would be lifted by another 2 cents. The price of lead now is 11 cents a pound, while that of zinc is 11½ cents.

Proposals for higher tariffs have met with little enthusiasm from officials of the Kennedy administration, who are concerned with the potential impact of higher tariffs on producer countries. The main nations involved are Australia, Canada, Peru, and Mexico, and their reaction to a tariff increase would be stormy indeed.

Thus, administration officials find themselves caught between a powerful domestic pressure group on the one hand and important principles of foreign policy on the other. How they will resolve this dilemma is unknown at present. But it is clear that their initial effort at compromise has not been a success. As one mining official said: "Someone let the air out of that trial balloon before it even got off the ground."

Mr. CARROLL. Within a few days after this proposal was announced, my staff talked to the President's deputy special counsel by telephone. During the discussion of the industry's opposition to the proposal, my staff was advised that the administration intended to withdraw the proposal.

I would like to insert in the RECORD an article by Freeman Bishop in the July 6 issue of the American Metal Market, the leading daily newspaper of the metal industries. This article appears under the provocative headline "Are U.S. Mines Sacrificial Goats?" and it is illustrative of the growing concern on the part of the domestic producers.

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

ARE U.S. MINES SACRIFICIAL GOATS?

(By Freeman Bishop)

WASHINGTON.—Is domestic minerals and metals production being sacrificed to encourage production of the same metals in foreign nations for import into the United States? This is a question many Members of Congress are pondering this week.

Sponsors of lead-zinc legislation were among those expressing the most concern over the Kennedy administration's failure to indorse any kind of legislation to aid domestic producers.

This alarm from many areas of the Congress was stimulated recently by a White House conference at which a proposal was made to have the Agriculture Department take over \$65 million in lead and zinc and process a similar amount of domestic farm surpluses overseas.

Interior Subcommittee Chairman Ed Edmondson, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, told Metal Market the proposal would help to relieve lead-zinc overhang in this Nation but that the majority of the lead-zinc would come from foreign production currently in storage in the United States.

They both urged that additional action be recommended by the White House in the form of subsidy legislation for small producers to relieve depressed conditions in lead-zinc areas.

But these national legislators and many others expressed a strong fear that the administration has adopted a policy of aiding foreign production of metals without making any provision to revive the domestic minerals industry.

BARTER PROGRAM

The barter program offered by the White House is fine if incorporated into adequate legislation covering domestic production and import duty increases to bring U.S. prices into line with low-cost foreign production, Senator KERR said.

But many western Congressmen, irked by the decision in 1958 of former President Eisenhower to place only controls on lead and zinc, yesterday indicated they feared the Kennedy administration has adopted the same view.

By the same view, they mean the administration's backing will be likely for lead-zinc import duties or for lead-zinc subsidy legislation to keep the small producer in business.

Lead-zinc has been a sore subject on Capitol Hill ever since Government buying for stockpiling ran out of funds and Congress refused to appropriate more money for this purpose.

COAL IMPORTS

The National Coal Policy Conference here told a group of 18 Members of Congress this week that the coal industry had been deeply affected by unfair competition from imports of residual fuel oils since the early 1950's.

The coal spokesmen said that lead-zinc and other metals asking for protection by tariffs only now are realizing the damage being done to American industry by cheap imports.

The coal industry has had to face unfair competition from foreign imports.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this brings us up to the present date. As Senator ANDERSON has pointed out, we still do not seem to be any closer to a solution to the lead and zinc problem. The 4th of July has come and gone. The summer is half over. The time has come when the executive branch should

come forward and state its position on the legislation we have proposed. Proposed, Mr. President, after years of diligent study into the difficulties with which our domestic miners and producers are faced and the recommendations for meeting these difficulties.

If we appear to be pressing for action, the impression is an accurate one. Still, we do not wish to be unreasonable. We are aware of the conflicting interests involved in this question because of our international trade relations, and we realize that the work of the executive branch in formulating this position is not easy. For this reason, the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee has scheduled the hearings on S. 1747 for July 25. The letter notifying the Department of the Interior of these hearings and inviting Assistant Secretary John Kelly and his associates to testify was dispatched to the Department on June 29. In other words, we have set the hearings almost a month from the date of the notification, which we earnestly hope will allow the executive branch time to finish its preparations.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Sidney I. Lezak, of Oregon, to be U.S. attorney, district of Oregon, term of 4 years, vice Clarence E. Luckey;

James V. Ryan, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Pennsylvania, term of 4 years, vice William A. O'Brien;

Doyle W. Foreman, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Oklahoma, term of 4 years, vice James Y. Victor; and

Jack D. Obbink, of Nebraska, to be U.S. marshal, district of Nebraska, term of 4 years, vice William Raab.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, July 14, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the rejection by the White House of the New Haven Railroad's application for a \$5.5 million loan under the Defense Production Act will probably force the railroad into receivership.

Receivership in itself is no solution to the problems which confront the railroad, its employees, and the people it serves in four Northeastern States.

But receivership could be the first step toward a solution. It could galvanize the States and cities immediately affected, and the Federal Government, as well,

into taking the actions which will be required in order to restore sound, efficient rail service in southern New England.

Mr. President, I have suggested to the President of the United States that he call a meeting of the Governors of Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, to discuss ways in which the Federal Government can assist under the mass transportation provisions of the new Housing Act. I have also suggested that he consider ways by which the New Haven can be relieved of the 10 percent tax on passenger fares, and other steps which the Federal Government might take to equalize competition with other modes of transportation which are heavily subsidized. Heavy subsidies to its competitors on the highways and the airways have been the chief factor in bringing the New Haven to its financial knees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I sent to President Kennedy on July 5, and editorials published in the Hartford Courant, the Washington Post, the Stamford Advocate, and the New York Times, commenting on the New Haven Railroad's financial crisis.

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

JULY 5, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.:

The immediate financial crisis facing the corporation now operating the New Haven Railroad must not obscure the necessity of finding a long-range solution to the problem of restoring sound, efficient rail service in New England. More than 30,000 residents of my State are dependent upon commuter trains to travel to and from their jobs each day. It is imperative that this service be continued and improved, and that other essential railroad services to business and industry be maintained without interruption.

I respectfully suggest that you call a meeting of the Governors of the States immediately affected—Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island—for discussion of ways in which Federal Government can assist under the mass transportation provisions of the new Housing Act. As you know these provisions were taken from bill which I joined Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey in sponsoring. They make available \$25 million in grants for studies directed at finding solutions to mass transportation problems, and \$50 million in loans to public bodies for such purposes as purchases of new equipment for lease to operating companies. Since losses incurred in passenger service are a major cause of the New Haven's current difficulties, mass transportation studies aimed at solution of commuter problems in New York, Boston, and Providence areas should be initiated without delay.

I also respectfully suggest you consider ways by which the New Haven can be relieved of 10 percent tax on passenger fares and other steps Federal Government might take to equalize competition with elements heavily subsidized by said Federal Government. This heavily subsidized competition is the principal single factor that has brought the New Haven Railroad to its knees financially.

With respect I am,

PREScott BUSH,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Hartford Courant, July 5, 1961]

BANKRUPT AGAIN

If all the signs are right we may expect the New Haven Railroad to go into bankruptcy at any moment. If it doesn't, it ought to. There is little use in throwing more good loans after bad. Not that bankruptcy is to be welcomed for itself by anyone—least of all by the creditors, who now include Uncle Sam. But bankruptcy is to be welcomed as the essential prerequisite for a turn for the better. In particular bankruptcy would open the way for these two necessities: (1) A new, professional management, (2) a long-term, thoughtful plan of Government aid.

The New Haven already has in its history a model of how bankruptcy, through ruthless surgery, can nevertheless bring about a turn toward improvement. In the depression the New Haven finally went over the brink into bankruptcy, and when in 1947 after 12 years of prudent management the trustees returned the road to private management, it had been restored to self-sustaining life.

To be sure the trustees have one advantage over private management, in that they don't have to pay out profits as they go along. They can put earnings into modernization and improvement. But the great advantage of bankruptcy is that it takes decisions away from stockholders and management who are interested in what they can get out of the enterprise. Bankruptcy brings to the fore the only ones involved who have a real interest in conserving the property and rebuilding it, the first-mortgage holders.

There are those who fear that bankruptcy means that lines will be abandoned and services cut. This need not be. The last time the trustees improved maintenance—and how the New Haven needs that again today. They also bought new equipment, and made service more reliable on cleaner, more attractive trains.

The last few years we have had just the opposite of such an upward spiral. Money has been poured into the New Haven by the millions, and still it needs more. Four States have given it tax relief, and still it needs more relief. The Federal Government has guaranteed its loans, but still it needs more loans. And all the while its equipment grows more shabby, its trains dirtier and fewer. Nor has the experience in freight, supposedly a railroad's moneymaker, been more encouraging.

There is one difference in the prospective bankruptcy from the last one. That time the economic climate in which American railroads operated was such that the New Haven, after rehabilitation, could be turned loose on its own. Now the inroads of automobile, truck, and highway have been so severe that the country as a whole will have to chip in to keep its railroads going.

Anybody who has enjoyed the excellent service on the modern trains of the state railroads of France or Germany or Austria or Switzerland, will hardly fear the cliché that government should keep its hands off the railroads. Not that we want a Government-run railroad. But the economics of the times are such that we do need a national policy of Government aid in one form or another. After all, the Government helps the barges, the oceangoing ships, the trucks and buses, and the airplanes. Why should we not fear help to these carriers, but fear comparable help to the railroads? Besides, it is the only alternative there is to what the New Haven has made all too unpleasantly familiar—a losing battle with decay.

[From the Washington Post, July 5, 1961]

THE LAW OF THE MARKET

The New Haven Railroad is in deep financial trouble. The road has been kept out of bankruptcy by a series of loans made or

guaranteed by the Federal Government. It is now applying for further assistance in order to stave off disaster once more.

Failure of a major business enterprise is a grave matter. The people who ride on the New Haven, the businesses that ship by it, fear that they will be hurt by service curtailment. Investors holding its securities would be injured. Financial confidence may suffer. The Interstate Commerce Commission has pointed out that bankruptcy would not be a solution to the road's problems, because the interest savings are less than what it takes to keep it running.

Nevertheless, there is a strong case for letting the law of the market prevail. Curtailment of service is very doubtful; according to past court decisions, it would be possible only with the approval of the regular State authorities. Receivership would offer the opportunity of injecting new blood into the organization, which might permit a fresh look at the New Haven's problems. Continued Federal aid would make sense if there were assurance that it would be used to improve the road's equipment and cut its costs. But a stream of loans mainly to pay interest and payrolls means throwing good money after bad. It simply puts off the evil day when the basic problems of the New Haven must be faced by the States and cities which it serves, by the men who work for it, and by its users. It delays the contributions that States and cities realistically will have to make, the cutting of payroll and other costs that must occur, and the improvements in the road's practices that are needed to make it viable. Beyond this, solution of the New Haven's problems will require more imaginative regulation by the ICC. Receivership is no solution, but it could be the first step toward one.

The plight of the New Haven raises broader issues of transportation policy. Our States and cities have been investing enormous sums in highways and access facilities that have allowed trucks and automobiles to compete on favorable terms with railroads. These are expensive facilities, and the possible demand for them is virtually open ended. The automobile abhors a vacuum, and will rapidly fill up any space allowed for it. For a fraction of what it costs to provide for automobile and truck transport, and for a fraction of the national resources involved, the States and local authorities could contribute toward a strengthening and improvement of our railroads. Before we convert our cities into a jungle of expressways, cloverleaves, and parking lots, we should give thought to how to tie the railroads into a sensible system of local mass transportation.

[From the Stamford Advocate, July 5, 1961]

THE NEW HAVEN IS BANKRUPT

The management of the New Haven Railroad is reputedly going to ask President Kennedy to personally intervene to save the railroad from bankruptcy. It now wants another federally guaranteed loan, this time of \$5.5 million, to pay interest on bonds and to keep the road running. Since the Government has already guaranteed \$35 million in loans for our railroad there are many who believe that the limit has been reached.

The fact is that the present management of the railroad has in its whole life shown no evidence that it can run a railroad regardless of how much money it is given. The New Haven seems to have the capability of losing more than any relief available. It constantly asks for more, but its record of earnings constantly diminishes. Its fare rate is close to if not already at the point of diminishing returns. The States and communities have given up their taxing of the railroad even as a business. Government loans are certainly subsidies in fact. But despite all, the railroad loses more money and attracts few supporters.

It would now seem that everyone must recognize the fact that further loans will only postpone the date of the beginning of recovery for the New Haven. This date cannot be marked until there is a change in management. Lawyers and bankers have their place in every business structure, but every business should be run essentially by those who know the business itself. Otherwise the business will not attract public support. So a railroad succeeds best when run by railroadmen and gets into trouble when bankers or lawyers attempt to run it for other purposes than to give railroad service.

The railroad is important to this community. It cannot be allowed to disintegrate to a point from which it cannot be saved. Bankruptcy is not a pleasant cure. No firm in receivership can deliver really fine service to its customers, but the alternative to receivership is ruin and further delay of recovery.

While some dwell on the amount of taxes the New Haven has paid the State and the communities in New England in those happy days of transportation monopoly and seem to feel that now the communities owe the railroad something, it is fair to point to the other side of the coin. Those owning, running, and manipulating railroads in those dear bygone days had a very good thing indeed. Property and right-of-way transactions made many fortunes. Some railroad activities were so outrageous that today's controls became necessary.

But the past is the past. It is time for a new day. That can only begin with a receivership which recognizes the fact that the New Haven is bankrupt in more ways than financial.

[From the New York Times, July 6, 1961]
THE PLIGHT OF THE RAILROADS

The New Haven Railroad, as it is known today, seems to be in its death throes. The 89-year-old carrier appears to have gone as far as it can as an independent entity operating in the general framework of private enterprise.

It has virtually exhausted its cash resources. It has been unable to meet interest charges on its first-mortgage bonds. Its commercial creditors have refused to extend it any new loans—even with a Government guarantee. Unless the Federal Government grants a \$5,500,000 disaster loan for the railroad under provisions of the Defense Production Act, bankruptcy would appear inevitable.

To find out what's the matter with the New Haven, all one need do is to look at a map of the three New England States the railroad serves. A vast network of highways makes it possible for a truck to take most anything portable from any point on the New Haven's 1,600 miles of line to any other point in less time than it would take the New Haven to make up a train containing the same merchandise in a freight car.

The only business in substantial volume which the New Haven retains from its great days is that of hauling commuters; and commuters never did pay their way on any railroad. But the railroad used to be able to recoup losses on commuters by carrying their wives and children to and from the city—at retail prices. The private automobile has ruined that traffic.

The New Haven's plight is symptomatic of what has been happening to eastern railroads as a whole. The once mighty Pennsylvania Railroad suffered its second annual loss in its 114-year history in 1960. Another red-link year seems assured for 1961. The New York Central Railroad had a \$25 million deficit in the first 5 months this year and its management has acknowledged that it was in the red again last month and will be once again in July.

The freight revenues of the eastern roads and particularly those serving New York simply cannot any longer absorb the passenger deficits they are incurring. The New Haven's special problems have placed it in the vanguard of a number of eastern roads moving at various speeds in the same general direction.

Only a major program of aid from Federal, State, and local sources seems capable of staving off the downward plunge of the eastern railroads. Some States and local bodies have taken positive steps. Congress has recently taken an interest in the commuter problem by voting funds for equipment loans. It is imperative that more be done, either by imposing taxes on competitive forms of transportation comparable to those paid by the railroads, or by granting the railroads comparable benefits. To save the vital commuter services essential to every large city—whether New York, Boston, or Philadelphia—subsidy appears inevitable. The railroads are too important to allow to die by default.

MR. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in order that I may comment on the New Haven Railroad situation, mentioned a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for 3 minutes in addition to the 3 minutes authorized under the order which has been entered.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on June 29, 1961, I inserted in the RECORD a letter which I had written to Mr. Frank B. Ellis, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, on June 22, 1961, in which I stated that in my opinion there is no legal basis for making loans from Defense Production Act funds to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

On July 6, 1961, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization ruled that the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad could not qualify for a Defense Production Act loan, since the applicant does not propose to engage in the development of processes or the production of materials, and that no expansion is proposed, and that the application makes clear that the proposed loan would be used to pay existing obligations and maintain existing capacity. Needless to say, the ruling was eminently correct; and in view of the tremendous pressure exerted in behalf of the requested loan, I commend Mr. Ellis in limiting expenditures under the Defense Production Act to the purposes intended under the provisions of the act and for his steadfastness.

On June 29, 1961, when I made a statement on this matter to the Senate, and inserted in the RECORD the letter I had written to Mr. Ellis on June 22, 1961, and the letter which the chief counsel of the Joint Committee on Defense Production had written to me on June 29, 1961, I stated that I realized the importance of the railroads to the country, but that I did not think a \$5.5 million loan to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad was the answer.

The Joint Committee on Defense Production is sympathetic to the problems of the railroad industry and has indicated in recent annual reports that

transportation is of the highest importance in the mobilization program. It is necessary that we have an economic climate in which the railroad industry can operate on a profitable basis as an important and necessary part of our transportation system. The Association of American Railroads today estimated the net income on the Nation's class I lines at \$17 million in the first 5 months of 1961. This was said to compare with a net of \$195 million in the like period of last year, and \$234 million in the 1959 period.

I urge the Congress and the departments and agencies of the Government which have responsibilities relating to transportation to give careful consideration to the steps which must be taken to create an economic climate in which the entire railroad industry can contribute to the economic activity of this country in the future, as it has done in the past.

It is my understanding that the Interstate Commerce Commission would not be precluded from guaranteeing loans to a railroad, simply because the railroad is operating under a plan of reorganization. The Transportation Act of 1958 requires that there be a reasonable expectation of repayment of the loan, but it is my understanding that the Court can authorize a receiver to issue certificates under which the loans advanced to the receiver would be given priority.

The morning newspapers indicate that the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad plans to ask for the appointment of a receiver, under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, which was passed several years ago by the Congress, to provide a remedy in situations such as the present one. Under that section, any railroad corporation may file a petition stating that it is insolvent or unable to meet its debts as they mature, and that it desires to effect a plan of reorganization.

The judge may, upon not less than 15 days' notice published in such manner and in such newspapers as the judge may in his discretion determine—which notice so determined shall be sufficient, for cause shown, and with the approval of the Commission, in accordance with section 20a of title 49, as now or hereafter amended—authorize the trustee or trustees to issue certificates for cash, property, or other consideration approved by the judge, for such lawful purposes and upon such terms and conditions and with such security and such priority in payments over existing obligations, secured or unsecured, or receivership charges, as might in equity receivership be lawful. Where such certificates are authorized to provide funds to pay for the acquisition, assembly, or installation of safety equipment or materials related thereto, or for the purpose of reimbursing the trustee or trustees for funds so expended, the judge may direct—without limitation of his power to make such direction in the absence of this provision—that the certificates shall have such lien on the property of the debtor and shall be entitled to such priority in payments over existing obligations, secured or un-

secured, and receivership charges and present or future dues, debts, or taxes or other obligations in favor of or payable to any State or any subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, and interest or penalties, and to such parity with all or any portion of the other costs or expenses of administration or operation as in the particular case the judge may find equitable at the time of authorizing the issuance of such certificates, regardless of whether such obligations, charges, costs or expenses, dues, debts, or taxes constitute or are secured by liens on real or personal property or shall have become payable before or after the issuance of such certificates.

For the information of the Members of the Senate who have not followed this matter in the press, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of July 6, 1961, from the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to the Secretary of the Treasury, and which was released by the White House on the same date, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The White House today made public the text of the following letter from the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury:

JULY 6, 1961.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
*Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This has reference to the application of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. for a loan in the amount of \$5,500,000 under section 302 of the Defense Production Act. The application for this loan was forwarded by your Department to this Office on June 18, 1961, for a determination regarding the issuance of a certificate of essentiality as required by Executive Order No. 10480, as amended.

We referred the application in the ordinary course to the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Department of Defense for review and comment. Those comments have been received. My decision in the matter is the product of a careful examination and full consideration of the application as filed, the applicable law, the views of Government agencies conversant with the problems of rail transportation and the needs of the national defense, and of the facts surrounding the loan proposal.

Section 302 provides, in pertinent part, that in order "to expedite production and deliveries or services to aid in carrying out Government contracts for the procurement of materials or the performance of services for the national defense, the President may make provision for loans * * * to private business enterprises * * * for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials."

Since the applicant does not propose to engage in the development of processes or the production of materials, the only basis which the Congress has here provided for a loan to the applicant is that such loan be "for the expansion of capacity" to perform transportation services needed for the national defense.

The application makes clear that the proposed loan would be used to pay existing obligations and maintain existing capacity. No expansion is proposed. Whether expansion of the applicant's transportation capacity would serve the national defense is not presented for determination.

For these reasons I am unable to certify the loan as essential under the terms of the statute.

Sincerely,

FRANK B. ELLIS,
Director.

HENRY DOORLY STEPS DOWN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last year, 57 years to the day after he started newspapering with the Omaha World-Herald, Henry Doorly stepped down from all official connection with that journal.

In a farewell editorial written on July 1, 1960, he wrote:

Today, after 57 years, I am retiring from all active duty on the World-Herald. I have thoroughly enjoyed my experience with the newspaper, and only old age compels me to give it up * * * I am sorry to leave, but the time comes when it is inevitable, and I do thank the people who helped make the World-Herald such a big success, the public, the advertisers, and the employees of the paper. Best of luck to you all.

Last week, Henry Doorly bowed to the inevitable. He went on to his greater reward at the age of 81, on June 26.

CHAMPION OF FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Freedom of the press was gained after a struggle lasting for centuries. It is highly prized. It is indispensable to a self-governed republic such as ours.

To reach its fullest fruition, its freedom must be used responsibly and with restraint. To win the constant battle necessary for continued existence as an independent institution, it must render constructive, wholesome, and balanced service; not only in the fullness and reliability of its reporting and news service, but also in its viewpoint and goals as expressed editorially and in its activities.

For over a half century, Henry Doorly as the dominant force in the World-Herald adhered to these principles and translated them into practicalities.

He first associated himself with this journal at a time when its outlook and fortunes were bleak indeed. In fact, they were far in arrears.

But together with its founder, Gilbert M. Hitchcock, he worked diligently to achieve steady progress. Together they built solidly and well. Mr. Hitchcock spent most of the time between 1903 and 1923 in Washington, first as Congressman and then two terms as a U.S. Senator. Mr. Doorly stayed in Omaha to run the paper.

By the time he had stepped down from official duties, Mr. Doorly lived to see the Omaha World-Herald a dynamic, influential, outstanding force, not only in its midwestern habitat, but in the entire Nation.

In more recent years, the efficient operation of his paper came to be taken for granted. Yet it was based upon hard-headed, hard-hitting business practices which he himself tried out, proved, and insisted upon in the earlier period of its existence, and from then on.

EXAMPLES OF PROGRESSIVE ACHIEVEMENT

One of his outstanding characteristics was his progressiveness, his desire to keep up with, and even anticipate, the fast-moving technology of our age, and

the quick-shifting scene of human events.

Examples of his wide civic and humanitarian interest include:

The Soil Conservation Awards begun in 1944 which won for him personally the 1952 Distinguished Service Award of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

The fabulously successful scrap collection drives of 1942-43 which served as a model for other newspapers the Nation over, winning for the World-Herald a Pulitzer Prize for public service.

The traffic safety campaign begun in 1952, also adopted by a number of other papers, which cut auto fatalities in the Nebraska area 30 percent in the first 4 months.

The campaign to build the Children's Memorial Hospital, one of the many ways in which Mr. Dooley proved his particular interest in the welfare of children.

Establishment of the World War II Memorial Park for which his paper led a drive for funds.

A MAN OF PRINCIPLE AND CONVICTIONS

Yet he never sought or attained progressiveness at the cost of abandoning those values and beliefs which demonstrated their wisdom under the stress and test of actual experience. While this was true in all of his activities, it was especially true in his views and battles on national affairs. He called the shots objectively, submitting them first to the cold analysis of long-range value, never the expedient. In this connection, it is especially notable that the firmest of loyalties, admiration, and respect flourished without abating for many years between our colleague the senior Senator from Virginia, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, and Mr. Dooley.

The Midwest has many fine heritages. One of its most prized will be Mr. Dooley's spirit and influence which will live for a great many years into the future in the newspaper to which he dedicated his lifetime efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a number of newspaper and editorial comments on the life and departure of this great American.

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

[From the Omaha World-Herald, June 28, 1961]

HENRY DOOLEY

Within the last 2 weeks Henry Dooley was talking to one of his associates on this newspaper.

"Can you think," he said, "of something the World-Herald can do for Omaha? Omaha has been good to the World-Herald, and I think it is time that we should do something more for the city."

The question he posed was not a new one. Again and again, in the 57 years he had served this newspaper as employee and executive, Henry Dooley had asked himself and others what more the World-Herald might do for Omaha. We will not list here his contributions to his hometown. Some of them have been noted, since his death, on other pages of the World-Herald.

Henry Dooley was one of the great builders of Omaha's history.

What he did generally was done through the columns of the World-Herald. Only rarely was he personally prominent in the direction of the many movements he launched. This does not mean, however, that he was merely an idea man. Quietly, behind the scenes, he worked hard and long for all of the things he thought were good for Omaha and the Midwest.

He was never satisfied that he was doing enough, because he loved his adopted city. Though in his later years he spent long vacations elsewhere, he was often restless when away and was always happy to return.

Those who knew him well believed that Mr. Dooley's background accounted in large part for what seemed to be an uncommon love of his adopted city.

He was born on the island of Barbados, in the West Indies, of English parents. Barbados was settled originally by adventurous Englishmen, but in Mr. Dooley's youth it had developed into the typical British colonial society. It was stratified. Opportunities were limited. Young Henry Dooley found it stifling. He left it, as soon as he could, with scarcely a backward glance.

The Middle West, which when Henry Dooley arrived in 1888, still had much of the frontier about it, suited him perfectly. Here, despite a British accent which persisted faintly until the day of his death, he felt at home. This was his kind of country; these were his people. He fell in love with the Great Plains. His fervor was that of the convert. Out of profound gratitude he served it well.

With an equal sense of dedication he fought, on the national scene, for what he believed to be the good of all America. He affiliated with no party, accepted no political honors, but championed always the cause of honest, decent, responsible government. Perhaps his warmest friend and most sincere admirer, outside of the Omaha community, was the conservative Democratic Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD.

All who knew Henry Dooley will honor him as a great leader and a great builder. So particularly do his associates of the World-Herald, who were privileged to serve under him and who will continue to the utmost of their ability to serve the vital interests of Omaha, the Midwest, and America.

[From the Hastings Daily Tribune, June 28, 1961]

A LEADER IS GONE

The death of Henry Dooley, retired chairman of the board of directors of the Omaha World-Herald, removes from the scene one of the leading figures in America's newspaper industry. He had a remarkable career in his chosen field, one that will stand as a tribute to him and to the American system of free enterprise in which he so strongly believed and consistently fought for.

His life constituted a classical American success story. He began his newspaper career as a police reporter and closed it in 1960 as the chairman of the board of directors of one of the Nation's truly great newspapers. During the 57 years of his association with the World-Herald it consistently rose in stature as a newspaper of force and influence.

The late publisher, through the World-Herald and as an individual, leaves his mark on Omaha and the State. He used the force of the free press in what he believed to be the best interests of the majority and there are any number of enterprises, private, and public, that this State would not have today had it not been for the devotion that he had for his State and its people.

Nebraska, during the years, was most fortunate to have had Henry Dooley as the director of a very potent force for public good. There were those who did not, and do not agree, with one or another of the editorial

policies of the World-Herald, but never could they attack those policies because they were dishonest. The newspaper's policies reflected always the considered best judgment of the publisher, and were never based upon decisions that would lead to personal gain or self-aggrandizement.

[From the Grand Island Independent]
DYNAMIC FORCE

For a quarter of a century Henry Dooley directed the business and editorial policies of the Omaha World-Herald. Inheriting the responsibility from his late father-in-law, Senator Gilbert Hitchcock, he accepted it with zeal and enthusiasm. Under his direction the World-Herald became a dynamic force in midwestern journalism. It made many enemies, as was to be expected. But it won many friends, also.

Mr. Dooley was cast in somewhat the same mold as another great midwestern publisher, William Rockhill Nelson, of the Kansas City Star. Both men were passionate believers in the policies they established for their newspapers. Both had a terrific amount of energy. Both left their impress indelibly on the communities their papers served.

Omaha will have much to remember Henry Dooley for. The Childrens Memorial Hospital. Public power. The World War II Memorial Park. He was a soil conservation pioneer, and in 1952 won the distinguished service award of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

Henry Dooley will go down in Nebraska history as one of the most outstanding newspapermen the State has ever produced.

[From the Nebraska City News-Press]
HOSPITAL BEST

(By J. Hyde Sweet)

Probably if one could have asked him the late Henry Dooley of the Omaha World-Herald would have called Children's Memorial Hospital in his hometown the best thing he ever did in the way of public service.

Mr. Dooley as the guiding light of the World-Herald for a half century loved the memorial hospital. It was largely on his account and his newspaper that the institution was built to serve thousands of youngsters throughout Nebraska and Iowa and to become one of the most unique enterprises of its kind in the country.

Mr. Dooley was an astute, energetic, and capable newspaperman. The World-Herald, established by his father-in-law, Senator Gilbert H. Hitchcock, grew enormously under the Dooley leadership to become the outstanding journal of expression in the Missouri River Valley country. It has maintained that degree of excellence even after the Dooley guidance was discontinued except in an advisory capacity.

Nebraskans will miss Henry Dooley and so will Omaha.

[From the Omaha World-Herald July 2, 1961]
FROM NEBRASKA PRESS

LINCOLN.—I deeply regretted reading of the death of Henry Dooley.

Nebraska and the Nation have lost one of the finest newspapermen.

For many years, Henry Dooley contributed generously of his exemplary talents to newspapering and journalism.

As president of the Nebraska Press Association I speak for our 250 members in expressing our deep sorrow in the loss of one of the finest publishers the State of Nebraska has ever known.

A. H. HENNINGSEN.

A GREAT MAN GONE

LINCOLN.—Nebraska newspapering has lost a great man. Few have done as much for

the raising of newspaper standards in Nebraska as Henry Doorly.

My sympathy is extended to his family.

VERN SCOFIELD,
General Manager,
Nebraska Press Association.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, July 3, 1961]

HENRY DOORLY

BOYS TOWN, NEBR.—Young citizens of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home were grieved to hear of the death of Henry Doorly. He was a great man, and we have deep respect and admiration for men of his caliber.

The older residents of Boys Town recall very well the encouragement and the support that this good and kind man gave to the late beloved Father Flanagan. He helped Boys Town grow. He told in his newspaper of our early struggles to survive; frequently, he would relate our many problems, and gained for us new friends and benefactors.

We shall keep him long in our memories and in our prayers.

PATRICK J. NORTON.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, June 27, 1961]

DOORLY WAS DOMINANT FORCE ON WORLD-HERALD FOR YEARS—HE STARTED IN 1903, RETIRED IN 1960

Henry Doorly, retired chairman of the board of the World-Herald Publishing Co., who died Monday night, was for many years, the dominant force in this newspaper.

An employee and executive of the World-Herald for 57 years, he made it a going institution financially.

Mr. Doorly was born in Bridgewater, Barbados, British West Indies, on November 9, 1879. His grandfather, a major in the British Army, established the family in Barbados. Mr. Doorly's father, Martin Edward Doorly, was a music teacher there. His mother, who was Katherine Isabella Carrington, was a member of a family that had lived in Barbados for generations.

SURVEYOR

Mr. Doorly, who had eight brothers and a sister, attended Harrison College in Barbados, then was apprenticed to study surveying under Walter Merivale, an engineer who was the father of Philip Merivale, the actor.

The prospects for a young man in Barbados were dim, so in 1898 Mr. Doorly, "with a smattering of civil engineering," borrowed money for passage to New York.

There he heard of a job on a ranch at Deadwood, S. Dak., and worked his way there with a Barbados friend. Only one job was open, and after one look at the ranch young Doorly told his friend, "You can have it." He went into Deadwood to ask the local surveyor for a job.

The surveyor had no job, but he said that he had heard that the Union Pacific, which was surveying for the famed Sherman Hill cutoff in Wyoming, needed men. The young surveyor went there and got a job.

Through the winter young Doorly, who had never before seen snow, lived in a converted boxcar and worked in temperatures that often were 10° to 20° below zero. In the boxcar he lived with several young Americans of about his own age. Despite his British accent, he evidently got along with them well, for he used to say in later years that this was the finest introduction to America that any young man could get.

DRAFTSMAN

The Sherman Hill job was followed by a similar one in Oklahoma. Then Mr. Doorly came to Omaha as a draftsman for the Union Pacific Railroad, and left that to be a draftsman with the Army Engineers. The pay was good and the work easy but, Mr. Doorly said, he looked at the elderly employees around him and said, "Once a draftsman, always a

draftsman." He got a job as a salesman for the M. E. Smith Wholesale Dry Goods Co. and remained there 6 months, hating every minute of it. "I just wasn't a salesman," he said later.

Mr. Doorly was the organizer of a short-lived cricket club on what is now the Field Club grounds and became acquainted with the young people of the time. One Sunday afternoon he went calling with friends at the Philip Potter home, and there met Margaret Hitchcock, daughter of the then U.S. Representative Gilbert M. Hitchcock, who was the founder and publisher of the World-Herald. Margaret Hitchcock and Henry Doorly became engaged in the spring of 1903.

REPORTER

Mr. Hitchcock suggested to his daughter's fiance that he come to work for the World-Herald. Mr. Hitchcock said frankly that the paper was not breaking even and was \$150,000 in debt. "But," he said, "we might as well sink or swim together."

"I agreed," said Mr. Doorly, "but I didn't know how close it was to sinking."

The newcomer was put on the payroll at \$17.50 a week and made police reporter. As the "Englishman" he created somewhat of a sensation in the rough-and-ready police station of that day.

"I guess I wasn't so hot as a reporter," Mr. Doorly said long afterward. At any rate, 3 months later he was made want ad manager—a job about which he knew absolutely nothing.

WANT ADS

"But if you have to do something, you do it," he said.

One of the things he did was to make an arrangement with a local candy company to supply 1-pound boxes of candy in exchange for advertising. The boxes of candy were given as premiums for want ads inserted in the World-Herald on Saturday.

The want ads came plentifully. There probably was little profit in them, for even in exchange for advertising the candy probably cost 25 to 30 cents a box. But there is an axiom in advertising—which well may go back to the young Henry Doorly—that the paper that gets the want ads will get local and national display advertising, too.

Mr. Doorly learned the want ad business so well that a few years later he wrote a book about his experiences which for years was regarded as the standard text in the field. In all the years that followed he kept an especially watchful eye on the want ad department and there was a legend that any want ad manager who could please him for a year would be welcomed by any paper in the country.

ORIGINATOR

The World-Herald, which in some years had had trouble scraping money together to meet its payroll, and had on occasion paid them in orders on advertisers, gradually gained financial stability.

After 2 years as want ad manager, Mr. Doorly was put in charge of local and national advertising as well. In 1910 he became business manager.

On the death of Senator Hitchcock, in 1934, he became publisher and president of the World Publishing Co.

Once again—though this time, of course, not altogether without preparation—he threw himself into a new task, that of learning everything possible about the news and editorial departments of the paper.

Again he learned fast and sparked ideas. He was the originator of and driving force behind many World-Herald policies, among them:

The fight for public power in Omaha, which lasted from 1939 to 1946.

The fabulously successful scrap-collection drives of 1942 and 1943, which served as a model for other newspapers the country over,

and which won for the World-Herald a Pulitzer Prize for public service.

The Soil Conservation Awards, begun in 1944, which won for Mr. Doorly personally the 1952 distinguished service award of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

The traffic safety campaign begun in 1952, also adopted by a number of other papers, which cut auto fatalities in this area 30 percent in the first 4 months.

The campaign to build the Children's Memorial Hospital, one of the many manifestations of Mr. Doorly's particular interest in the welfare of children.

Establishment of World War II Memorial Park, for which the World-Herald led a drive for funds.

Mr. Doorly explained his views on newspaper publishing thus:

"We figure we are here to look after the public's interest. Those things are the job of a newspaper, especially when you publish the only newspaper in a city the size of Omaha. I look upon myself as a trustee of the public interest."

In his role, Mr. Doorly expected no thanks.

"You can't look for popularity if you are an independent newspaper," he said, "because you are constantly stepping on some one's toes. When you are alone in the field, it is doubly difficult to please."

RETIREMENT

When Mr. Doorly announced his retirement as president in 1955, he was no doubt sincere. But for a man of his temperament, retirement was almost impossible. He became chairman of the board, and held that office until mid-1960. His interest in the paper never slackened. He was a director when he died.

Only recently, telling of his early years as want ad manager, he remarked, "I poked my nose into almost every department of the paper."

Then, chuckling guiltily, he added, "I guess I still do."

Mr. Doorly is survived by his wife, Margaret; two daughters, Mrs. W. Dale Clark and Mrs. Ben H. Cowdery of Omaha, and a son, Gilbert, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF VIRGINIA'S DECLARATION OF RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on the Fourth of July the erudite and articulate junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered a significant, timely, and appropriate Independence Day address at Shadwell, Va., the birthplace of the revered author of our immortal Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson. Devoted to the topic "The Origin and Meaning of Virginia's Declaration of Rights," it was an oration distinguished by the eloquence and scholarship characteristic of the able and respected Senator and worthy of the solemn occasion of our Nation's 185th anniversary.

The Senator traced with authority and perception the origins of our heritage of government, which derives its power from the consent of the governed and performed a notable public service in delineating the modern-day distortions which have developed in the meaning of the term "equal" as used by Mr. Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and subsequently employed in the dubiously ratified 14th amendment. His irrefutable conclusions demonstrate beyond question how the philosophy of

government on which this Nation was founded has been twisted by the Supreme Court of the United States and advocates of force legislation in the field of human relations.

This address deserves a prominent place among the historical papers of the Nation, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of it be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF VIRGINIA'S DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at Shadwell, Va., July 4, 1961)

On June 12, 1776 a Virginia Convention, assembled in Williamsburg, adopted a declaration of rights which had been prepared by a senior statesman and one of the ablest of the Revolutionary leaders, George Mason. Included in the convention that voted for the adoption of that declaration were Edmund Pendleton, Edmund Randolph, James Madison, Patrick Henry, and most of the other Virginia leaders of that period.

In a recent celebration of that historic anniversary, an English historian, Dr. Arnold J. Toynbee, said that various 20th century revolutions "display, unmistakably their origins in the parent revolution in this country" and indicated that they would have had Jefferson's approval. Commenting upon that misunderstanding of American history, the distinguished editor of the Richmond News Leader said in the leading editorial on June 13: "Jefferson was a revolutionary, but it is preposterous to suggest that his revolution of 1776, led by men of literacy, sound education and deep political tradition, in any way is to be equated with the chaos of the Congo or the new tyrannies of Castro's Cuba."

There is a widespread misunderstanding in this country of the meaning of the word "equal," that was used by Mason in the Virginia Bill of Rights and next by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and an even more widespread misunderstanding of the meaning of our representative democracy among the illiterate millions of Asia and Africa. Therefore, no place could be more fitting than the birthplace of Thomas Jefferson; no time more appropriate than the anniversary of the adoption of his immortal Declaration of Independence, to discuss the origin and meaning of Virginia's Declaration of Rights, usually referred to as Virginia's Bill of Rights.

Students of Virginia history will recall that the declaration of rights contained 16 paragraphs. Time will not permit me to quote them all, nor is that necessary for a discussion of their origin and meaning since the first 2 sections stated the essence of the form of government that members of the convention sought to establish and the other 14 were merely corollaries explaining in greater detail the fundamental principles of personal freedom and the right of self-government.

George Mason, the author of our Bill of Rights, knew the Bible, the original source of all law that recognizes human rights, the principles of democracy as enunciated by Pericles some 450 years before the birth of Christ, and the principles of natural law as enunciated by Cicero some 60 years before the birth of Christ. He also drew liberally upon established British principles of freedom commencing with the revision of the Magna Carta in 1215. Referring to the sources of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, a distinguished Virginia scholar and historian, Dr. Lyon Gardiner Tyler, son of Pres-

ident John Tyler, said in his "History of Virginia," published in 1924:

"As regard the Virginia Declaration of Rights, it not only contained all that was valuable in Magna Carta in 1215, the Petition of Rights in 1628, written by Sir Edward Coke, and the Bill of Rights in 1689, written by the great Lord Somers, but it constituted also the most complete statement of the principles of government. Thus its first and second sections expressed the idea of the democracy which lay at the bottom of the whole revolution, the first declaring 'the equal rights of all men, by nature, to freedom and independence' and their inalienable claim to the 'enjoyment of life, liberty, property, and happiness;' and the second, declaring that 'all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them.' While these sections really stated nothing that had not been tacitly recognized ever since the de-thronement of James II by people of English descent everywhere, the old form, depicting the king as 'the fountain of authority' had been kept up in all legal and political literature in England and America. Now for the first time, fact and form were brought together in official papers. Rights began with Nature, and not as concessions of the monarch, and the people, not the king, became the open and acknowledged source of authority."

Section 1 of the Virginia Declaration of Rights reads as follows:

"That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

The fundamental principles of the sacredness of human life and of the right to acquire and possess property are to be found in the Ten Commandments which God gave to Moses on Mount Sinai some 1,500 years before the birth of Christ. Moses in Deuteronomy enlarged upon those 10 fundamental principles including this instruction to the judges of the courts which he established:

"Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment, but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man."

And all students of the Bible are familiar with the frequent references in both the Old and the New Testaments to property rights—condemnation by the prophet of the illegal taking by King Ahab of Naboth's vineyard being an outstanding example.

Among exponents of freedom and equality, none had a greater influence upon Mason than the eminent English philosopher, John Locke.

Locke was the political theorist of the Martin Luther Reformation. He strongly objected to the doctrine of royal prerogatives based upon the so-called "Divine Right of Kings." Instead, Locke expounded the belief that individuals, by means of a social compact, formed a body politic, giving up their personal right to interpret and administer the law of nature in return for a guarantee that their natural rights to life, liberty, and property would be preserved. When injustices became obvious, the people might resist the civil authority. There was need of rebellion, Locke stated, whenever the government endeavored to invade the property of the subject and to make itself the "arbitrary disposer of the lives, liberties,

or fortunes of the people." This right of revolution he qualified in two ways. Force was not to be used except in the most serious cases. And only the majority could overthrow the government.

Mason also drew upon the Greek conception of equal rights when he wrote into the first section of our Bill of Rights, "All men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights . . . namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

All the members of that convention knew that the equality referred to in the Virginia Bill of Rights related to the inherent rights that were specified—life, liberty with a means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing happiness and safety. It was only 18 days after the adoption of the Virginia Bill of Rights that Jefferson presented his draft of the Declaration of Independence to the Continental Congress in Philadelphia, to members of which copies of the Virginia draft of Mason's Bill of Rights had been sent. He shortened and paraphrased the Mason statement but, in the opinion of John Adams, the Continental Congress did not intend to change its meaning. That great son of Massachusetts, Jefferson's opponent for the Presidency, but in later years his warmest friend, was on the committee selected to draft the Declaration of Independence. When his wife in Boston heard that he had signed a declaration saying, "all men are created equal," she promptly wrote him that he knew that was not true, to which Adams replied: "You don't understand what we meant. All we meant to say was that all men are born men and not some men and some whales." Years later, after observing the excesses of the French Revolution, Adams wrote John Taylor of Virginia:

"Inequalities are a part of the natural history of man. I believe that none but Helvetius will affirm, that all children are born with equal genius.

"That all men are born to equal rights is true. Every being has a right to his own, as clear, as moral, as sacred, as any other being has. This is as indubitable as a moral government in the universe. But to teach that all men are born with equal powers and faculties, to equal influence in society, to equal property and advantages through life, is as gross a fraud, as glaring an imposition on the credulity of the people, as ever was practiced . . . by the self-styled philosophers of the French Revolution. For honor's sake, Mr. Taylor, for truth and virtue's sake, let American philosophers and politicians despise it."

The action of the Supreme Court in the public school segregation cases of 1954, the multiplicity of so-called civil rights bills introduced in the Congress all testify to the current misconception of the term "equal."

In commenting on the word "equality," Hon. R. Carter Pittman, of Georgia, a distinguished constitutional authority, said:

"No one who helped to write it or who voted to adopt it ever asserted the doctrine of human equality either before or after July 4, 1776, but the Declaration of Independence, like the Constitution, has 'taken on new meaning' by the application of 'new philosophy' and 'modern authority'"—such, for instance, as the Swedish Socialist Myrdal.

The influence which Locke's philosophy had upon Mason is evident not only in the first section of the Declaration of Rights but also in the second and third sections. They are as follows:

"II

"That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them."

"III

"That Government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common Benefit, Protection, and Security, of the People, Nation, or Community; of all the various Modes and Forms of Government that is best, which is capable of producing the greatest Degree of Happiness and Safety, and is most effectually secured against the Danger of Mal-administration; and that, whenever any Government shall be found inadequate or contrary to these Purposes, Majority of the Community hath an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible Right, to reform, alter, or abolish it, in such Manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public Weal."

Although the writings of Locke and of other noteworthy men greatly influenced Mason, the Declaration of Rights was, by no means, a mere repetition of another's ideas. Admittedly, Mason was not a discoverer in a wholly unexplored field. However, according to a former Member of Congress from Fairfax County, Hon. R. Walton Moore, "No one will deny that he exhibited astonishing originality in what cannot be regarded as other than a great creative achievement."

For example, Mason was familiar with the English Bill of Rights of 1689. But that instrument was largely retrospective. The English Bill of Rights contained little or no thought of popular government, for it left the prerogatives of the Crown unimpaired and the authority of Parliament beyond any great control by the people.

The work of Mason applied the principles of freedom, equality, and the social compact to local politics and gave them a new meaning in the American application of a government, to which the people had delegated certain powers, reserving all others to themselves or to their sovereign States.

A fundamental principle of a representative democracy is contained in section 4, which reads:

"That no man, or set of men, are entitled to exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges from the community, but in consideration of public services; which, not being descendible, neither ought the offices of magistrate, legislator, or judge, to be hereditary."

Such thinking derives its origin from Pericles who in his famous "Funeral Oration" stated this principle as follows:

"If we look to the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences; if to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit, nor again does poverty bar the way, if a man is able to serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition."

Mason, like our other forefathers, had seen the numerous abuses which resulted from hereditary political offices, notably the succession of kings. These early Americans, many of whom like James Madison and Patrick Henry, were not large landowners, were determined that the elevation of anyone to a position of authority must depend not on ancestry but on merit. And who should be the judge of merit but the people themselves?

The precautions which Mason insisted upon were later incorporated by Madison in article I, section 9 of the Constitution: "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States; and no person holding any office or profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state."

I will pass over a number of the sections of the declaration which contain provisions substantially the same as the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, framed by James Madison. In fact, he succeeded in having incorporated in the Philadelphia Constitution all

of the essential provisions of government to be found in the 16 paragraphs of the Virginia Declaration.

The 14th section of the Declaration of Rights is not the work of Mason but was added by the Virginia Convention. It reads:

"That the people have a right to uniform government; and, therefore, that no government separate from, or independent of, the government of Virginia, ought to be erected or established within the limits thereof."

Apparently this section resulted from the efforts of those delegates who were concerned over the situation in Virginia's western territory. It extended to the Mississippi River, and Virginia claimed title to the Northwest Territory.

It is interesting to note the relationship between section 14 and the thinking of those delegates in the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1788 who objected to the Constitution on the ground that the Federal Government thereby created would engulf the States with a tyranny not dissimilar to that of George III. The foresight and determination of men like Mason and Madison established our Central Government as one of limited powers and emphatically affirmed this position with the 10th amendment, which provides that:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In section 15 Mason contends:

"That no free Government, or the Blessing of Liberty can be preserved to any People but by a firm Adherence to Justice, Moderation, Temperance, Frugality, and Virtue, and by Frequent Recurrence to fundamental Principles."

Here, perhaps, we find his strongest emphasis upon the principles of morality which are expressed in the Bible. And evidently Mason had the Bible in mind when he called for a "frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

Finally, 16th section declared:

"That Religion, or the Duty which we owe to our Creator, and the Manner of discharging it, can be directed only by Reason and Conviction, not by Force or Violence; and therefore, all Men are equally entitled to the free exercise of Religion, according to the Dictates of Conscience; and that it is the mutual Duty of all to practice Christian Forbearance, Love, and Charity, towards each other."

Mason's original wording had provided for "religious toleration." We owe it to the efforts of James Madison, who, at but 25 years of age, suggested that Mason's wording in the original draft should be broadened into a statement asserting freedom of conscience.

George Mason's Declaration of Rights is particularly significant because its principles, in large measure, serve as the basis for the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and its Bill of Rights, and most State constitutions.

Drawing upon the Bible, and the experience in government of civilized nations and applying those precedents to a new theory of government "of the people, for the people, and by the people," George Mason and his coworkers provided for us the priceless principles of constitutional liberty in a unique system of private enterprise. In a brief span as compared to the 900 years of the city-state of Athens, 400 years of the Roman Empire, we have become both the richest and the freest nation of the world.

All this heritage is now threatened—from without by the forces of communism, armed with nuclear weapons, and at home by those who would abandon the ancient landmarks, set by our fathers, and take us down the road to socialism. We may survive a nuclear attack. But we cannot survive, any better

than Athens and Rome, moral degeneration and the abandonment of fundamental principles. For as Daniel Webster said:

"Who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

LINEAR ELECTRON ACCELERATOR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a bill—S. 2043—to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission is now on the Senate Calendar. I have particular interest in one section of that bill and would like to take this opportunity to ask the support of my colleagues in approving an important project authorized by this legislation.

I refer, Mr. President, to the 2-mile linear electron accelerator, known as Project M. This accelerator, to be the longest ever built, was first recommended by the Stanford Physics Department in 1955. In 1958, a National Science Foundation Panel asked for favorable consideration of this proposal. In the same year, it was also approved by a Joint Panel of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission and the President's Science Advisory Committee. President Eisenhower gave the project his strong endorsement, and hearings were held before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. A refusal, last year, to grant the necessary funds for construction has thwarted progress on the effort. Now the Atomic Energy Commission again has submitted an authorization request, amounting to \$114 million for this important Stanford project. I am grateful that this year, this great undertaking has been approved by the committee, and I look forward to approval also here in the Senate and the House.

The efforts of private industry and private institutions have played a vital role in the growth of scientific knowledge. By private means, have we pioneered, initiated, and explored. Yet, the Government must also accept its responsibility. The Government must work with private effort, particularly when, as in this case, the cost of a project necessary for American security and welfare is beyond private means.

While I cannot speak with more than a layman's knowledge in behalf of the proposed linear accelerator, I can speak as an American interested in maintaining the U.S. lead in high energy nuclear physics.

It is generally conceded that our Nation leads the world in this particular field. It is also known that the Soviet Union is expending tremendous effort in order to not only catch our lead, but to surpass it. Therefore, our action on this

proposal is imperative, as it affects the continued leadership of the United States in a highly significant field. If we are to remain strong in the scientific war with the Russians, we must encourage in every way possible scientific research, education, and knowledge.

While the atom-smashing accelerator may even alter the very concept of space, it will extend the frontier of science and welfare in other fields as well. Particularly impressive to me is the remarkable progress made in the treatment of malignant disease, brought about by the construction of a medical version of the linear accelerator. Dr. Edward L. Ginzton, the director of the linear accelerator project, along with Kenneth B. Mallory and Henry S. Kaplan, related the progress in treatment of cancer in a Stanford Medical Bulletin in August 1957. According to their study, the physical advantages resulting from cancer treatment by high-speed accelerators compared with conventional X-ray treatment are substantial. To spell this out, high-energy beams make possible curative therapy for some cancers unlikely to react to ordinary treatment, greater precision and homogeneity of dosage instrumental in the treatment of deep tumors, and palliative therapy for such tumors without exacting an excessive price in terms of radiation sickness and skin destruction. Faced with the gruesome facts that 270,000 Americans will die from cancer in 1961 and 510,000 new cases will be reported, we must grasp every scientific opportunity that will thwart the growth of such dread diseases.

The medical version of the accelerator is also at Stanford. In this regard, I would like to comment on Stanford University as the site of the new project. As we all know, the facilities at that great university are outstanding and its staff world renowned. Furthermore, no other group of scientists is so expert in the field of linear accelerators. Their experience dates back to the mid-thirties; and since the war, no fewer than 10 linear accelerators have been constructed either at Stanford or under Stanford's direction. Accelerators around the world have been influenced by the Stanford pattern or Stanford scientists.

In February, I had the privilege of touring the vast Stanford accelerator facilities with some of the leading experts in the field. I was deeply impressed; and I am sure that if all my colleagues had the opportunity to see the advancements already made, as I saw them, there would be complete and enthusiastic support for this worthwhile project to keep our country in the lead in this vital field of research.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL BEFORE THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I testified before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary last week, indicating views that are mine with re-

spect to the overdue need of reform in the electoral college system.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments I made at that time be printed in the RECORD.

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

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

(Statement by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, Thursday, June 29, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to appear before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee to discuss our electoral college system.

As we saw in November, Senator John F. Kennedy won the Presidency by the slimmest of popular vote margins—one-fifth of 1 percent—yet succeeded in winning a comfortable majority of 300 votes in the electoral college. More significantly, it would have been possible for Mr. Kennedy to have lost the election on the basis of the people's will and still be elected President.

President Kennedy's close call emphasizes the need to reexamine the method of selecting the Chief Executive, particularly the anomalous selecting body of the electoral college. Under our present system, the people of the United States still do not have the privilege of electing their President. It is done for them by representatives of the individual States.

"If," as Alexander Hamilton said of the electoral college, "the manner of it be not perfect, it is at least excellent." The best method of selecting a President had been a problem to the Founding Fathers. Several plans had been proposed and discarded; in the end, the electoral college was favored. Perhaps Mr. Hamilton was correct in the era of 1789. But in the 1960's, it is, I think, generally conceded that the electoral college is not excellent, but, to the contrary, is archaic, outmoded, and potentially mischievous.

A system of indirect choice appeared to solve the problems of Hamilton's day. Communications were poor; the country was large and sparsely settled; its citizens were uneducated; and the likelihood of such citizens knowing the candidates was slim. There were no political parties as we know them. Trust was placed with the local elector to select the best possible candidate.

However, the justification for this approach in electing a President has long passed. The times require a more realistic and accurate electoral process.

A number of alternatives to the present system is possible. One is the outright abolition of the electoral college, leaving the choice of the President to the popular vote. Another is the distribution of the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote. A third is the so-called district system, which would allocate an electoral vote to the winner of the popular plurality in a House district with the senatorial votes going to the winner of the statewide popular vote.

Reasonable arguments have been made in supporting and rejecting each of these alternatives. My own inclination is that the second proposal, the proportional system, offers the basis for the most constructive and acceptable solution. While it abolishes the anachronistic office of presidential elector, the electoral vote is retained and divided between the candidates in proportion to the popular vote.

Such a plan would, in my view, give more accurate weight to the minority vote cast in each State by eliminating the winner-take-all system now in effect.

As it now stands, literally millions of American voters—35 million this last elec-

tion—are disenfranchised because of the unit rule system. In the 1960 presidential election, in my own State of California, almost 50 percent of the voters went unaccounted for in the final analysis. With a 35,623 vote margin, out of a total of 6½ million votes cast, Vice President Nixon won California's 32 electoral votes. Contrariwise, Mr. Kennedy, in Illinois, gained 27 electoral votes with a margin of fewer than 9,000 popular votes.

Such a process only exaggerates, State by State, the margin of the victor as well as the defeat of the loser. In sum, Kennedy was able to win the election by disproportionate margin in the electoral college.

Actually, there have been more flagrant electoral distortions in history. Franklin D. Roosevelt's victory over Willkie in 1940 is such an example. While winning the election by only a 5-percent popular margin, FDR took 85 percent of the electoral vote. Abraham Lincoln walked away with one of the biggest electoral landslides in history in the election of 1864. Lincoln's electoral total was 91 percent of all those cast; however, his popular margin over his opponent, George McClellan, was only 5 percent.

This distortion will not occur under the system I favor.

Second, a proportional system prevents the danger of a presidential candidate receiving a minority of the popular vote and winning the Presidency with a majority of the electoral vote. Under our newer apportionment figures, it would be possible for a candidate to receive a plurality of a single vote in only 11 States to become President. He need not get a single vote in the remaining 39 States.

I have posed the extreme of an example. Nevertheless, aside from the 10 Presidents who did not poll a majority of the popular vote but who did win by a plurality, we have already had 3 minority Presidents. This to me, reveals the weakness of our system. In the election of 1824, the House of Representatives gave the election to John Quincy Adams, although Andrew Jackson had received both the popular and the electoral votes. In the dramatic election of 1876, Rutherford B. Hayes became President with 264,282 fewer popular votes and 1 more electoral vote. In the election of 1888, Benjamin Harrison became President with 95,713 fewer votes and 65 more electoral votes. And, as we came close to seeing it happen again, we must alter our system to keep pace with changing needs and to allow us to elect a popular, national President.

Third, a proportional system will abolish what has been called the evil of the one-party State and, by doing so, invigorate the two-party system. Under the present system, there is little incentive to vote in one-party States, as verified by voting performance. A public interest group ranked States according to the percentage of not only the registered voters but also the voting age civilians who might have voted in the 1960 presidential election.

Dramatically low on the list were four southern one-party States—South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi—where participation ranged from approximately 31 percent down to 25 percent. In close two-party States participation was appreciably higher. Illinois voters, for example, had a ranking of 76 percent, and my own State of California had over a 70-percent participation.

Faced with the unit rule, there is also little incentive for the minority party to waste precious funds and energies in a State they cannot reasonably hope to win. They prefer to concentrate their efforts on the large and pivotal States where the greatest rewards may be reaped.

Breaking down the sanctity of the electoral vote in the one-party State means that

the Republicans will be encouraged to be more active in Alabama and the Democrats more active in New Hampshire. Subsequently all citizens—not only those in pivotal areas—will have the benefit of being exposed to a national campaign and its accompanying political education. In time, a presidential candidate might be chosen from any State, not just pivotal States such as New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio.

Such prospects as these will not depreciate the basis for the adherence to the two-party system, as the critics of the proportional system contend. Indeed, I believe it is the other way around. If anything, the splinter parties now can wield tremendous power in a pivotal State if they can shift the weight of power for one of the two major parties. Reasonably, these electoral reforms should strengthen the historical foundations of a two-party system. A few electoral votes should have no greater appeal to minor parties than the scattering of a few popular votes.

Fourth, a proportional system undeniably provides the best reflection of popular desire in the framework of a Federal system that retains the States as voting units.

Any change necessitates a constitutional amendment—a long and complex process—which must be ratified by the legislatures or conventions in three-fourths of the States. If we urged complete abolition, the very idea that the smaller States would have to yield some of their constitutional equality would probably prevent its adoption. Clearly, the proportional plan, while eliminating the defects of the present system, is a compromise, and for that very reason it ought to have a better future.

Furthermore, by a revision short of abolishing the electoral vote, States would not be prone to encourage ridiculous voting laws merely for the sake of broadening the voting population. In other words, under a direct, popular vote, with the voting requirements still in the hands of the State, there would be nothing to stop a State from lowering its voting limits to an unreasonable age. The alternative would have to be Federal control of voting requirements, which is an infringement on the States.

The electoral college has been criticized for a century and a half. Yet the obsolescence remains. We can less afford a minority President in these perilous times than in any period of our history. National strength depends on the solidarity of the American people behind a President who is directly elected by a majority of the voters. It is our obligation to the American people to secure for them the democratic machinery that will insure this.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently the *Citizen-Journal*, of Columbus, Ohio, carried a column written by Mr. Henry J. Taylor, stating that in high places within our Federal Government there is a move to discredit and oust J. Edgar Hoover. I cannot believe that that move is in existence, and I therefore hope the report is not true.

I cannot believe that there are well-intentioned and loyal citizens occupying high places in our Federal Government who would seek to render ineffective the services of a man who for 37 years has been the most feared individual in America by Communists and their hirelings. To the Communists and their fellow travelers in this country J. Edgar Hoover is an arch enemy. He has fought them openly and watched them secretly in their subversive and hostile activities

toward our country. He has stopped them. They fear him.

Mr. President, it is a matter of public record that repeated times, through the leadership of Mr. Hoover, Communists and their sympathizers and their activities to overthrow our Government have been brought to light. Without question there are many similar cases that have not been made public due to the never-ceasing activities to track these people right to their den.

Mr. President, Khrushchev and his hirelings who try to infiltrate our Government, in my opinion, would shout with joy upon the dismissal of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. It would be a day of victory for them and an added incentive to pursue their trade more openly and without fear.

Manifestly, if what has been reported is true, a great service has been rendered to our country in bringing to light this alleged attempt to "get Mr. Hoover's scalp."

I cannot believe it is true. I hope it is not true.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I congratulate my colleague for the comments he has made. I look upon J. Edgar Hoover as one of the great Americans of this or any other generation. I think he represents a bulwark of strength for the security of our people. The Senate, the Congress, and the country would be shocked if any attempt were made to relieve Mr. Hoover of the magnificent public service he continues to perform.

I repeat my congratulations to my friend.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am very grateful to the Senator from California for his statement.

THE LADY AND THE "LEAHY"

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last Saturday, July 1, I had the pleasure of accompanying our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and his gracious lady for the launching of the new guided missile frigate *Leahy* at the Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine. Mrs. Mansfield christened the mighty ship, the largest ever built in the Bath yard. The occasion was auspicious and significant for several reasons.

Mrs. Mansfield, in launching the ship, displayed not only her charm and grace, but also exhibited the skill of a veteran launcher. In wielding the christening bottle, she demonstrated a swing which would have done credit to a Mickey Mantle or a Ted Williams.

The *Leahy* was the 339th hull launched by Bath Iron Works since it first began constructing vessels for the Navy in 1890. Its first contracts were for the gunboats *Machias* and *Castine*, part of the Great White Fleet sent around the world by President Theodore Roosevelt. Since that time, Bath Iron Works' vessels have represented the highest quality in Navy construction. Its destroyers have been favorites with generations of naval officers and enlisted men.

During World War II, the Bath Iron Works launched a destroyer every 17 days for 3 years. Its destroyer production totaled more than the destroyer construction of the entire Japanese Empire during the same period. The Bath Iron Works' record demonstrates a facility of incalculable value to the country in maintaining peace on the oceans of the world. It is a vital link in our defense structure. Under the leadership of President John Newell, it is a model of compact efficiency.

July 1 was a most significant day for the launching of a vessel named for Adm. William B. Leahy, the President's Chief of Staff during World War II. Admiral Leahy was a great leader in our Nation's struggle for freedom, and on the day his namesake was launched, Gen. Maxwell Taylor was appointed to a similar post with President Kennedy.

At the launching, we were treated to one of Maine's incomparably beautiful and bracing days. The Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. METCALF] and Representative INOUYE, of Hawaii, were treated to the pleasure of a brilliant summer sky on the coast of Maine. Even Representative INOUYE was impressed by the crystal clear air and the beauty of our impressive coastline.

Finally, the occasion was given special meaning by the pertinent and graceful comments of our distinguished majority leader. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's thoughtful comments on the launching of the *Leahy* be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA, AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE GUIDED MISSILE FRIGATE "LEAHY," BATH, MAINE, JULY 1, 1961

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I have brought a lady here to launch another lady. I can assure you that Mrs. Mansfield is an expert launcher. Many years ago, far from the sea, she launched me on a voyage in politics and Government. So potent was Mrs. Mansfield's effort that I think a bit of the momentum remains despite 20 years in Congress. The Congress of the United States is sometimes a stormy sea. And to Mrs. Mansfield and the influence of her launching, I give full credit for managing to stay afloat in it.

I am proud that you have chosen her to perform this task today. I am also delighted that the name which shall be given to the other lady is *Leahy* and that the time for her christening is so auspicious. It was almost 18 years ago that Admiral Leahy laid down the burdens of a unique office, that of Chief of Staff to the President which he had borne so magnificently in World War II and in the difficult years thereafter. This post went unfilled after his withdrawal in 1949. But on this particular day, this July 1, 1961, another distinguished servant of the Nation, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, is officially assuming similar burdens. May I express the fervent hope that his coming to the White House at this time will signify as much for the preservation of peace as Admiral Leahy's contribution meant to the achievement of victory in war.

Ladies and gentlemen, when we say we are here to launch a ship, we say what has been said countless times before on similar occasions. We say it with scarcely a thought of what lies in back of the sentence.

It is to that—to what lies behind a launching—that I ask you to turn your thoughts for a moment. Think first of the immense and intricate labor here in this shipyard, of the putting of plank on plank, of plate on plate. Think of the integration of skills, of heart, of brawn, and of brain, from the beginning of the architect's drawings to this moment.

And think, if you will, of the combination of these same factors which acted to produce the materials in hundreds of mines and factories, the materials which were brought to this yard in order that the ship could be assembled. How many hands, in how many cities, in how many nations have already touched this ship? How many minds have combined to bring it to this cohesion of birth?

What did it take to make just the compass by which this ship will be steered? Where does a compass begin? In a factory in Boston with a purchase order? Or does it begin—this compass—with the first stirrings of man's awareness of his difference from other life forms?

And a missile—where does a missile begin? In our decade? In our century? Or does it begin at that dim moment in the past when man first understood that 2 plus 2 equals 4?

The name that this ship will bear; it is an illustrious name. It is a name and something more for it tells of other factors, factors of our history without which this ship would have no meaning, no bearings. *Leahy* is the war with Spain. It is World War I. It is World War II. It is the conflict in Korea. It is, in short, a name and a symbol of a life dedicated—one life in the millions of lives risked for a nation and countless thousands given for it. These, too, the named and unnamed whose sacrifices have given form, substance, and survival to our Nation in conflict, lie behind this moment, this event.

What I am trying in a most inadequate way to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, is that when we launch this ship today, we set upon the seas more, far more, than an assemblage of inanimate materials. We put into the wind a repository of human civilization and of our particular part of it. We launch the essence of an endless flow of human dreams and human hopes and human achievements.

This ship is an expression of our national and our total civilized heritage, mankind's heritage. And it is this heritage which is at stake in the world today—this heritage and the opportunity for generations to come in this Nation and in all parts of the world to add to it.

It is this heritage which peace—honorable peace—will preserve. It is this heritage which war—unbridled war—can destroy.

May this ship bring peace, stability, and understanding. May the *Leahy* always carry with it—on its bow—the image, figuratively speaking, the image of the lady who will launch her and with it the confidence, the strength, and the devotion we all have for our country at all times and under all conditions.

May this ship, then, defend that peace and may it go always in peace on the oceans of the earth.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On behalf of Mrs. Mansfield I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine. I think all too often we overlook our wives, who have done so much to help us get where we are and who, in return, receive so little in the way of recognition.

It was more of an event, I believe, for me to be with Mrs. Mansfield at the Bath Iron Works when she christened the *Leahy*, than it may have been for her. I was extremely proud not only of the way she wielded the christening bottle but also of the honor accorded to her.

Speaking of the Bath Iron Works, I must say I have never seen a more compact, a more competent, a more well-run shipyard than the one at Bath, Maine. It has, as the Senator from Maine indicated, an outstanding reputation. In my opinion, the Bath Iron Works would compare favorably not only with any other shipyard in the United States but also with any other shipyard in the world. It is run by an extremely capable man in the person of Mr. John Newell, its president, and it is a credit not only to the State in which it is located but also to the Department of the Navy, and the country as a whole.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] was there, along with my distinguished colleague [Mr. METCALF] and his wife, the outstanding Representative from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and his wife, and two distinguished Representatives from Maine [Mr. TUPPER and Mr. GARLAND] and their wives. It was an occasion which will long be remembered by all of us in attendance.

In conclusion, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Maine for making his remarks, and I assure him, I thank him also, on behalf of Mrs. Mansfield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his generous comments.

OFFICIAL REGISTER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was pleased to note an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 1, 1961, urging approval of proposed legislation which I have introduced, and which I have also proposed as an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill, to restore the Civil Service Commission's authority to publish the Official Register of the United States. This vital document, which has been published since 1802, was abolished through a legislative rider to last year's appropriation for the Civil Service Commission.

I fully agree with the editorial that there is even more need now for such a publication, so that citizens may know who is making the decisions in Government which affect every one of them, and how much these officials are being paid.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

REVIVE THE REGISTER

Congress should revive the Official Register, either by separate statute or by the amendments which Senator Javits urged on the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee last week.

The publication, which contained names and salaries of Government employees in administrative and supervisory posts, was suspended last year as an economy measure. Its total cost is about \$40,000 a year.

This sort of publication was commenced in 1802 in the Jefferson administration, on the theory that the annual publication of all employees of Government might hold down the Federal payroll. Initially all employees were included but later the affected classes were cut down. Jefferson said in his first annual message:

"We may well doubt whether our organization is not too complicated, too expensive; whether offices and officers have not been multiplied unnecessarily and sometimes injuriously to the service they were meant to promote. I will cause to be laid before you an essay toward a statement of those who, under public employment of various kinds, draw money from the Treasury or from our citizens."

There is a lot more need for such a list now than there was in 1802. The best evidence of that is to be found in the very fact that the list has grown so large that, in the estimate of Congress it costs too much to print it. Its very length seems a better argument for continuing publication than for suspending it. Citizens in a democracy really ought to be able to find out easily, as they could in the Official Register, who is governing them and how much they are paid.

MR. SMITH COMES TO WASHINGTON

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that today Mr. Smith comes to Washington. I refer to Mr. William T. Smith, of Big Flats, N.Y., who has received wide attention recently because of the rather dramatic way in which he has chosen to demonstrate the illogic and foolishness of the new feed-grains program. Mr. Smith, as many will recall, bought an automobile with money which the Government paid him not to grow corn under this program.

Mr. Smith has admitted that he hopes to make taxpayers angry in the knowledge that they have contributed to his purchase of a \$6,000 car. He will very likely achieve his desired result. If the mail which I receive is any indication, he has already done so.

Mr. Smith with his wife and family are in Washington today, and I have taken this opportunity to honor them at a luncheon in the Old Supreme Court Chambers.

Mr. President, I am frankly disturbed by the new departures being advocated in the way of proposed agricultural policies. Above all, the Congress has been requested to give up its powers to make decisions about farm policy and turn them over to the Secretary of Agriculture. We are being asked to substitute a farm czar for the Congress.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the relevant committees of both the Senate and the House will turn thumbs down on the omnibus farm bill. It is my sincere belief that new and better farm programs are needed to provide farmers with the opportunity to stand up for themselves, and to make decisions for themselves. This is no easy task, but it is certainly a responsibility of the Congress, and it is not one which we should abdicate to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Smith's action certainly illustrates the difficulties that are bound to be encountered when the Government accepts the full responsibility for a sector of our economy. The new feed-grains program is another illustration of the principle of prosperity by subsidy. Unless Farmer Smith and those like him challenge this program, we will soon be on the road to the complete federalization of agriculture.

Americans have traditionally been rewarded for what they create rather than for what they fail to create. Idleness—in the form of either idle hands or idle land—has always been considered a vice to shun rather than a virtue to cultivate. Once the Government assumes the full responsibility for the welfare of a given group and a given industry, then it soon becomes responsible for everyone who buys from people in this industry, sells to them, or has some function related to the activity involved. For example, because the Government now pays people not to grow corn, I received a strong letter from a manufacturer of silos who says that if we do not grow corn, then we will not need silos to store the corn that we do not have but for which the Government is paying anyway, so why does not the Government also pay for the silos which are not being used for the corn which is not being grown? There is no end to this.

Mr. President, I fully believe that Congress is ready and willing to make the hard decisions necessary to develop a realistic and equitable farm program. The American people want us to do this. One of the reasons that Mr. Smith's actions have been so widely heralded is that he has found a unique way to express the feelings of many citizens that in a free economy, the role of the Government must be carefully and assiduously evaluated and circumscribed if freedom of action is to be preserved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York in paying respects to Mr. Smith, of New York. Mr. Smith is to be congratulated on what he has done to call the attention of the American people to the absurdity of the Kennedy feed-grain program. Certainly the principle of paying farmers for not growing a commodity, such as is being done under the feed-grain program, cannot be defended. Mr. Smith has done an excellent job in calling attention to this absurdity.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Political No Man's Land," published in the *Wall Street Journal*, be printed in the *Record* at this point, as a part of my remarks. This editorial calls attention to the confusion which exists because of the lack of leadership of the executive branch of the Government.

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

POLITICAL NO MAN'S LAND

Almost everyone, it seems, is dissatisfied in one way or another with the Kennedy administration. Even its best friends are saying it is floundering like a fish on a beach. What is the trouble anyway?

A number of explanations readily occur for the confusion and curious out-of-control atmosphere in Washington—an atmosphere so palpable in regard to Cuba, Laos, the mishmash of domestic programs, the haphazard running of the White House, the inept handling of the press, and just about everything else of either major or minor significance.

One reason commonly heard is that the President is still working into his unenviable job; his supporters are hopeful about this on-the-job training, figuring he has the capacity to learn and is learning. Another explanation is that he has been the victim of uncommonly bad advice, which seems plain enough. A related view is that, whatever the first appearances, the quality of many of the advisers he brought to Washington is not very high. Still another is that Mr. Kennedy and his colleagues are temperamentally prone to speak more firmly than they are willing to act, which unquestionably does make for confusion.

There is, we suspect, a good deal of truth in all of this, and yet, take it all in all, it does not seem to be the whole of the trouble. For what it is worth, we sense an additional difficulty: In a deep and philosophical sense, this administration does not know what it is doing or what it wants for America.

To be sure, administration spokesmen talk a lot about national purpose, national goals and the need for citizens' sacrifices for the national interest. And the administration does have broad goals, the same ones as would any other administration—a just peace in the world, concern for the commonweal at home. But all that is much too general to define a clear political philosophy.

In the present climate of American politics, two philosophies are possible. One is the traditional, constitutional concept of government: That the individual prospers best, materially and spiritually, when least hampered by government, and that government should do only what the people cannot do by themselves. However much this approach may be abused in political practice, it at least provides clear principles which can be applied in specific cases and specific choices.

The second philosophy is the doctrine of the big government solution: The answer to all problems and the foundation of all hopes lies in the expansion of the Federal Government. This, too, can be a self-consistent philosophy, leading logically to socialism if not totalitarianism.

The Kennedy administration has so far shown little use for the first and leans strongly to the second. Yet the administration is not prepared—nor would it be a politically realistic decision—to apply the doctrine of the Federal solution fully and consistently and logically. Thus, it finds itself in a foggy area somewhere in between the two, with no compass for direction and no dependable guide for the hard choices that have to be made.

This makes more difficult the conduct of foreign affairs, difficult enough at best. For example, while the administration cannot yet be called soft on communism, it is very soft on socialism abroad, an attitude which is no help in fighting communism. In general, uncertainty as to one's own ideological stand complicates the countering of a determined and politically committed foe.

In domestic matters, how can such an administration draw any lines, set up any priorities among the myriad competing special-interest claims? Without a political philosophy, it has no logic with which to resist any. It tries to satisfy all but succeeds in satisfying none.

Even without a clear direction, there is a financial yardstick to determine how much is enough and how much is too much, but the administration won't use it. Instead of insisting that the Government spend no

more than it has left after meeting the requirements of defense, this administration says categorically that budget deficits are inevitable and appropriate and that living within income is totally unacceptable. This being said, there is no measure for setting priorities or, indeed, for saying "no" to anything.

It is no wonder the upshot of all this is to bewilder the Nation and the world. We say that not merely in criticism of the President, for many circumstances and many associates are conspiring to make his job tougher than it need be, and he is entitled to sympathy on that account.

Still, it is up to him to pull his administration out of its intellectual fog, and we hope he can. Until he does, the administration will give the impression of floundering because it is in fact floundering in a political no man's land.

THE NEW FRONTIER TROIKA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a troika, as we know, is a Russian vehicle drawn by three animals. It now looks as if the New Frontier has a troika of its own.

Orville Freeman has said that food and the disposition of surplus farm products to feed the hungry abroad must be integrated "to meet the demands of foreign policy."

The President told the same audience on June 27 in Washington that food for peace "is not an element of the cold war—not an arm of the foreign policy of the United States."

The redoubtable Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] stated to the same audience that surplus food donations should be placed on a repayable dollar loan basis and substituted for part of our foreign aid policy.

So we can take our choice. It seems, however, that one horse pulling the troika is headed north, one south, and one east.

Or if one would like his directions stated differently, one horse moves right, one left and one up—or down.

Here is a chance for some real farm slogans—"Food to the Right." "Food to the Left." "Food." Farmers should like this.

First, we will send one batch of food with the special blessing of Orville labeled "Food for Peace." The next batch we can send with the President's blessing and label it "For the Hungry." The third batch we can send under the imprimatur of Senator ELLENDER and label it "Food for Cash."

It is wonderful.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to comment on the remarks of the Senator from New York concerning Mr. Smith. I believe all Americans should hold Mr. Smith in great admiration. I shall relate very briefly a similar occurrence in my own home State. A taxpayer undertook to point out the stupidity of the Agricultural Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 3 minutes of the Senator from Illinois have expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I will speak on my own time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The gentleman to whom I refer had 4,500 acres in cotton planted in one county. He did not plant a crop the next year, so the Government paid him out of the soil bank for not planting. He went into another county and planted 4,500 acres of cotton outside the allotment. Before he reached that point he had received \$205,000 from the soil bank for not planting cotton in one county. He was fined \$905,000 for planting 4,500 acres of cotton in another county. But by the time he sold the cotton, he had made a quarter of a million dollars, and he decided that the Agricultural Act was stupid, but also it provided opportunities of making money.

I join the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] in paying my respect to Mr. Smith. I believe that the Mr. Smiths of America, whom I have often called the forgotten Americans, will rise up more and more in indignation at the spending by the New Frontier.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Chicago Tribune published an editorial under the caption "Corn and Cadillacs." I hope others do not catch on, because if they do, we shall have corn and Cadillacs all over the place, and we shall be farther from base than ever before.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then Chevrolet will ask for equal time.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S VISIT TO THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, David Lawrence, writing in the Evening Star of July 6, said:

Of all the roving ambassadors who have gone abroad, none has produced so profound and useful impression in behalf of the United States as has Gen. Douglas MacArthur this week in the Philippines.

This is understandable for there is universal acceptance of men who are right and who are strong, and at the same time wise and kind. The general is such a man, and I suggest that wherever he might travel his reception would be the same as that given him in the Philippines. He is what the world has always expected of Americans. He typifies the man of faith in his God, his country, and himself. He stands erect because of pride. He has never been one to weaken in the face of the enemy. Had his advice been heeded, the world today would be more peaceful, for the mainland of China would be controlled by free people and not enslaved by Communists. If the purpose of roving ambassadors is to be accomplished, I suggest that we send more men like General MacArthur on such missions so that the world can see that we still have determination and courage and faith.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "MacArthur's Sentimental Journey," by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star issue

of July 6, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MACARTHUR'S SENTIMENTAL JOURNEY—MOST USEFUL IMPRESSION IN BEHALF OF UNITED STATES CREATED BY HIS VISIT TO THE PHILIPPINES

(By David Lawrence)

Of all the roving ambassadors who have gone abroad, none has produced so profound and useful an impression in behalf of the United States as has Gen. Douglas MacArthur this week in the Philippines.

"A sentimental journey" is what the retired commander of America's Armed Forces in the Far East during World War II called his trip on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of Philippine independence. The outpouring of millions of emotion-filled citizens of the Philippines proved that the ties between the two countries are stronger than ever. This was a tribute to America as well as to its "old soldier."

The example to the world is a significant one. For it was the United States which, over a period of years, helped to educate and train a whole generation of leaders for the new republic. No better illustration of how to deal with colonialism could be given in the modern world. It contrasts with the failure of various European nations to train their colonies in Africa for self-government. What a travesty on fairplay that the United States, which liberated first Cuba and then the Philippines, should still be chastised as imperialistic by certain orators and organs in Latin America.

General MacArthur's trip, therefore, is a timely reminder of the record of the United States, which sacrificed the lives of many of its soldiers to secure the freedom of both the Philippines and Cuba following the Spanish-American War in 1898.

General MacArthur's wise counsel and careful handling of the American occupation of Japan helped, moreover, to contribute to the setting up of a democratic government in Japan. It is too bad that his record was marred by the arbitrary recall from his entire command which he experienced at the hands of President Truman in 1951. Whatever differences there were about military policy in the Korean area, history will render the judgment that it might have been better to limit the recall of the general to the Korean command and not to have subjected him to the humiliation of a withdrawal also from Japan, where he had made such a remarkable success in the postwar period. Certainly, some way to prevent the tragedy that surrounded the event could have been found. But, unhappily, impulsive men in the White House make mistakes which they live to regret someday, though they do not always concede that they erred.

General MacArthur symbolizes today the heroism of millions of Americans who fought in two wars in the Far East—8,000 miles from home. The wars in that region have proved that the United States will defend its interests in any quarter of the globe and that it will not follow concepts of isolationism. Indeed, the Spanish-American War also proved even six decades ago that American forces would go as far away as the Philippines to tackle an enemy.

General MacArthur's visit to the Philippines is not official. He doesn't represent the U.S. Government there, although the journey has an official blessing and facilities of transportation were made available to him by our Government.

So far as the people of the Philippines are concerned, they saw again the man whose father had served as a general in the U.S. Army in the days when the Philippines were liberated from Spain. The people saw also

this week the same man who was in command of American and Philippine forces in 1941, when Japanese bombers drove them out. He pledged then, "I shall return." His words echoed around the world, even as the story of his spectacular escape on a submarine was being reported. He came back at the head of a victorious army in 1945, as his troops, aided by America's naval and air forces in the Far East, made the return possible.

General MacArthur is 81 years old and doubts that he will ever see the Philippines again. But the record of an American soldier who stood up bravely under the most discouraging circumstances and steadfastly promised to rescue the people of the Philippines will live long in the memory of all peoples in the Far East. It is a record of Americanism, of courage, of kindness toward the citizens of the Philippines, and of wisdom in administering the delicate task of a military occupation of Japan.

It is always easy to speak of what might have been. Had General MacArthur's advice been followed by President Truman with respect to the bombing of the Red Chinese bases in 1950, the Communists might never have gotten North Korea, and a telling blow might have been struck against Communist aggression in the Far East. The saddest words of tongue or pen are, indeed, "It might have been."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article on General MacArthur, written by Lyle Wilson, and published today in the Washington Daily News, be printed in the RECORD.

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

"MAC" HASN'T FADED AWAY

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The man to alert the American people to the deadly truth of our times is General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

The deadly truth is that the United States may be in a war over Berlin by midwinter. President Kennedy is under pressure to alert Americans to this shocking situation. The President equally is under pressure to convince the Soviet Union that the United States has the will to fight for West Berlin.

It is no reflection on the President of the United States to speculate that the Communists' Mr. K might hear better if he were listening to Douglas MacArthur. Nor is it any reflection to believe that, given the proper sounding board, General MacArthur could command in the United States and throughout the world as great and attentive an audience as any man.

If the President has come to the hard decision that there shall be no appeasement on West Berlin, who could better state it and calculate the consequences than General MacArthur. He is the man widely acclaimed as the most articulate soldier and greatest military leader of our times. His business was war and, more especially, victorious war.

General MacArthur is not the man to whom should be given a blank check on which to draft national policy on his own. If General MacArthur's ideas on West Berlin and global strategy matched the policies of the Kennedy administration, however, the General would be capable of stating the whole in words which could boom and echo around the world.

General MacArthur is 81 years old. He is controversial, vain and arrogant, a sentimentalist who speaks sometimes in the language of purest corn. To all the World War brass here and abroad surviving, however, Douglas MacArthur most perfectly symbolizes, save only Sir Winston Churchill, his country's indomitable, triumphant will to

win. These old soldiers have not died nor faded away.

Perhaps the President and General MacArthur could have a meeting of minds on West Berlin and what after that. If so, maybe the leaders of Congress could arrange a repeat appearance for the General before a joint session for a statement of American policies and aims.

All of this, of course, is most unlikely. Harry S. Truman would be mortally offended if General MacArthur were recalled to the national stage. Surely, President Kennedy would not want to offend HST. Or, would he?

There are alternatives by which the President could alert the American people and convince Khrushchev. He could do it himself. The complaint arising, however, is that he has not done it. There could be an instant general mobilization. One mobilization begets another, however, and another until, as in July-August 1914, mobilizations begot an unwanted war.

Or perhaps there is some other U.S. citizen best fitted to sound the alarm. The hard job awaits—seeks—the man.

INDEPENDENCE DAY

MR. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on Tuesday, Americans celebrated Independence Day, even though many of them did not fully appreciate the significance of the anniversary. On July 4 an editorial written by James Brown and published in the Idaho Statesman sounded a timely and eloquent warning to Americans who are rapidly losing much of their independence by virtue of the concentration of Government in the National Capital. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the RECORD at this point.

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

INDEPENDENCE DAY

Back in 1776 it started with the Declaration of Independence. And for many years it was celebrated in every village and city in the Nation. Independence Day, it was called, the day commemorating the establishment of the great freedoms that have made this Nation tops in the world.

Plenty of freedom is left, of course. There is the freedom of religion, which is a great national treasure. There is freedom of speech which survives despite an occasional throwing of tomatoes and rotten eggs. There is freedom of the press which is our privilege.

Individuals are free to come and go wherever they choose as long as they have the long green, and even that isn't too essential in these days of freedom of credit. A man's home is his castle even if he has a 30-year mortgage and a stubborn lawn. Everyone has an automobile; some persons have two or three of them, and the Nation has created a highway massacre situation that kills more people than an ordinary war. Individuals are free to work or be idle just as they are free to overeat or starve.

Great times, these.

So great perhaps, that the value of independence has been forgotten as we live in the lap of luxury and credit and, compared to 1776, idleness.

Little concern to Americans is the fact that independence is a rapidly shrinking privilege all around the world. Nations have fallen under cruel dictatorships, individual privileges have been taken away, the right to worship as peoples of many nations once chose is a thing of the past. In many parts of the world the spirit of 1776 has been buried under the iron heel of dictators.

Americans gradually are losing their independence but they seem unconcerned. They accept regulation from Government that the founders of the Declaration of Independence never intended, and certainly never imagined. Under the sublime feeling of comfort and little annoyance, the people of this Nation have concern only for the moment and for their pleasure.

Government, originally intended not to regulate any more than was necessary, now is the dominant factor in the American way of life. Regulations have developed from Government-created emergencies which control the individual and his property from the cradle to the grave. In turn for this seizure of the rights under the original independence, the Government pays doles and the slumbering American surrenders his birthright.

How far along the road to complete surrender of independence has this Nation traveled? How many even consider the fact that Government in this country has assumed new power over the individual and his former rights? Very few, we think, and that is a regrettable conclusion.

Presently in Washington, with the general approval of the Nation, the program is to seize more of the individual's independence that comes to him from his labors and transpose it into Government largess. Do-gooders, from the President on down in Government, are dedicated in an all-out effort to take from the people of this Nation the independence that they have earned from their skills and their effort. Many Socialist schemes are in our way of Government now, and more of them appear to be not too far around the corner. Day by day Americans come more and more under the Government yoke. So skillfully has the transposition from former independent government been planned and handled, so definitely is the program to discredit and abandon our American traditions that it seems almost amazing that the intelligence of this Nation does not demand the same vigorous action that created Independence Day in that year of 1776. We certainly could use a revival of that spirit and we should get at the business of demanding it before it is too late.

In 1776, Government was new. People could not pay it much tribute for the simple reason that they had nothing with which to pay. And for more than 150 years, our Government was contained within the original concept and purpose.

Came then a depression and the opportunity for the great planners. After 30 years, the trend is evident. Give it another 30 years and independence granted the individual will be forgotten and dependence of the individual on the Government will be the way of life. The great forfeit will be the determination of the predepression American to make his own way of life to accept, instead, the way of socialism.

All around this city and this State and this Nation there are millions of intelligent Americans who are breezing along with the breeze, ignoring their destiny. Now they live it up. They have enough left after they pay the big bite against their independence that they find no alarm. Most unfortunate, they are irritated at any mention of where we might be going. Their concern is where we are now.

Yet around this same Nation there are other millions who have started to generate concern over the restrictions to their independence. They are not quite in the Minuteman status but they are developing. It is the eventual collision that will come from this growing concern over the loss of full independence and the acceptance of the inevitable disaster of too much government that the end effect of the spirit of 1776 will come to test. Whether we have gone too far down the wrong road, and whether

we can ever get started back to the principles of Independence Day is the issue.

Other nations, grown careless, have collapsed and today live in memories of their traditions. Too late, they learned their lesson. It is not too late for this Nation to awaken but it is getting near that time. The revival of Independence Day could be of even more significance than 1776. The question is whether a sufficient number of the people of the Nation either understand or care.

NUCLEAR TESTING

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, among the most interesting and heartening developments of the last few weeks has been the evergrowing demand from a number of my colleagues in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle for an end to the so-called agreement with Communist Russia whereby we forgo all types of nuclear and atomic weapons tests.

As far back as February 1958, on the floor of the Senate, I warned against a ban on such testing until a hard-boiled and practical inspection system was established. It is difficult enough to enter into a technical agreement with a friendly country. It is pure folly to expect the Communists to observe a ban based upon honor and good faith.

As Dr. Edward Teller put it: Since that ban went into effect almost 3 years ago, we have been sure of only one thing, and that is that the United States has not engaged in any testing.

In the meantime, we have the familiar marathon negotiations at Geneva threatening to break all records, with the show going on even though the negotiators change, even though administrations change.

If it is said that nothing has been accomplished, that it has been an exercise in futility, I say, "No." Something has been accomplished—something of great and sinister importance for the future.

For almost 3 years, our experimentation and testing has been at a standstill—one might say that all sorts of ideas and projects which needed to be tested and proved have piled up, until there is a fantastic backlog.

But, underground nuclear explosions cannot be detected, and one might also say that for all we know all sorts of ideas and projects in Communist Russia have in fact been tested, that important breakthroughs in weapons development have been made.

From the viewpoint of Communist Russia, therefore, something has been gained by the Geneva test ban. For us the negotiations have been futile, but not for them.

I ask you to note the sequence of these two reports:

On January 14, 1960, in a speech to the Communist Central Committee, Khrushchev said:

Though the weapons we have now are formidable weapons indeed, the weapon we have today in the hatching stage is even more perfect and more formidable. The weapon which is being developed and is, as they say, in the portfolio of our scientists and designers, is a fantastic weapon.

According to a July 1, 1961, North American Newspaper Alliance report

from Bonn, Germany, Khrushchev at the Vienna meeting with President Kennedy is said to have referred to Russia's possession of a fantastic new military weapon.

One is not being an alarmist in assuming from these statements and reports that Khrushchev may very well have been referring to the so-called neutron bomb. The Russians may have just moved a test model neutron bomb from the drawing board to the laboratory, or they may be much further along in its development. The crucial point is that under the present arrangement we have no control over their decision to develop such a bomb. There is nothing we can do either to detect or to prevent experimentation leading to the perfection of this weapon.

While the Russian Government may profess to have suspended tests, there is no way of knowing. Monitoring equipment is not sufficiently accurate at the moment to detect small tests—especially those underground. We know that it is very difficult to determine the difference between underground nuclear blasts and earthquakes and tremors—thousands of which are recorded as originating in Russia each year.

Nor is that all. There is one other result about which we are absolutely certain: The United States and the West have made most of the concessions, if you compare our stand as of 1958, or 1959, or 1960 with the present stage of agreement or disagreement. The negotiations have been an exercise in the art of compromise, but largely on our part.

After the latest British-American proposal, about which so many of us have serious reservations, the Communist answer was to propose a completely unworkable method of supervision through a three-man commission which could act only by unanimous vote.

Here is no desire for effective controls and supervision, but only to maintain the status quo. And why not, if it reaps great advantages to the Communists to insist that we observe the test ban, while at the same time dragging on with these negotiations?

The President is faced with a difficult decision, but the office of the Presidency requires him to make a decision, difficult though it is. That decision might involve the destiny of our Nation.

Much of the past concern about nuclear testing was in regard to air pollution due to radioactive fallout. There is certainly no such danger when conducting underground tests. World opinion—even among government officials of many nations—is largely uninformed on this matter. We might even contribute to world understanding if we invited qualified representatives from many nations to act as observers for the first series of proposed detection tests. As I understand it, these would be tests to develop more refined detection equipment, particularly with respect to underground explosions.

On the other hand, let us not forget that we are informed, we have the facts, and we also have the responsibility of preserving freedom throughout the world.

We quite likely have given a 3-year advantage to the Communists in this matter of weapons testing. We cannot afford to continue to give such decisive advantages to those whose avowed intention is to destroy us.

If communism triumphs, the darkness of tyranny will fall across the face of the earth.

We must have the courage to make a hard decision on behalf of freedom in our Nation and indeed the whole world.

KENNEDY TALKING LIKE NIXON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a very interesting article written by Roscoe Drummond entitled "Growth Statistics: Kennedy Talking Like Nixon."

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

[From the Washington Post, July 5, 1961]
GROWTH STATISTICS: KENNEDY TALKING LIKE NIXON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When I listened to the President of the United States the other day saying that we are outproducing the Soviets and that they won't catch up with us even by the year 2000, for one moment I thought I was at the wrong press conference, or that, perhaps, there had been a recount and the other man had taken over or that by some odd political alchemy the man who was talking was President Richard Milhous Nixon.

Don't get me wrong; I liked the spirit and substance of what was being said about the state of the economy and about the Russian gross national product moving up only 1 percent in comparison with the United States gross national product in 48 years.

But somehow during the campaign I got the impression that it was that other fellow—what's his name, Nixon?—who was almost alone in contending that the United States was running well in the race with the Soviets, and that Mr. Kennedy had persuaded a plurality of one-tenth of 1 percent of 88 million voters that things had been going so badly for so many years that if we didn't get a change of administration, the race would be over soon and we wouldn't even be on the track.

During the campaign Mr. Kennedy appeared to have two principal adversaries—Nikita Khrushchev and Richard Nixon. Now he appears to have embraced one in order to dispatch the other. Or, one could fairly say that President Kennedy has hurled Mr. Nixon—or at least his arguments—at Mr. Khrushchev and scored a bull's eye.

Only a few months ago no two persons could have been much farther apart in appraising the United States-Soviet economic race than Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon. Now Mr. Kennedy comes within 2 percentage points of agreeing precisely with Mr. Nixon—and that is an economic statistician's latitude. Mr. Nixon said Soviet production as of 1959 was only 44 percent of U.S. production. Last week the President placed it at 46 percent.

During the campaign Mr. Kennedy warned us repeatedly that "if we didn't get going again," the Soviets would be on our heels momentarily.

Not long ago Mr. Kennedy was warning that the Soviet Union was growing nearly two and one-half times as fast as the U.S. economy.

At times last year Mr. Kennedy put the pace of Soviet economic growth even higher. On February 10, 1960, he saw the Soviets growing not two and one-half times our rate, but nearly three times as fast.

There was a wide range in Mr. Kennedy's growth statistics in the campaign. In April 1960 he said: "Why should we be satisfied when the Soviet Union moves ahead 10, 11, and 12 percent, and we move ahead 1½ percent?" This statement leaves the impression that Mr. Kennedy was saying that the Soviets were moving ahead not two or three times as fast as we are, but six to eight times as fast.

At his reassuring press conference, the President put our present economic growth rate at 3½ percent, estimated that it would average 4½ percent, and thereby affirmed the same view which Mr. Nixon expounded in the campaign—that the Soviets would not catch up with the United States as far as we could see ahead.

I do not mean that it is unfair for Mr. Kennedy to seize Mr. Nixon's stance and statistics. Mr. Nixon has no monopoly on them and undoubtedly he'd be glad to help the President win any debate—kitchen or otherwise—with Mr. Khrushchev.

MEDICO

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in a world beset on many sides with fear, suspicion and antagonism, one of the truly heartwarming developments during the last few years has been the emergence of a voluntary, nonprofit organization known as Medico.

Medico, composed as it is of thoroughly dedicated people, was inspired initially by the work of the famed Dr. Albert Schweitzer and was founded by the late Dr. Thomas A. Dooley together with its present secretary general, Dr. Peter Commanduras. Its avowed purpose is to administer to those millions of afflicted individuals, particularly in the underdeveloped nations, who belong, as Dr. Schweitzer put it, to the "fellowship of those who bear the mark of pain."

We have heard much of "The Ugly American" and it may be that the epithet has been warranted on occasion. We hear too little, however, of "The Good American," which the inspired doctors, nurses, and laymen of Medico so truly represent. Theirs is a saga of selfless devotion to the ultimate goal of the medical profession, the relief of disease and suffering wherever they may be found.

Last year I had the pleasure of presiding at a luncheon in the capital of the United States in honor of the late Dr. Dooley, the young man who became a legend in his own short lifetime. In the course of his remarks at that luncheon, Dr. Dooley stated succinctly one of the fundamental purposes of Medico as being that of an instrument of international good will. He made the point that the Medico program was designed initially to help people to help themselves, and thus maintain their self-sufficiency and self-respect. The successful achievement of this objective in a relatively short period of time has been manifested dramatically by the relief of human suffering in a large number of program areas, from Kenya to Laos. However, much needs to be done and, with the full support of the American public, much more can be done.

In view of what I consider to be the vital importance of Medico, I was extremely heartened and pleased to read of a conference which was held last

week in New York City, in connection with the 110th annual meeting of the American Medical Association.

At this conference, Dr. Commanduras gave a full and descriptive report of the need for medical services which exists in many underprivileged areas of the world and offered proposals calling for more extensive cooperation on the part of the various specialist groups among the membership of the AMA. It is heartening indeed to learn that the representatives of the medical specialty societies in attendance gave full endorsement to an enlarged program of participation in Medico, and agreed to present these proposals to their several memberships for formal action.

An enlightening report of Dr. Commanduras' presentation and the enthusiastic reaction of those present, in agreeing to accelerated action, is contained in a fine article which appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, July 2, 1961, entitled "A Report on Medico," by Howard A. Rusk, M.D. In view of the significance of this report, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

A REPORT ON MEDICO: STATUS OF AID TO INTERNATIONAL HEALTH IS RANKED TOP SURVEY AT AMA PARLEY

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Amid a feast of clinical reports, scientific exhibits, motion pictures, and telecasts presented at the 110th annual meeting of the American Medical Association here in New York last week, there was one report of medical starvation and famine.

The report was given to a small group of the foremost leaders of American medicine, at a special meeting called by Medico. Medico is the voluntary, nonprofit, nonpolitical, nonsectarian organization formed in 1958 by Dr. Peter Commanduras and the late Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. Headquarters of Medico are at 420 Lexington Avenue.

Each of the medical specialty organizations, such as surgeons, radiologists, internists, pediatricians, and general practitioners, had been invited to send official representatives.

The story of the world's medical needs, as told to them by Dr. Commanduras, Medico's secretary general, was a grim one. He reported:

One-half of the people of the world, more than a billion persons, rarely if ever in their lifetime have a physician to treat their ills.

Malnutrition, vitamin deficiencies and even starvation take an annual toll of millions of children in Asia, Africa, South America, and the Caribbean.

Readily correctible clubfeet and other congenital deformities doom tens of thousands of children to go through life as cripples.

Trachoma prevention and modern ophthalmological treatment and surgery could save the sight of thousands of persons, chiefly in southeast Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa, who now face a lifetime of blindness.

Diseases that have yielded to modern medical science, such as smallpox, cholera, and malaria, still cause millions of deaths annually in these areas.

ENORMOUS, BUT NOT HOPELESS

The problem, as reported by Dr. Commanduras and other Medico officials, is enormous but it is not hopeless.

Substantial progress, particularly in public health, has been made in many nations with the help of the World Health Organization, International Cooperation Administration, and private foundations.

These programs, although of the utmost importance, only indirectly touch the lives of the world's sick, blind, and disabled. Their need is immediate and personal; their primary interest is not political or ideological.

Such words as freedom, justice, dignity, and security are meaningless to those faced with the heritage of a life of discomfort or agony.

Something tangible and definitive can be done to reduce suffering on a sufficiently broad scale to be significant. This has been demonstrated by Medico, which operates under two basic concepts:

1. To bring direct, physician-to-patient medical aid to areas where the need is greatest, treating the sick who otherwise would receive no medical attention.

2. To teach and train others to give this kind of medical assistance.

Medico's success and expansion from 1 small hospital in Laos in 1958 to 15 projects in 12 nations currently, has resulted from support from several sources.

The program is financed largely by 70,000 local supporters with annual contributions in amounts of \$10 or less.

The Nation's leading pharmaceutical, hospital, and surgical supply manufacturers have contributed drugs and equipment valued at more than \$8 million.

The American physicians who have personally participated in Medico's oversea work on a short-term basis have all been volunteers who have received no pay. Many have paid their own travel and maintenance.

A number of these physicians and surgeons were present at last Monday's meeting to tell heartwarming stories of the friendly reception they had received in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Gabon, Ghana, Malaya, Laos, Peru, Sudan, and other underdeveloped nations.

The purpose of this special meeting called by Medico was to invite formal participation by all national medical and surgical societies in the Medico program.

Under the proposal each specialty organization would be represented on the Medico board of directors and each would form a special committee to implement the Medico program objectives.

For example, if an anesthesiologist were needed for a Medico project in Sierra Leone, the committee representing the American Society of Anesthesiologists would be responsible for recruiting a volunteer.

Should the specialty organization itself approve, its members would automatically become members of Medico and would be assessed annual dues to support Medico projects.

The representatives of the specialty societies present as individuals enthusiastically and unanimously endorsed the proposal in principle and agreed to present it to their own organizations for formal action. In view of the importance of the undertaking, it is almost inconceivable that any of our major medical and surgical societies should refuse the invitation.

Another evidence of the increasing recognition of American medicine's international responsibilities came at a meeting of the U.S. Committee of the World Medical Association Wednesday. Five years ago only 30 persons attended a similar meeting. Wednesday there were more than 300 present.

All who attended the meeting urged a campaign for more members, more interest and more support from American medicine.

Today more than at any other time in our history, the leadership of our Nation is challenged. Direct, physician-to-patient services by American doctors offer a proven, effective

way by which the sick, blind, and crippled of the world may understand in a personal way the value we place on human dignity.

Of all the scientific reports, research advances, new drugs, and sociomedical recommendations coming out of the 110th annual meeting of the American Medical Association, probably the most significant and vital development was the interest shown in the physician's role in international health.

THE BERLIN POWDER KEG

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, those of us who know Bill Knowland, the former Republican leader in this body, are well aware of his capacity for stating a strong position in clear, concise terms.

I recently read an editorial from his Oakland Tribune which illustrates this fact. The editorial, entitled "The Berlin Powder Keg," correctly states:

The supply of little surrenders has been exhausted. * * * On the issue of Berlin the chips are down and the sooner 180 million Americans face up to these facts the more likely our Nation is to survive and with us a free world of freemen.

Our actions with respect to Berlin could well be the deciding factor in the efforts of freemen to win the struggle with Communist oppression. A concession to Russian threats would be disastrous.

The editorial in the Oakland Tribune by our former colleague is an outstanding commentary on this crisis, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE BERLIN POWDER KEG

Will the lights be going out in Berlin before the year 1961 passes into history on December 31?

In Washington, Moscow, Bonn, Paris, and London the implications of the Khrushchev thinly veiled ultimatum are better understood than they are away from the capital cities.

Before we hardly know it summer will pass into fall and the preparations for Christmas with its message of "Peace on earth, good will to men" will be subverted by the rulers of the Kremlin determined to force a showdown even at the calculated risk of war.

They anticipate that their will and iron nerve will outlast what they consider "the decadent West" and will result in an abject surrender by the North Atlantic powers.

Despite the Munich-minded men in our own country and among some of the allied nations there can be no surrender of the free people of Berlin without destroying the morale of freemen everywhere to resist Communist tyranny. These are the stakes Moscow is playing for and determined to win.

The supply of little surrenders has been exhausted by the stalemate in Korea, the farce at Geneva, the offer of payment of tractor blackmail to Castro and the backdown, after brave words, in Laos.

On the issue of Berlin the chips are down and the sooner 180 million Americans face up to these facts the more likely our Nation is to survive and with us a free world of freemen.

At an early date the wives and children of our combat-ready forces in the isolated garrison of Berlin should be withdrawn, for no nonresident women and children should be available as possible hostages to communism.

It will soon be time for our forces and the city of Berlin to strip for action. No nonessential personnel or nonproductive workers should be left there to be furnished food, fuel, and clothing by airlift or otherwise.

As a completely surrounded outpost of freedom neither the token forces there nor the courageous civilians of Berlin could long hold out against a massive Soviet or East German Communist effort to take the city. But neither was the Alamo, Fort Sumter, or Corregidor able to hold out against the overwhelming odds against those garrisons. The forces which won the initial struggle lost the three wars against us.

But nothing will impress Khrushchev and his Presidium more than the certain knowledge that we have determined to preserve this island of freedom, that we understand the calculated risks involved and the potential costs. We will not fire unless fired upon but if our garrison and the free city of Berlin is attacked by Communist forces, East German or Soviet, the Communists must know that we will fight with all the weapons and all of the power of a free people determined to remain free. This resolve was so clearly enunciated in the Declaration of Independence in these words:

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

"HOW TO MAKE A PORK BARREL"

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "How To Make a Pork Barrel," which appeared in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal, provides a shocking revelation of the extent to which the urban renewal program is used and abused.

The facts brought out in this revealing column make previous advocates of pork-barrel legislation look like skinflints. When, in the name of urban renewal, a town can receive as much as \$478 in Federal funds for every one of its inhabitants, we have certainly hit a new high—or perhaps the word should be "low"—in fiscal irresponsibility.

I believe this commentary should be read by every Member of this body, and I particularly commend it to those Senators who champion the cause of a multi-billion-dollar urban renewal program. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "How To Make a Pork Barrel" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOW TO MAKE A PORK BARREL

If the phrase "urban renewal" conjures up any clear image it is that of a street scene in one of our great cities, with its rows of tenements swarming with people lacking not merely room to move but air to breathe, a congestion that chokes not merely the view but the community that surrounds it.

Such, anyway, was the image that supposedly moved Congress to pass the multi-billion-dollar urban renewal program. There was little inquiry as to why the slums and congestion existed or why the cities were unwilling to renew themselves. It was sufficient that the condition was, therefore, to apply the familiar remedy of billions from Washington.

Well, the actuality has turned out to be something different, as a detailed report in this newspaper the other day revealed.

Whatever else this program may be, it isn't urban renewal.

A more accurate name today might be "the village landscaping program" or, if people were willing to be bluntly honest, the Federal pork barrel project. That old favorite of Congress, the rivers and harbors bill, just can't compare with this handy, bulging cask for dipping into.

Take just a few samples from the many reported in our recent story: The metropolis of East Granby, Conn., \$246,000 of Federal funds for its 2,434 people. Lithonia, Ga., \$102,800 for its 1,667 people. Atchison, Kans., \$1,916,800 for its 12,500 people.

Or look a little more closely at the situation in Mercedes, Tex., a town of some 10,000 people. Here was a town which, by all the evidence, really did need a new sewer system, the cost of that program being about \$234,000. In the words of the mayor, "We would never have been able to finance that by ourselves."

So what happened? In the name of "urban renewal" this small town got a Federal grant of \$1.1 million not only to fix up its sewer system but also to pave streets and build a residential housing project. And now, again in the words of the mayor, "We're able to issue \$350,000 in bonds for a new civic center without even raising the tax rate." They can now build a civic center when they were too poor to take care of their own sewage.

Or look at Wink, Tex. Here the Federal Government has allotted \$478 for every man, woman, and child of its 1,800 population. This to completely remodel the town's business district, all three blocks of it.

To labor the evidence would be needless. As one of the officials of the Urban Renewal Administration quite frankly states, "There are no limits whatever on the size a city has to be to get urban renewal grants." And apparently none, either, on the kind of project for which towns and villages can tap the Federal till. The list of things which these happy folk are building with Federal funds includes parks, playgrounds, tennis courts, and swimming pools. All good things indeed for any town. And more blessed yet when they are paid by other people's taxes.

As a pork barrel this has the wonderful advantage that there's no need for any pretense about building a dam to preserve natural resources or dredging a creek for navigation purposes; the handouts can go to lovely, little towns like Princeton, N.J., or crossroad villages, like Wink, Tex., lost in the wide-open mesquite plains. All you need is a diligent representative in Washington.

It's hardly necessary to labor the editorial comment either. As the publisher of the Wink Bulletin remarked, "You can hardly spend money like this in a little town without doing some good." Or as the Mercedes mayor put it, "This is the greatest thing that's happened to us in years."

So it is. And also the greatest thing that's happened in years to the business of building pork barrels.

BERLIN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Boston Sunday Herald, one of the outstanding newspapers in the country, outlined in a frank and hard-hitting manner the problem we face with respect to Berlin and the initial steps which should be taken to prevent a tragic misunderstanding by the Communist bloc of our intentions with respect to this strategic city.

The commentary rightfully points out:

All the words we can say about Berlin are as fragile as the Soviet pledge to honor our access routes. It is only what we do that will communicate our unalterable purpose.

I heartily agree. While we can hope for the best, we must of necessity be prepared for the worst, and I, for one, hope we will not be tardy in making these preparations.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Boston Sunday Herald be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

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

FRAGILE WORDS ON BERLIN

We cannot say enough times that we will not get out of Berlin to convince the Soviet that we will not.

We can string out one "no" after another until the processions of negatives fade into a distant repetitiveness, and Moscow will be unimpressed.

All the words we can say about Berlin are as fragile as the Soviet pledge to honor our access routes.

It is only what we do that will communicate our unalterable purpose.

The only rights that Khrushchev will respect are the rights that we are willing to fight for. And he has seen no evidence that we are any more willing to fight seriously for Berlin than we were to fight for Laos or Cuba.

There is one way, and one way only, in which we can make our determination so unmistakable that history can never record 1961 as a year in which we were tragically misunderstood by the Communist imperialism. That way is by clear preparation for a military engagement.

This will not be saber rattling. There would be no threats of nuclear weapons; indeed no threat at all, merely the quiet preparation for defending the status of West Berlin.

What these preparations should be would depend on a careful calculation of the probable challenge. Presumably stockpiling of military and civilian supplies would be indicated in West Berlin and in the West German termini of communication routes across East Germany.

Armed trucks and trains should be readied, and fighter planes stationed at suitable West German airfields. Additional transport planes could be ferried across from this country.

These would conspicuously be the weapons of an engagement strictly limited to the enforcement of our rights of access to Berlin. They would be in no way aggressive in appearance. There would be no increase in the number of troops in West Berlin (United States, 4,000; United Kingdom, 3,500, and French, 3,500).

The entire deployment would be most unexcitably carried out, and we could hope that in the process our official spokesmen might exhibit the same confident good humor that President Kennedy exhibited when he suggested that Khrushchev not plan to nail up the tiger skin of economic victory until he had captured the tiger.

In all this we shall need the understanding cooperation of our NATO allies, and this may preclude any peacemaking role for Prime Minister Macmillan. For there not only can be no compromise which prejudices our position, there can be no indication that such a compromise might be considered.

In no way can we say in words that we mean to stand firm. The calm preparation to meet the challenge head on—that is how to say what we mean to say.

CAMPAIGN OF DECEPTION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, much has been said in the past with respect to

the proposition of Red China being admitted to the United Nations and, I assume, this controversy will develop even more fully in the immediate future.

My position against the inclusion of the Peiping regime in the U.N. is well known. If anything, I feel more strongly now that to admit Communist China to this international body would be one of the most tragic mistakes of our time.

A recent editorial in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, entitled "Campaign of Deception," refers to the admission of Red China to the U.N. as "the grand betrayal." This is an outstanding editorial. Its comments about the latest report of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council are most straightforward and informative.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this fine editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Manchester Union Leader, June 24, 1961]

CAMPAIGN OF DECEPTION

The latest report of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council presents an intelligent analysis of one of the most misleading of all arguments put forth by proponents of U.N. acceptance of Red China's membership.

We're referring, of course, to the non sequitur—"We can make no real progress with disarmament unless Communist China participates." Therefore: "We can make no real progress with disarmament unless Communist China becomes a member of the United Nations."

It should be obvious that the latter inference simply does not follow from the original premise. Yet, Peiping's apologists in our own country and throughout the world have sought to confuse the whole issue by writing supposedly learned epistles based on the illogical assumption that the admission of Red China to the United Nations would in some way aid the cause of disarmament.

The truth of the matter, as the ASC report points out, is that "admission of another Communist state would make it possible for the Communist bloc to take an even more rigid and belligerent position on all disarmament matters."

Of course, if Red China did qualify for membership in the U.N., i.e., if Red China were a peace-loving nation, if Red China accepted the obligations of the U.N. Charter, and if Red China was able and willing to carry out these obligations, then, the ASC report acknowledges, "the prospects for disarmament would be greatly improved."

However, the National Strategy Committee emphasizes, "The pious hope that making Communist China a member of the U.N. would force her to bow to the pressures of world opinion and abide by both the spirit and the letter of international agreements, is hardly a sound basis for the reduction of armaments."

The assumption that Red China's presence at the Conference in Geneva of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament this August would aid the Committee in its work is unbelievably naive.

The free world, unless it chooses to close its eyes to the facts—will see the type of obstructionism Red China would employ as a member of the U.N. when the Fourteen Power Conference on Laos attempts to reach a solution to that particular problem. And the ASC report is right on target with its analysis of how Red China's participation in

this Conference "will undoubtedly be used propagandewise to emphasize the Communist line that a nation of 600 million cannot be ignored; that it is firmly established and will remain the true Government of China; and that it is prepared to work with other nations to contribute to a lessening of tensions. These themes will be played over and over again throughout the summer months, echoing from the sophisticated international Conference headquarters in Geneva throughout the capitals of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

Indeed, Peiping's inclusion at the Conference table is a calculated move to wear down the opposition of Congress and the overwhelming majority of the American people to the grand betrayal—the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

TELFORD TAYLOR AND THE CIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger of June 14, 1961. This article appeared on page 1 under the heading "Protests Mount Against Telford Taylor as CIA Boss." It was written by Edward J. Mowery under a Washington dateline.

I think the information contained in this article may be of interest to the Members of the Senate because some confusion arises with respect to individuals named "General Taylor."

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

PROJECTS MOUNT AGAINST TELFORD TAYLOR AS CIA BOSS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—The active boom for retired Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor to head the Central Intelligence Agency has caused grave concern, even consternation, on Capitol Hill.

Allen W. Dulles, 68-year-old CIA Director (since 1953), has evinced no desire to step out. But he has been held personally responsible for the abortive, CIA-directed Cuban invasion and is expected to be replaced.

Taylor, a product of Harvard Law School, a native of Schenectady, and a New York City lawyer, is known as a perennial champion of leftists, whose professional talents have aided such individuals as Harry Bridges, various Smith Act defendants, and union moguls with asserted Communist leanings.

Others mentioned for the Dulles post are Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor (who heads a committee probing CIA), Deputy Attorney General Byron R. "Whizzer" White (reputed choice of his boss, Robert F. Kennedy), and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway (favored by Gen. Douglas MacArthur).

But the ground swell for Taylor's nomination, it was learned yesterday, has reached the cloakroom discussion stage, and Taylor has reportedly been interviewed extensively for the CIA post.

Taylor supporters claim they have the sympathy of Walter W. Rostow, deputy special assistant to the President for national security affairs.

Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle coyly dodged all direct questions relating to the Taylor rumors, but they did not mask their concern.

Congress, they indicated, will take a hard, solid look at any nominee for the important CIA directorship which requires Senate confirmation via the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—who also refused to comment on Taylor rumors—characterized the CIA top post as a vital rung in safeguarding America's security.

DODD, who has served with naval intelligence, the FBI, and as vice chairman of the Nuremberg war trial review board, declared:

"This position (CIA Director) is one of the most sensitive, delicate, and important in the Federal Government. Both the President and the country must have unquestioned confidence in whomever is chosen to fill it."

"I would place this position on a level with that of the Secretary of Defense and Director of the FBI, requiring the same kind and degree of confidence as that reposed in J. Edgar Hoover."

"I personally believe that the individual (named to the CIA), his qualifications and background will come under exhaustive scrutiny by the Congress * * *."

Who is Telford Taylor, an apparent frontrunner in the scramble for the top job in the supersecret Central Intelligence Agency?

HELD MANY POSTS

Newspaper files, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, and other data disclose that Taylor (now 53) entered Government service as a young New Deal lawyer in 1933 in the Department of the Interior.

He served successively in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Attorney General's Office, and Federal Communications Commission (General Counsel) before entering the Army in 1942.

After a brief stint in military intelligence (Europe), Taylor became a staff colonel (1945) at the Nuremberg war trials and chief U.S. counsel at proceedings subsequent to the Four Power trials of principal defendants. He became a brigadier general in 1946.

ATTACKED IN SENATE

The "Nuremberg trial scandal"—alleged procedures under Taylor's direction—erupted before Presiding Judge Charles F. Wennerstrum left Germany. The judge bitterly attacked prosecution procedures.

Charges against Taylor exploded in the Senate in two stages. On May 1, 1950, Mrs. Freda Utley, a self-described former member of the British Communist Party who lived 6 years in the U.S.S.R., described Taylor as being "sympathetic" to the Soviet Union, "one of a number * * * with leftish sympathies."

Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee (p. 777 of the record), Mrs. Utley (an author) said she considered America to be the hope of the free world, "and people like [Owen] Lattimore a menace to our freedom."

MADE CHARGE IN BOOK

"Question. Did you write 'The High Cost of Vengeance' (a book about Germany) and did you refer to Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor as being sympathetic to Soviet Russia?"

"Answer. In a chapter I referred to a number of people with those kind of leftish sympathies * * * who has been placed in high position * * * and I referred to Telford Taylor. That was the general opinion of Mr. Taylor * * *."

(Representative George A. Dondero, Republican, of Michigan, had previously demanded an investigation of Nuremberg trial procedures and the "Communist clique" which had assertedly penetrated the Taylor staff.)

TRUMAN APPOINTEE

On December 18, 1950, the late Senator William Langer, Republican, of North Dakota, startled members of the Senate Judiciary Committee with this assertion:

"If the payrolls are subpoenaed * * * it will be seen that practically the entire (Nurem-

berg) staff was composed of leftists and men *** since exposed as Communists and members of Communist-front organizations."

Taylor next appeared on the Washington scene (1951) as head of the Small Defense Plants Administration (a Truman appointee), and in November 1953, the Harvard lawyer touched off a real hassle with the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy with a speech before the Cadet Corps at West Point.

BLASTED McCARTHY

Taylor called the Senate Government Operations Committee probe of espionage at the Fort Monmouth, N.J., Radar Center "a shameful abuse of congressional investigating power." And McCarthy, Taylor said, was a dangerous adventurer.

The Wisconsin Senator's quick rebuttal took the form of a bombshell.

McCarthy announced that Taylor's civil service record was "flagged" with the notation, "unresolved question of loyalty."

Civil Service Commission Chairman Philip Young told newsmen that the "flagging" meant either that a loyalty investigation was underway when Taylor left the Small Defense Plants Administration (September 18, 1952) *** or one had been made without a decision.

He assumed the "flag" would stay on Taylor's record, Young explained, unless the "Commission takes action to remove it *** the matter has never come up."

Three weeks later, McCarthy reported receiving a list of "about" 125 Reds who allegedly had infiltrated the staff of John McCloy, High [U.S.] Commissioner for Germany *** "who were brought in by McCloy, Telford Taylor, and others."

McCarthy charged that the persons were identified Communists who fled Germany, became U.S. citizens and returned to work in McCloy's office.

DEFENDED BRIDGES

Newspaper files (including those of the Daily Worker and People's Daily World) picture Telford Taylor as frequently defending accused Communists.

He has appeared as defense counsel twice to stymie Government efforts to deport Harry Bridges, and is quoted as having described Bridges' long pro-Red record as the record "of successful trade union leadership."

Taylor also has appeared for 7 Smith Act defendants in Hawaii, for 14 officers of the Communist-controlled International Mine, Mill & Smelters Union, for Junius Scales, described by the Daily Worker as a victim of the Smith Act, and for 6 U.N. workers whose dismissal stemmed from their alleged leftist views.

BOOMED AS CANDIDATE

Scales' conviction under the act's Communist Party membership clause (with a 6-year prison term) was upheld June 5 in a startling Supreme Court decision.

Taylor's rising star as the professional champion of leftists triggered one unique proposal that he be boomed for Attorney General.

Testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee concerning Communist political subversion—page 7341 of the official record—unfolds a speech by Corliss Lamont at a party sponsored by the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born.

Lamont told his enthusiastic audience that Telford Taylor should be appointed Attorney General of the United States.

This may have been a protective measure by Lamont and the notorious committee. Lamont is vice chairman of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a cited Communist front.

The ACPFB, according to the Attorney General, is "subversive and Communist."

As one lawmaker commented concerning the CIA:

"Whoever pops up as the suggested nominee for Director *** will get a hard, thorough appraisal."

ONE THOUSAND VOTES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press has added its commendations to that being heard throughout the Nation on the occasion of the 1,000th consecutive vote of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. The Press says, "In 6 years, Maine's voice not once has been neglected." I would add only that in the years that Senator SMITH has been in the Senate, neither has the national welfare ever been neglected by the senior Senator from Maine.

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

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

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 19, 1961]

HEAP OF YEAS AND NAYS

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that faithful journal of the words and deeds of our Washington lawmakers, there appear every so often the results of the voting: Yeas, so many; nays, so many; not voting, so many.

With exceptions so rare as to be almost never, the "not voting" list is a part of the RECORD, usually preceded by formal apologies for the absences, such as: "I announce that the Senator from wherever is absent on official business." Which could mean anything.

But never once, in about 6 years, has the name of MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the Senator from Maine, appeared on the "not voting" list. When the billboard test came to a vote Thursday, Mrs. SMITH answered her 1,000th consecutive rollcall.

This was such an unusual performance that the hardbitten male politicians of the Senate paused to note it with applauding oratory. Never before, in 172 years, had any Senator compiled such a consistency.

Now how a Senator votes, and how he attends to his duties otherwise, could be more important than fidelity in responding to the drone of the rollcall clerk. But this is a remarkable record, as evidenced by the fact that no other Senator ever approached it and that it was freely predicted by those lauding Mrs. SMITH that no other ever would.

In the Senate, as in other legislative bodies, there always are some who unavoidably are detained, some who deliberately duck, some who just don't get there in time to vote. For 1,000 rollcalls, vital or not, Mrs. SMITH has been in none of these categories. She was there.

And when you come right down to it, isn't that why we send Senators to Washington? To vote for us on the issues, great and small. In 6 years, Maine's voice not once has been neglected.

BACK-DOOR SPENDING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press, a highly regarded newspaper in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has endorsed the proposal by the distinguished Senator from Utah to prevent more back-door spending. The newspaper makes the point very simply, when it says:

The alternative is rampant Government debt, and quite probably further depreciation of the 47-cent dollar.

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

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

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 19, 1961]

DRAIN ON THE TREASURY

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Salt Lake City, is making a new attempt to shut the back door to the Treasury.

He is doing this in the face of an increasing number of programs sponsored by the Kennedy administration to expand this debt-making way of doing business.

Under the Constitution, taxpayer money is supposed to be spent only by specific appropriations passed by Congress. The back-door system sidesteps this constitutional mandate. Instead of making appropriations, Congress merely says to a Government agency: "We won't give you any money directly, but you go down to the Treasury and borrow it."

This eliminates congressional control on spending. The agency borrows from the Treasury and the Treasury borrows wherever it can get the money. Up goes the national debt.

Treasury Secretary Dillon has just been before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a proposal to permit the administration to take \$8,800 million through the back door of the Treasury for long-term foreign aid loans over 5 years. Mr. Dillon says this is the "most efficient and least costly" way to provide this foreign aid.

It is neither. Congress loses control. The debt increases. Inflation is stimulated.

"This is hidden spending of which people are often unaware," says Senator BENNETT. "Yet it hurts our pocketbooks, both in the form of tax drains and decreased purchasing power through inflation. It weakens control over Government spending in general. It can result in loss of confidence in our dollar at home and abroad."

Senator BENNETT has proposed a change in Senate rules which would prohibit any spending except by appropriations cleared by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

In the House a similar rule has been blocked in committee. But if the Bennett proposal is approved by the Senate the effect will be the same as if both Houses had agreed to abide by the Constitution. At least in the Senate, any spending scheme must pass muster by the Appropriations Committee and there will be an annual limitation on handouts of the taxpayers' money.

The alternative is rampant Government debt, and quite probably further depreciation of the 47-cent dollar.

TRANSITION IN AFRICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the emerging nations on the African Continent present us with an extraordinary challenge in every phase of our national American economy and policy. We have not been adequately prepared for the swift developments in Africa, and in the effort to catch up numerous problems have been created, particularly in the economic area. Some of these are discussed in an article by H. S. Cummings, Director, Africa-Near East Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD his article entitled "Facing the Power Shift in Africa," which appears in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, July 3, 1961.

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

FACING THE POWER SHIFT IN AFRICA

(An analysis of the "mutual ignorance gap" between the United States of America and the emerging African nations)

(By H. J. Cummings, Director, Africa-Near East Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce)

Every businessman in America, indeed every taxpayer in America, is being affected in some measure by the major power shift now being carried out in a large part of the continent of Africa.

The transition from European control to African control of economic activities in Africa is now underway. This transfer of economic power from London, Paris, and Brussels to some 24 newly independent areas of Africa is a matter of direct concern to Americans as well as to the peoples of the new African countries involved and to the citizens of former metropoles.

Our direct concern with this power shift is illustrated rather dramatically in the sudden change in economic relationships between the United States and the Republic of the Congo after the latter received its independence just a year ago. In the period 1955-60, U.S. exports to the Congo averaged about \$40 million a year and U.S. aid expenditures to the area during that period were nil. During the year following the power shift from Brussels to Leopoldville, the level of U.S. exports fell nearly 50 percent below the 1959 level and U.S. aid to the Republic of the Congo reached a level of about \$75 million.

POWER SHIFT COSTLY

This shift in power from Brussels to Leopoldville was sudden, disorderly, and very costly in terms of human life as well as in terms of money. Its effects in discouraging private foreign and domestic capital participation in African economic development have been felt in Africa far beyond the Congo's frontiers. African officials of countries located hundreds of miles from the nearest Congo border state frankly that their attempts to attract foreign capital and foreign technical and management assistance have been seriously hampered by events in the Congo. Experienced bankers and businessmen in nearby east Africa and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland attribute much of the capital flight from those areas in the latter part of 1960 to the failure of the power shift from Brussels to Leopoldville to take place in an orderly fashion.

This one tragic and costly breakdown in the power transfer process has served to focus attention on the nature of the problems to be faced in Africa during and following the transition period in which Africans assume responsibility for economic control of their respective countries. In order to understand these problems we must acquaint ourselves with the institutional arrangements that existed just prior to the transition period. These might be roughly and very generally summarized as follows:

Economic policy was developed in the metropole and carried out in the African territories largely by European staffs. In the private sphere international trading activities were handled by large expatriate firms. In short, the actual operation of both the public and private sectors of the economy was the responsibility of the European civil servant and the expatriate businessman. During this period the supporting institutions of both the public and private sectors were European and located in Europe. The highly developed and costly educational systems that produced civil servants, teachers, technicians, businessmen and professional men for the African areas were located in Europe and financed by Europeans.

LEADERS RECOGNIZE NEEDS

Many responsible African leaders recognize that the transfer of economic power from the metropoles to individual African countries did not carry with it the basic social and economic institutions essential to sustained and orderly economic growth. In the long run, such institutions must and will be developed in Africa. In the meantime, each African country must utilize to the fullest extent possible economic and social resources available to it from friendly non-African sources including the former metropoles.

In a few African countries aggressive programs for educating Africans abroad and for attracting foreign capital and management training to Africa are already underway. In others, such programs are still in the planning stage. In many African countries the leaders are expecting the United States to increase its share of participation in the social and economic development of Africa.

These expectations are in many cases very general and are based upon impressions gained by African leaders during comparatively brief visits to the United States. Actually, most African leaders are quite unaware of the multifariousness of this country's training resources; most Americans likewise are unaware of the wide range of specific and urgent demands African countries have for know-how, technical and management training assistance, and for foreign capital—both public and private. This mutual ignorance gap cannot be closed by merely matching comprehensive catalogs of African requirements against American availabilities but such catalogs, if produced on a periodic basis, might be useful in determining program priorities.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PRIORITIES

The problem of determining development project priorities in Africa during the coming decade may be complicated by a number of factors that can influence regional as well as national economic growth rates. Should, for example, national rivalries in Africa be carried to the point where the large hydroelectric power installation becomes the preferred status symbol of national progress, then programs for diversified development will have to be scrapped or at least placed in the bureaucratic deep freeze, pending the coronation of the national kilowatt king. Since, in many instances, national boundaries in Africa were established with little or no regard for economic and ethnic realities, some national economic development efforts will be handicapped by a paucity of natural resources and the lack of a sense of national unity.

To minimize their handicaps, Africans will have to intensify their efforts in working out regional development schemes with their neighbors. Both Africans and Americans should develop effective methods for exchanging information and ideas on matters relating to specific African development needs and to specific American means of meeting these needs.

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL HELP

Effective methods cannot be worked out without first taking into account two basic ingredients in Africa's present and future development programs: the first is that Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, will continue to be the principal source of many of Africa's development needs that must be met from outside sources; the second is that many international organizations—such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, and many of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, including the Economic Commission for Africa—will become increasingly important sources of assistance to Africa.

It might be well for everyone concerned in this matter to keep in mind that for the

foreseeable future, global development requirements will run considerably ahead of the world's capacity to meet these requirements and that Africa will find itself in competition with southeast Asia and Latin America in its attempts to obtain capital and know-how.

Against this background Africans and Americans can develop effective methods of exchanging information and ideas on specific fields for African-American cooperation in African development. The first step in developing these methods would be to look at what of value is currently being done in this field. This would include an evaluation of African as well as of United States efforts. For sake of convenience, these efforts might be classified in three general categories according to their origin and source of finances—private, public, and combined private and public. In the private field, trade and industry associations might join with foundations, schools and universities, and other nongovernment organizations in listing present programs in the field of African-American cooperation. U.S. Government agencies engaged in programs in Africa could make a similar assessment of government programs.

EFFORTS SHOULD BE EVALUATED

The primary objectives of this stocktaking would be to measure the scope of our present efforts, assess the efficiency of our existing programs, and to work with Africans on the problems of developing new areas of collaboration.

Should the above type of analysis, for example, be applied to U.S. Government commercial programs for Africa we might expect the following type of questions to be posed:

ASSESSMENT OF AMERICAN EFFORTS

Are Africans in increasing numbers being made aware of the services available to them in the commercial offices of U.S. Embassies and consulates in Africa?

Are the commercial offices of the U.S. Embassies and consulates in Africa well located, equipped with adequate commercial library facilities, and staffed by commercial officers who are well informed on matters relating to foreign trade and foreign investment?

Are American commercial officers now serving in African posts working closely with other members of their respective American missions in acquainting Africans with the availability in the United States of a wide variety of consulting and advisory service organizations that can render Africans substantial assistance in such fields as engineering, marketing, transportation, communications, management, procurement and technical training?

Are members of the American business community being kept currently informed through private and U.S. Government publications on Africa's specific development needs?

Have local chambers of commerce and other private business associations been made aware of the vital role they can play in the field of African-American economic cooperation? (Results of recent experiments in this field in the form of trade clinics conducted by the New England Chambers of Commerce and by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh demonstrate clearly the value of having Africans discuss economic problems with various sectors of the American business community.)

Similarly, the African government in making an analysis of their respective efforts in this field might wish to raise the following questions:

ASSESSMENT OF AFRICAN EFFORTS

1. What arrangements are being made by African governments and by African commerce and industry associations to bring

their specific problems of trade and investment to the attention of U.S. business firms?

2. Are African government officials and African businessmen acquainting themselves with the services available to them through the commercial offices at the nearest U.S. Embassy or consulate?

3. What efforts are African governments making in the United States to acquaint private U.S. businessmen with specific opportunities for African-American economic cooperation?

4. How many African governments are utilizing the public and private facilities available to them in the United States for the distribution of information designed to acquaint Americans with conditions in specific African countries?

These questions illustrate some of the avenues of approach to increasing the level of African-American economic cooperation. This search for more effective methods of African-American cooperation must be carried out with vigor and imagination by Africans and Americans alike. Each African country has its own special problems and its own particular social and economic goals. The establishment of economic institutions through which the desired economic goals can be reached may in some instances be seriously retarded by certain cultural rigidities peculiar to a particular country or section of country. For this and other reasons, the rate of economic development will differ widely among the nations of Africa.

It is reasonable to assume that the highest rate of economic development will take place in those countries that establish the type of economic institutions through which the country's resources can be channeled systematically into wealth-producing activities. Many African leaders know that real independence of their respective countries will be reached only after that country has developed basic institutions essential to its sustained growth. Important among these institutions will be the educational institution which will supply the national personnel requirements in the fields of government, industry, agriculture, and the professions.

America's experience in developing institutions which preserve individual human rights and, at the same time, generate a high level of economic activity, is of more than passing interest to a number of African leaders who are seeking help in developing institutions through which they can carry out bold plans for rapid economic development. In seeking help from this country, these African leaders may wish to keep in mind this country's goals in Africa as they were stated by President John F. Kennedy when he said: "We want an Africa which is made up of a community of stable and independent governments * * * where men are given the opportunity to choose their own national course free from the dictates of coercion of any other country."

FIRST ANNUAL PAUL TOBENKIN MEMORIAL AWARD PRESENTED TO BONNIE ANGELO LEVY OF NEWSDAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the first annual Paul Tobenkin Memorial Award was presented recently to Mrs. Bonnie Angelo Levy of the Washington bureau of Newsday, for a series of articles on the abandonment of public schools in Prince Edward County, Va.

This annual award was established by a group of Paul Tobenkin's friends who wished to see his dedicated crusade for civil and human rights carried forward by other reporters and newswriters after him. Paul Tobenkin was a reporter and

newswriter on the staff of the New York Herald Tribune for 25 years before his untimely death in 1959. He was noted for his inspiring reports of man's never-ending war against racial-religious bias, bigotry, and discrimination.

Mrs. Levy's perceptive on-the-scene accounts of the fight over school integration in Prince Edward County fully justify the recognition they have received. They portray the difficult struggle for equal protection in human terms every American will understand. They faithfully report not only the facts involved, but the atmosphere of the conflict. This is interpretative reporting at its best.

Mr. President, I congratulate Bonnie Angelo Levy for being the first recipient of the Paul Tobenkin Memorial Award and I commend those who have made this award possible for encouraging newswriting in this great spirit. I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of the award and Mrs. Levy's prize-winning series be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PAUL TOBENKIN MEMORIAL AWARD

For newswriting on racial or religious bias, awarded to Bonnie Angelo of the Washington Bureau of Newsday, for a series of articles on the abandonment of public schools in Prince Edward County, Va.

Judges: George Cornish, editor-in-chief of Grolier Encyclopedia; Charles Collingwood, CBS news correspondent, and Joseph Carter, national affairs editor of Newsweek magazine.

In addition to the award to Bonnie Angelo, citations were awarded to: Don Marshall, Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N.J.; John J. Lindsay, Washington Post; Aaron Epstein, Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat; and David Zinman, Associated Press, New Orleans.

BATTLE OF PRINCE EDWARD, VA.—SOUTH FINDS MODEL FOR SEGREGATION

(By Bonnie Angelo)

(A series of articles by Bonnie Angelo, of Newsday's Washington bureau, on Prince Edward County, Va., which appeared consecutively from December 19 through December 23, 1960.)

FARMVILLE, VA.—A delegation from New Orleans recently traveled 1,000 miles to visit this small southside Virginia trading center, which calls itself, "the deathbed of the Confederacy."

Tourists aren't unusual here—Civil War buffs from both sides come to retrace Lee's route to surrender at nearby Appomattox, and to take pictures of the plaques, side by side, noting that both Lee and Grant (traveling separately) were guests at the Prince Edward Hotel on that April day in 1865. But the New Orleans group, like other delegations from Atlanta and Baton Rouge and Mississippi and Tennessee, were here not to mourn Lee's surrender but to cheer Prince Edward County's refusal to surrender to the Supreme Court.

In the historic decision of 1954, the Court ordered this placid county in Virginia's "Black Belt" to end segregation in its schools. But rather than integrate, Prince Edward simply abandoned public schools altogether. Since June 1959, when "No Trespassing" signs were posted on its 20 schools (13 Negro, 7 white), Prince Edward County has enjoyed the dubious distinction of being the only county in the Nation without public education.

That is not to say without schools. The 1,370 white children of the county are receiving an education in an elaborate private school system. Their education is virtually free, thanks to some artfully framed State laws, including one that provides grants for students who wish to attend private schools. By choice of Negro leaders mapping legal strategy, the estimated 1,700 Negro children get no schooling at all. It is the mechanics of this thus-far successful integration dodge that attracts observers from other southern communities unwilling to accept integration to some extent as a fact of life in the mid-century. They clutch at the straw offered by Farmville.

Other groups are watching Prince Edward County closely for other reasons. Race relations workers fear that the Negroes are growing restive, and are interested in the economic boycott threatened last week by the Negro leaders. Educators across the country, who might have trouble finding Farmville on their maps, are concerned at this threat to the public education system. Among these is Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming, who recently described the Prince Edward school situation as "a serious blight on the American education scene."

Farmville, the county seat, is a pleasant town of 5,000, about 65 miles southwest of Richmond. It is the trading center for five surrounding rural counties and is, ironically, a small-scale center of higher education, boasting Longwood State Teachers College in the heart of town and Hampden-Sydney, a Presbyterian supported men's college, a few miles out.

In the morning white children scurry to school, teenage girls on their way to classes in the Presbyterian Church clutching an impressive load of books, little boys shunning the tame propriety of sidewalks to walk on walls and through puddles en route to makeshift quarters in the Baptist Church. Afternoons, the sandwich shop collects chattering college girls, studying to be teachers in a town with no public schools. Main Street is bright with Christmas decorations and shoppers—white and Negro—would appear to be more concerned with holiday chores than the sorely unequal state of education in Farmville.

It has the everyday face of a small southern town. Who can say what lies beneath the unruffled surface? It depends on whose eyes are looking into the heart of the town.

The segregationist standard bearers—and they speak for the majority—reassure you with conviction that things in Farmville have never been better. Negro leaders prefer to think that the community is bordering on complete breakdown.

The truth lies somewhere between these two extremes, but the truth is hard to pin down when those who can look at both sides of the question are afraid to talk. And they are. One businessman, his face taut, said, "It's like a runaway team of horses—get in the way and you get trampled." He had gotten "in the way" a year ago by opposing the sale of the public high school to the private white school group—the action seemed too final to him. For this reluctance, his business and family have suffered. "I don't discuss it at all any more," he said wearily, and his eyes showed the hurt. "It upsets me all over again, and I've spent too many sleepless nights over this thing."

Another lifelong Farmville resident said, "Nobody can talk. In Farmville today they figure, 'You're either for us or against us.' You can't say anything—because you may say the wrong thing, and that can ruin you. We are all unhappy about everything." Raising his voice a shade, as if to make sure it carried to the several bystanders within earshot, he added, "But get this straight—the Negroes are wrong in this thing, and the whites are right, absolutely right."

Down the block, in a store featuring mocha-skinned dolls in its toy display, a manager nervously eyes the shoppers like a producer counting the house after poor reviews. "We're hurting," he said tersely. "You can't take \$300,000 a year (the Negro school budget) out of a town of this size and not feel it. At least not in a store where we do 60 percent colored business."

He, like all other Farmville merchants, pledges hefty sums to the private school foundation. A committee comes to call with a "suggested" figure for his pledge. What happens to a businessman who doesn't give? "Nobody wants to find out."

Last summer number of deeply concerned Farmville business and professional men met—secretly, of course—to try to work toward some solution. But after the second meeting, mimeographed "minutes" were distributed by a spy, giving names and quotes. The men whose comments indicated even tentative interest in reopening schools felt the bitter sting of rebuffs from townspeople who had been friends and neighbors.

Despite the undercurrents eddying beneath the smooth surface, Farmville has suffered none of the violence that wrenched Clinton, Tenn., then Little Rock, cropped up sporadically in other southern towns and now grips New Orleans. Farmville, too, might have become a familiar word in headlines—and might yet—if integration, even token integration, had been attempted.

But Prince Edward's ingenious—or diabolical—stroke of abolishing public schools neatly precluded violence. The whites complacently shifted to the private school; the Negroes had nowhere at all to turn. White leaders offered a similar private school system for Negro youngsters, but only one signed up. The others, cautioned by their leaders, shunned the bait that might have undermined legal action to force the reopening of schools.

Farmville people, even those who may be correctly called white supremacists, express regret (in varying degrees) that half the county's young are getting no education. The regrets, however, are usually coupled with the explanation that "they brought it on themselves when they listened to those NAACP outsiders—they don't care about the children, they just wanted to make this a test case."

BATTLE OF PRINCE EDWARD, VA.—WHITES, NEGROES IN TOUGH CHESS GAME

(By Bonnie Angelo)

FARMVILLE, VA.—In southern communities a court order to desegregate schools all too often leads to battle conditions between white and Negro, names called and stones hurled, crosses burned and windows shattered. But in Prince Edward County, one of the five cited in the fateful Supreme Court decision of May 1954, it has been not a battle but a chess game of awesome dimensions.

A chess game spanning almost a decade calls for two shrewd masterminds on opposite sides of the board. Plotting the moves of the Negroes is the Reverend L. F. Griffin, Negro minister and coordinator for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). This odd, laconic man has a sly cat-and-mouse insight into his adversaries' moves, and shows a wry sense of humor about the struggle he leads.

Opposing him is the entire power structure of Farmville. They rally round one master strategist, J. Barrye Wall, editor of the Farmville Herald, who demonstrates on its pages weekly that the pen and the sword are not necessarily on opposing sides. Wall gets the lion's share of credit—or blame—for framing the boldly defiant decision to abolish Prince Edward's public schools and set up a for-white-only private school system financed almost entirely by State and county funds.

In his comfortably cluttered newspaper office, Wall helps the cause in several ways, gathering money for the Prince Edward Academy building fund, jacking up wavering readers with rip-snorting editorials, and serving as a general consultant on segregation matters.

Wall, a corpulent man with a Phi Beta Kappa key dangling proudly across his necktie, is a dedicated segregationist. As he sees it, his community is under constant attack from outsiders. In a recent editorial he warned that "outside sources *** use your children as pawns in a national, if not international, conspiracy."

The leader of these outsiders is the Reverend Mr. Griffin, a Farmville native whose father before him occupied the pulpit of the First Baptist Church for Negroes on Main Street. His big, bulky frame and his bronze face with its small mustache were familiar around Farmville. But when he allied himself with the NAACP, he gave up his claim to being "one of our good Farmville Negroes."

It was the Reverend Mr. Griffin who made the opening play in the Prince Edward chess game. In 1951 the students at the Negro high school staged a strike—a gambit never before used in this unsophisticated rural setting—in protest against their shabby, inadequate school. Did the minister arrange the walkout? "My good friend Barrye Wall says I did—and so I must have," he replied with elaborate deference.

The strike led to the NAACP suit, which in turn led to a tortuous legal maze with no end in sight. Wall insists that despite legalities, the whites have checkmated the Negroes. "People don't seem to understand that Prince Edward County is no longer in the public school business," he said flatly. Stabbing the air with his cigar to underscore his statements, he spelled it out: "We are not going to pay for integrated schools and that's that."

He paused briefly to take an obituary over the telephone, then returned to chat about attitudes he finds in New York. "I listen to taxidrivers, I don't ask their opinions, they tell me—and I tell you that in the North there is hate in the heart. There's no hate in our hearts," he insisted, and one knew without asking that he referred to white hearts. "Maybe it's because of generations of a close relationship."

In a moment he returned to the core of the matter. "We aren't against public schools," he said, "we are against integration." His blue eyes turned steely behind his glasses as he spat out with fearsome finality, "We just ain't going to have it."

The Reverend Mr. Griffin, however, looking to the courts and the inexorable tide of the 20th century, is equally certain that they will have it. He admits that the schools may reopen as all-Negro, shunned by whites as long as the courts allow tuition grants and tax credits from public funds. He predicted that court action would have the public schools back in business by next September, but his words had the hollow sound of whistling in the dark.

The minister's optimism is boundless—tending occasionally to outdo his capacity to deliver. Last week he put into motion plans for an economic boycott, following up a mild threat he blandly tossed out at a meeting of the county supervisors. Negro sympathizers shuddered because they doubt that a boycott will succeed in Farmville. And the failure will only hurt the Negroes more. Barrye Wall asked pointedly, "Who will give them credit?" and others wonder if the Negroes, dirt poor now, will dare endanger their jobs.

In a sense, the Reverend Mr. Griffin's task is thankless, for he must bear the brunt of the white community's anger and at the same time is aware that many of his own people have no heart for the fight. He

knows that white people say that he doesn't care about the Negro children's education, what he really wants is integration. Some suggest that he is trying to be another Reverend Martin Luther King, and to achieve this bases his moves on publicity mileage.

In his detached, almost diffident way, the big preacher restated his case. "I am only concerned that the Negroes of Prince Edward County are not deprived of their rights as citizens," he says. To try to help keep up the morale of his people, the Reverend Mr. Griffin organized the Prince Edward Christian Association (PECA). Each Wednesday night 100 or so Negroes gather at his church for the PECA meeting—mostly hymns and a sermon to bolster sagging spirits, and a collection. That is the extent to which the Negro community is organized—organization is not the forte of this small-church pastor.

He takes hope wherever he can find it. He cited the meetings of a bare handful of whites—"biracial, not interracial," he observed laconically—to try to work toward a solution, admittedly they haven't gotten anywhere, "but," he added, "in Prince Edward County the shocking, amazing, remarkable, astounding thing is that a biracial group would get together and talk."

He also noted with some relish the strains in the fiber of the white community. "The whites have turned on their own—the Negroes are getting a little rest," he clucked. He knew it was an optimist's exaggeration.

To see Prince Edward's school situation in perspective, he needs only to look at the contrast in the lot of the white children and that of the colored. Tomorrow Newsday will report on the flourishing Prince Edward Academy for white children only.

BATTLE OF PRINCE EDWARD, VA.—WHITE PRIVATE SCHOOL: \$15 A YEAR
(By Bonnie Angelo)

FARMVILLE, VA.—Where else but here can every child (white) in a county boast that he attends private school? And where else but here can private schooling be had for a mere \$15 a year per child (white)?

In Prince Edward County in southside Virginia almost 1,400 children attend accredited private schools virtually free. The Negro child has no school of any kind, yet his parents' taxes help support the institution that is the brick-and-mortar symbol of defiance of the Supreme Court's order to end segregation. No other county in the South has so openly flouted the court and its defiance is well into its second successful year.

The students are currently housed in temporary quarters, mostly Sunday school rooms. But on a hilltop at the edge of Farmville, six buildings are taking shape on the new campus of Prince Edward Academy. The \$375,000 project is being built for about \$200,000, thanks to generous gifts of labor and materials. The money has come principally from Farmville residents who have given until it hurts—and it hurts particularly when one is pressured into giving even when his heart is not in it.

SCHOOLS LIE ABANDONED

Around the county the seedy look of disuse has crept like a parasitic vine over the abandoned public schools, including the fine Negro high school that came—too little and too late—after the Supreme Court decision against Prince Edward's segregated schools.

If members of the Negro community once thought the private school system would collapse under its own shortcomings, as did a similar undertaking in Little Rock, they know now that they underestimated the white community's determination not to tolerate integration. Now the Negroes pin their hopes on the courts. The NAACP has brought suit to prevent the county from selling its schools (the private school foun-

dation yearns to buy the high school building) and to force the reopening of the public schools.

The NAACP is optimistic about the outcome. "This kind of defiance won't hold up in court," said one official. "If you are collecting tax money and spending it for education, you can't discriminate this way." But a leading segregationist countered with this question: "Who's going to make the county appropriate funds and who's going to operate the schools—the Federal Government?"

WHITE ACADEMY FLOURISHES

While the suit is languishing in the crowded channels of legality, Prince Edward Academy is flourishing. Even those who hate its fancy name and everything it stands for admit grudgingly that it is a remarkable feat of organization and cooperation.

More than anyone else, the man who has made it work is B. Blanton Hanbury, president of the Prince Edward School Foundation. In the past year and a half, he has probably spent more time in the intricate maneuvers of shifting from public to private schools than he has on his business, the Buffalo Shook Co. (Shooks are assembled into hogshead, which store tobacco.) On his desk is a photograph of five pretty little Hanburys (one more has arrived since the picture was made) and these are the reason for his zealous interest in education—segregated education.

Tamping tobacco into his pipe, Hanbury, genteel and soft-spoken, glowed with pride as he talked about Prince Edward Academy. He credits the "magnificent cooperation of parents, teachers, and pupils—everyone felt they were participating in an experiment that had to succeed."

Scholastically, the pupils are doing as well as they did in public schools, perhaps because the teachers moved en masse from one system to the other. Sixty percent of last June's graduates went on to college or business schools. There has been no juvenile delinquency—"not even a pencil mark on the walls"—and the pupils seem to feel a personal responsibility for the success of the anti-integration project. They go to school from 8:30 until 1:30, with no study halls or lunch periods. Sports are the only extracurricular activity, possibly because the former public school coach was made "headmaster" of the academy. "We cut out all the frills and improved the level of education," Hanbury said. He envisions similar private systems as "the coming thing throughout the South" and cites the many delegations that have come to study the Prince Edward operation. "It will improve the whole system of education," he said.

Though he seems to be a thoughtful man, Hanbury is not troubled by the fact that the Negroes of Prince Edward have no schools at all. "We were concerned at first," he said blandly. "We all want education for Negroes—through the years the white people have paid 90 percent of the costs to educate them. We offered them private schools like ours, but they weren't interested. What they want is integration."

Hanbury is the first to admit that the great experiment could not go on without the help of the State and county. Public funds are designed to help them in three ways:

First, and most important, the State and county provide tuition grants for students wishing to attend any private, nonsectarian school—\$265 for each high school student, \$240 for elementary pupils. In each case it is only \$15 short of Prince Edward Academy's tuition fee.

Second, the county allows tax credits for property owners who contribute to the private school foundation. They can give up to 25 percent of their total tax bill and have this amount deducted outright—a device

that has netted \$56,866 for the private system. As a pointed reminder, the 25 percent was figured and neatly penciled in the corner of each tax bill mailed to a white property owner.

The county helps the schools in still another way, authorizing transportation payments to each family to pay the cost of getting the children to school by bus or private transportation. The payments go up to \$35 per pupil a year. Thus, the county rescued the floundering 16-bus fleet operated by "Patrons Inc." to transport children to the five rural elementary units and to the consolidated private high school in Farmville. The buses are antique vehicles purchased from schools replacing them. The drivers are high school boys.

At this point, NAACP leaders are not attacking this use of public funds for private schools. They are waiting first for the outcome of the pending suit—but it is a good guess that in time the grants and tax rebates will be challenged. And if public funds are cut off, the private white system will surely fall apart.

"From here on out," said Hanbury, "there's always going to be some form of public aid to help parents who don't want to send their children to integrated public schools. And that's all the public schools we'll ever have in this county."

Integrated public schools are precisely what the Negro half of the county's population is holding out for. "And if you win in the end, all this is not a price too high to pay," sighed one NAACP leader. To find out how high the price is, Newsday visited the volunteer centers set up by the Negroes for the Negro children. A report on these centers will appear tomorrow.

BATTLE OF PRINCE EDWARD, VA.—DILEMMA: HOW TO EDUCATE NEGROES WITH NO SCHOOLS

(By Bonnie Angelo)

FARMVILLE, VA.—In New Orleans, Negro children on their way to integrated schools are harassed each day with jeers, curses, even rocks in this first agonizing stage of desegregation. In Prince Edward County, Va., where desegregation was ordered almost 6 years ago, the Negroes would risk violence for the chance to go to school again.

New Orleans has at least made a start. Prince Edward, on the other hand, has defied the Supreme Court by putting a stop to public school education altogether. Since June 1959, not one Negro child has had a day of schooling, while white youngsters attend private schools financed chiefly by public funds. The Negroes, holding out for integrated public schools, steadfastly refuse to participate in a similar segregated private system.

A number of Negro children, 200 or so, have left the county, determined to continue their education. Some are living with relatives in other parts of Virginia, a number attend a Negro institution close by in North Carolina, and 50 have been sent to other States—their expenses paid by the American Friends Service Committee. All but 3 of the 70 Negro teachers, the backbone of their community, have left the county to find jobs.

To help the "kids" who are left behind, the Negroes have set up 14 centers where volunteers do what they can to keep young minds active for about 3 hours a day. The centers have registered 652 children—another 800 are lost, unaccounted for—and untaught.

They are trying, really trying, with those centers. But how much can you do with 34 children from 5 to 12 years old crowded into 1 bare room 9 feet square? Their teacher, Mrs. Victoria Brown, one of the three who stayed, knows her work well. She has a master's degree from New York University. In the big round printing that is the mark of her profession, she chalks sentences on a heavy cardboard box—her ingenious substi-

tute for the blackboard she does not have. But there is no substitute for running water and plumbing.

Tacked on the bare board wall is a numbers chart and a manger scene with the ancient message: "Joy to the world, the Lord is here." The little room, like all the other centers, is heated by a small wood stove, hazardous in the tiny area jammed with squirming boys and girls but necessary against the inordinately bitter Virginia winter.

The money for wood came from a professor at Hampden-Sydney, a men's college about 300 yards down the road. This token of concern from one troubled professor is the only offer of help from that center of higher education in the liberal arts. Mrs. Brown accepted the money gratefully, graciously. "Some are interested, but I guess they don't know what to do—we're in such confusion," she said kindly.

She is equally kind in her attitude toward the Negro minister whose tidy, well-built church, Mercy Seat Baptist, stands idle just across the road from the center. He knows the unbelievable conditions of the squalid hut in which Mrs. Brown desperately tries to bring the light of education to the neglected children of his race. But he has never offered to let them use any part of his church.

In a way, the children of the Hampden-Sydney Center are luckier than some, for they have Mrs. Brown, a teacher of 35 years' experience. Out in the dirt-road backwoods of the county, the children depend on any neighborhood woman who has the time and interest to watch over a center.

Beyond the crossroads hamlet of Prospect, a bleak two-room schoolhouse—long ago ruled unfit even for Negroes by the Prince Edward County School Board—serves as a center. Mrs. Leola Hill does the best she can with the dozen or so youngsters who climb the scabbly windswept hill each morning. It's hard to worry about not having books when your one warm room doesn't have a door, but Mrs. Hill worries about both shortcomings.

Whatever is there is a testimonial to this goodhearted Negro woman's concern for the children. She bought the stove, she bought the weekly current events sheet that is their only textbook and she is selling candy to buy a door. She fills the water bucket, with its dipper, at a nearby house and puts up bright pictures from her copy of *Farmer's Wife* (pies and table settings and animals, whatever is colorful). She tries to teach letters and numbers, but finds that they mostly like to cut out pictures. The meager supply of *Farmer's Wife* was almost exhausted as she said this and one little girl was snipping the bold letters from a patent medicine ad.

Some of the centers have more to offer. The largest, in the basement Sunday school auditorium of the Farmville First Baptist Church for Negroes, has 2 blackboards, a couple of worktables and a variety of books for its 94 pupils. They are divided into three different age groups—the youngest learning their lessons from a 15-year-old boy who was teaching the alphabet with brisk, grown-up efficiency.

In this center, the leaders stress pride in the accomplishments of the Negro. Bulletin boards display magazine articles on the first African cardinal and Fats Domino's \$200,000 home, along with lists of Negroes famous in the worlds of sports and music. The moving spirit behind these centers is Mrs. Helen Baker, the one outsider who has moved into Farmville to help the Negroes. Mrs. Baker, a lively and capable Negro woman, is completely at ease with any race and intellectual level. She was sent down from Baltimore 2 months ago by the American Friends Service Committee to organize the Negro community to deal with the emergency that goes on and on.

Director of a youth center, a natural diplomat and a buoyant spirit, she filled a serious gap. She laughs now at what she had thought her job would be. "To me, a center meant basketball courts and handcraft programs and hobbies and all that," she said. "I had no idea of the realities of Prince Edward until I saw the centers."

She is not the first social worker to find the county situation beyond imagination. Last year, an NAACP worker outlined a program for the centers that read like sheer fantasy. It suggested, for example, that older students might learn "how to open a bank account" and how to figure measurements for curtains and drapes—nothing, unfortunately, on how to obtain a schoolroom door.

There is no money available for the centers in a county where Negroes and poverty live side by side. "We need everything," said Mrs. Baker. "Furniture, books, crayons—everything." She knows that the centers can't fill the need of schools, but she would like to see them teach the children useful skills, sewing and knitting for the girls, woodworking for boys and some creative crafts for both.

Mrs. Baker is a peace-loving Quaker, but in off moments she deplores the utter calm of Farmville. "It's calm because nothing, nothing is happening. Nobody—white or colored—talks about the real issues. People say 'it's a shame these children are out of school,' but even the Negroes show nothing more than discomfiture, no fire."

"There is, however, one man in Farmville who speaks out and doesn't care who might not like it. He is Dr. Gordon Moss, dean of Longwood College, who talks about past damage and future hope for Prince Edward County in tomorrow's *Newsday*.

A LONE WHITE STANDS UP FOR EQUALITY

(By Bonnie Angelo)

FARMVILLE, VA.—In the emotional maelstrom that goes along with the desegregation of public schools in the South, the voice of the white southerner who is willing to accept integration is drowned out by the shrill invective of unyielding segregationists.

This is not hard to understand, for the white moderates are a troubled minority in Dixie. And even fewer will speak out when they know it leads to snubs and insults—or worse—from the people they must live with. In Prince Edward County, Va., where segregationists are so solidly united that they could abolish public schools without community protest, only one white resident has the courage to oppose his neighbors boldly and without equivocation.

Dr. Gordon Moss, dean of Longwood Teachers College, is not a man to be intimidated. He takes the floor at public meetings, doesn't care who knows that he meets with Negro leaders, and delights in forcing former friends to speak to him. Moss is a native Virginian, so they can't call him an outside agitator. But they do call him a nigger-lover and an integrationist—the two most damning epithets in the Virginia vernacular.

His concern is not primarily race relations. He has devoted his life to the training of teachers and cannot sit by and watch the fabric of public education ripped to shreds because a few colored children might sit alongside whites in a classroom. There are a few others—pitifully few—who think like Moss, but as business and professional men they are vulnerable to the retaliation that comes swiftly in Farmville. A man has to watch what he says when his livelihood is at stake.

In his position of stature on the Longwood campus, Moss is comparatively safe—although a protesting delegation has called unsuccessfully on the college president. "I get right many black looks when I go downtown," the dean drawled with a wry smile. "Fortunately, my family is fairly immune." One grown son lives elsewhere, his daughter

is a Longwood student, and his younger son was sent away to prep school when the all-white private academy replaced public schools.

"I wouldn't let my son go to it for anything in the world," he said, his brown eyes flashing with anger, despite his calm, professional tweeds-and-pipe exterior. "Maybe the kids are doing all right in French and math and English, after all, they have the same teachers they had in the public schools, but they are learning principles that are far from what I would call proper education. How, in a government class, can they teach democracy in such an undemocratic school?"

Moss is harsh in his judgment of the motives at work in Prince Edward County. He believes that the hard-core white supremacists are using the Supreme Court decision as "an excuse, or opportunity, to destroy public education here completely and permanently." He based this opinion on "what I've heard the white supremacist leaders say over the years." The nub of it is simple: Educating only the white children would be cheaper and educated Negroes are troublemakers.

What will solve Prince Edward's incredible have-or-have-not situation? Moss is a realist. He does not believe that the white community will ever do anything until it is forced to. The moral issue, the patent injustice of present conditions, goes without challenge. Farmville people are churchgoers and Bible readers, but the crisis that grips the community is never mentioned from the pulpits. One Presbyterian minister spoke out and the elders soon told him tactfully that he was being replaced. The Presbyterian Church is the key building for the private white school.

"The ministers," Moss said in measured tones, "have been pusillanimous and cowardly to the nth degree. They couldn't help immediately, but they could make the conscience of the people hurt worse than it does—and, yes, consciences do hurt."

Two developments, Moss said, might force the reopening of the public schools. First (and preferably) would be court action cutting off public funds now used to operate the private all-white system. (No suit has been filed as yet to challenge Virginia's ingeniously drawn new laws designed to get around Supreme Court orders.) State and county provide tuition grants, transportation allowances and tax rebates to underwrite the private white schools. Without these public funds, only well-heeled students could afford the actual costs of private education, unless the wealthy were to make up the tremendous deficit, and at least half the whites would then be in the same boat with the school-less Negroes.

"That's when the whites will accept integration," Moss predicted. He is convinced that it would be only token integration. "The Negroes want recognition of their rights. Then they will be content to go on to their own schools, if they are as good as white schools. And prior to 1959 there was not equality of schools here."

The second course of possible action is rebellion by the Negroes, but there has been no sign of this. "The Negroes here are unbelievably patient," Moss observed. He has seen no indication that they are even thinking of making demands "in a way forceful enough" to bring about action. They are counting heavily on the courts to force the reopening of schools.

This thoughtful educator finds it hard to be optimistic about any neat, legalistic end of this situation that has been caught up in the intricacies of the courts for almost 10 years. "Farmville can get over the superficial nature of it," he said soberly. "But I don't think for the next generation it can get over the intangible scars and the evil of it."

The Negroes are likely to win the legal stage of the battle of Prince Edward—and

New Orleans and many other southern towns yet untouched by the turmoil that marks the Negro's tortuous path to equality. But the battle that lies beyond may be even harder for the dark-skinned citizen. For it must be fought in the conscience and the heart of the white man, in the North as well as the South, if the meaning of equality is to be more than a legal phrase.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

FREE ENTRY OF ELECTRON MICROSCOPES AND OTHER APPARATUS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 451, H.R. 3385.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3385) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free entry of electron microscopes and certain other apparatus imported by, or on behalf of, certain institutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3385 is to transfer from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, apparatus utilizing any radioactive substance in medical diagnosis or therapeutic treatment, including the radioactive material itself when contained in the apparatus as an integral element of the apparatus, and electron microscopes, and parts or accessories of any of these articles, when imported for its own use, and not for sale, by or on behalf of, any nonprofit society, institution, or organization, whether public or private, incorporated or established for educational, scientific, or therapeutic purposes.

GENERAL STATEMENT

A number of educational institutions are purchasing electron microscopes from abroad for use in connection with research and educational activities. Because of the expensive nature of these new tools of scientific research and education substantial import duties would normally be applied.

Rather than attempt to legislate separately for each separate importation, it would appear to be in the interest of expediency to provide one vehicle for the free importation of all microscopes of a similar nature when imported by nonprofit institutions.

Included in the bill is a provision for the free importation of apparatus utilizing

radioactive substances in medical diagnosis or therapeutic treatment, such as cobalt 60 therapy units used in cancer diagnosis and treatment. Parts or accessories of the articles covered, such as kits to increase magnification, voltage focusing kits, etc., are included.

The general public interest in developing and advancing scientific or medical research and inquiry as well as diagnostic and therapeutic techniques will be served by permitting nonprofit societies, institutions, and organizations established for educational or scientific purposes to import free of duty the highly advanced equipment covered by H.R. 3385.

The committee, in reporting the bill, emphasizes that the free importation provision applies only to bona fide organizations actually engaged in science and education and that they must in all cases be classed as non-profit in their operations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 3385) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS, FAMILIES, AND EFFECTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 453, S. 1458.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1458) to amend the act of July 8, 1940, relating to the transportation of the remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, so as to restore the benefits of such act to employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment at the top of page 4, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective with respect to Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, on and after the date each of them became a State of the United States of America.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of July 8, 1940, entitled "An Act to defray the costs of returning to the United States the remains, families, and effects of officers and employees dying abroad, and for other purposes" (5 U.S.C. 103a), is amended to read as follows:

"In case any civilian officer or employee of the United States dies (1) while in a travel

status away from his official station in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, or (2) while performing official duties outside the continental United States or in Alaska, or in transit thereto or therefrom, the head of the department, independent establishment, agency, or federally owned or controlled corporation, hereinafter called department, in the service of which such officer or employee was engaged, is hereby authorized, under regulations to be prescribed by the President and except as otherwise provided by law, to pay from the appropriation available for the activity in which he was engaged—

"(a) In case of the death of the officer or employee in such travel status in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, or in the case of the death of the officer or employee while performing official duties outside the continental United States or in Alaska or in transit thereto or therefrom, the expenses of preparing and transporting the remains of such officer or employee to his home or official station or such other place as the head of the department concerned shall determine to be the appropriate place of interment.

"(b) In case of the death of the officer or employee while performing official duties outside the continental United States or in Alaska or in transit thereto or therefrom, the transportation expenses of his dependents, including expenses incurred in packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household effects and other personal property to his former home or such other place as the head of the department shall determine.

"(c) In the case of dependents of a civilian officer or employee who died while residing with such civilian officer or employee performing official duties at a place outside the continental United States or in Alaska or while in transit thereto or therefrom, the head of the department concerned is authorized to pay the necessary expenses incurred for the transportation of remains to such person's home or to such other place as the head of the department concerned shall determine to be the appropriate place for interment. Mortuary services and supplies may be furnished, if practicable, by the department concerned in respect of such dependents on a reimbursable basis where local commercial mortuary facilities and supplies are not available, or if available, the cost thereof is prohibitive in the opinion of the head of such department. Reimbursement for the cost of mortuary services and supplies furnished under the authority of this paragraph shall be collected and credited to current appropriations available for the payment of such costs."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective with respect to Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, on and after the date each of them became a State of the United States of America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement with reference to its purpose be printed in the RECORD in connection with each bill passed today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The statement of the purpose of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The act of July 8, 1940, among other things, authorizes the payment of the expenses of preparing and transporting to his home or place of interment the remains of a Federal employee who dies while performing official duties in a "territory or possession of the United States" and the expenses of transporting his family and household effects to his former home. While these expenses were paid in the case of employees dying on duty in the former territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the Comptroller General has ruled that they may not be paid in the case of employees

stationed and dying in Alaska and Hawaii after they became States. On the other hand, the act continues to authorize the payment of the costs of transporting home the remains of dependents who die while residing with an employee performing duties in either Alaska or Hawaii. Thus, since statehood, the remains of a deceased dependent, but not those of the employee himself, may be returned at Government expense.

The measure corrects this inconsistency by amending existing law to authorize the return at Government expense of the remains of employees and dependents alike who die in either Alaska or Hawaii.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 454, S. 841.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 841) to amend the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement with reference to its purpose be printed in the RECORD in connection with each bill passed today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The statement of the purpose of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this measure is to correct two minor deficiencies found in the Overseas Teachers Act since it was enacted in 1959.

EXPLANATION

Section 7(c) of that act provides authority for quarters and certain other types of allowances, during summer recess periods, for teachers who complete a school year and who agree in writing to serve for the next school year. Section 7(d) obligates any such teacher who does not report for duty at the beginning of the next school year to repay any allowance received during the summer recess regardless of the reasons for not reporting. Section 1 of the proposed legislation would permit administrative relief in appropriate situations, when a teacher is unable to report for the next school year.

for reasons beyond his control and which are acceptable to the Department of Defense. Such reasons could include death, serious illness, etc.

The second change made by the proposed legislation relates to the definition of "year" for the purpose of certain administrative actions in the case of teachers. The proposed measure proposes in the case of teachers that it be "school year" rather than "twelve months." The Department of Defense states that such a change will improve administration of the program and eliminate inequities which may arise under present law.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1. Amends section 7(d) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act to provide that a teacher who has received quarters or a quarters allowance or storage of household effects for the recess period between school years and who fails to report for the next school year for reasons acceptable to the Government will not be obligated to the United States for the amount or value of quarters or storage he has received.

Section 2. Amends section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-3), to permit the granting of transportation agreements for teachers serving in the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense which would require a minimum period of service of less than 1 year. When appropriate, such agreements would require a minimum period which would coincide with the length of a school year.

AGENCY VIEWS

Following are letters from the Department of Defense requesting enactment of this measure and setting forth detailed reasons therefor.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, January 16, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961 and the Bureau of the Budget advised by letter dated January 10, 1961, that there is no objection to its submission for the consideration of the Congress. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of the legislation is to correct certain deficiencies in current legislation which have resulted in actions which are not believed to be in accord with the intent of the existing legislation, and the correction of which would improve the administration of the personnel program for teachers in the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense.

Section 7(c) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (5 U.S.C. 2355(c)) provides authority for quarters or a quarters allowance or storage of household effects and personal possessions, during summer recess periods, for those teachers who complete a school year and who agree in writing to serve for the next school year. Section 7(d) of this act (5 U.S.C. 2355(d)) obligates any such teacher who does not report for service at the beginning of the next school year to repay moneys received as a quarters allowance or for storage, or both, regardless of the reasons for not reporting.

Section 1 of the proposed legislation would amend 5 U.S.C. 2355(d) so as to permit administrative relief in appropriate situations, when a teacher is unable to report for the next school year for reasons beyond his

control and acceptable to the Department of Defense. Such reasons could include death, serious illness, transfer (when considered to be in the interest of the Government), and other such circumstances. Similar authority for relief from obligation to repay moneys to the United States is contained in other statutes, and should be available for administrative use in appropriate circumstances for teachers in the overseas dependents schools.

Section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-3), authorized the payment, at Government expense, of the expenses of travel and transportation for an employee, his family, and household effects when he is assigned to a post of duty outside the continental United States. It also contains a proviso that such expenses shall not be allowed unless the employee agrees to remain in the Government service for 12 months following his appointment, unless separated for reasons beyond his control and acceptable to the Government.

While the Department agrees fully that a minimum period of a year of service should be required incident to assignments overseas, the present wording of the statute has presented technical problems with respect to teachers in the overseas dependents schools. As a general rule, services of teachers are required only for a school year which usually varies from 9 to 10 months. Thus, an effective "year of service" for teachers falls 2 or 3 months under the minimum service requirements of the present law. To comply with the letter of the law, therefore, a teacher must plan to spend 2 or 3 months in a nonpay status in the overseas area after the school term is over in order to accumulate the minimum period of 12 months of service. An alternative is for the teacher to resign after completing the school year, whereupon the Department would make a finding that such reason for separation was beyond the control of the teacher and for reasons acceptable to the Government. It is not believed that such administrative difficulties were anticipated when the statute was enacted.

The proposed legislation would exclude personnel subject to the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (5 U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) from the minimum oversea service requirements. Under section 4(a)(7) of that act, the Secretary of Defense is already responsible for prescribing regulations governing the length of the school year or school years applicable to teaching positions. With enactment of section 2 of the proposed legislation, the Secretary of Defense would be able to prescribe minimum periods of oversea service for transportation purposes consistent with the length of the school year in a particular country.

Section 2 of the proposed legislation would also serve another important purpose relating to a teacher's entitlement to quarters, quarters allowance, or storage during the summer recess period as authorized by section 7(c) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (5 U.S.C. 2355). That act authorized continuance of those benefits during the summer recess if the teacher has agreed in writing to serve as a teacher during the next school year. By permitting the minimum period of oversea service for transportation purposes to be stated in terms of a "school year" rather than "12 months," the Department, if determined to be in the interest of the Government, could return a teacher to the United States at the close of a school year without the necessity of processing a resignation. In such cases, the employee would be carried on leave without pay during the recess period, thus making clear the teacher's entitlement to the benefits of section 7(c) of that act.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would improve the administration of the overseas teachers personnel program and will eliminate possible inequities which may arise under existing law.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is anticipated that any increased costs resulting from the enactment of this proposal would be negligible and would result in no increase in budgetary requirements.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Deputy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7(d) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (5 U.S.C. 2355 (d)) is amended by inserting after the words "he shall", the words "except for reasons beyond his control and acceptable to the Department of Defense".

Sec. 2. Section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-3), is amended by inserting in the first proviso after the words "his appointment", and in the second proviso after the word "concerned", the words "or, in the case of a person employed in a teaching position (other than as a substitute) in the Department of Defense under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (5 U.S.C. 2351, and the following), for a minimum period of one school year as determined under such Act".

EDUCATION AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point, perhaps I should inquire of the majority leader with respect to the so-called education and cultural exchange bill, about which there is considerable controversy, what is proposed with respect to the bill or the amendments, in view of the fact that a demand will be made for some yea-and-nay votes as of today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention, when the Senate has finished with its consideration of the bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, to return to the consideration of the unfinished business, which is the cultural exchange bill. However, it is not anticipated that there will be any yea-and-nay votes on that proposal this afternoon. There will be, but later, after consultation with the minority leader. We will get together to see if we can agree upon a time limitation for voting, to begin on Monday next.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 455, Senate bill 1087.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1087) to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to

the government of American Samoa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to transfer, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the government of American Samoa, within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, title to all property, real and personal, which is located in American Samoa on the date of enactment of this Act and which is owned by the United States and is within the administrative supervision of the Department of the Navy on such date: Provided, That title to any personal property which was located in American Samoa on July 1, 1951, and was made available to the government of American Samoa by the Department of the Navy, but which has been consumed or disposed of since such date, shall be deemed to have been transferred to the government of American Samoa on July 1, 1951.

The excerpt from the report (No. 486) is as follows:

The purpose of this measure is to authorize a transfer by the Department of the Navy to the government of American Samoa of the land, buildings, and certain personal property held by the Navy in Samoa in 1951 prior to the termination of the period of naval administration. Since the transfer in 1951 of the responsibility for the administration of the territory to the Secretary of the Interior, these lands, buildings, and property have not been used by the Navy and have been utilized by the present government of American Samoa.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

A similar measure, requested by the U.S. Department of the Interior during the 2d session of the 86th Congress, passed the Senate but died in the House of Representatives. Mr. LONG of Hawaii, introduced the current proposal.

It is required to transfer title to property that is excess to the needs of the Department of the Navy and has been used by the government of American Samoa since July 1, 1951, as existing law does not permit such transfer without reimbursement.

The property to be transferred by the bill was acquired by the Department of the Navy during the period of naval administration of American Samoa. This property comprises 215,845 acres, acquired at a cost of \$68,049.40, and improvements have been constructed at a cost in excess of \$3 million. July 1, 1951, was the effective date of Executive Order No. 10264 of June 29, 1951 (16 F.R. 6419) by which administration of the territory was transferred from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior. The Departments of the Navy and Interior on June 28, 1951, entered into an agreement with respect to the transfer of responsibility for the administration of the government of American Samoa from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior. The agreement provided that the Navy would transfer to the government of American Samoa all land at American Samoa under its control, and the improvements thereon. Since this transfer of responsibility, these lands, buildings, and property have not been used by the Navy and have been utilized by the present government of American Samoa under a revocable permit from the Navy Department.

Special provision is made for any personal property which was located in American Samoa on July 1, 1951, and which was made available to the government of American Samoa by the Department of the Navy, but which has been consumed or disposed of

since such date. The bill provides that title to such property shall be deemed to have been transferred to the government of American Samoa on July 1, 1951. This personal property consisted primarily of quantities of various supplies, including appropriation purchase account materials, Navy stock account materials, and Bureau of Medicine and Surgery materials.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds. This measure simply transfers the property in question from the rolls of the Navy to the rolls of the Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The enactment of this measure is favored by the Department of the Interior and neither the Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, nor the Bureau of the Budget has any objections as indicated by the letter printed below and hereby made a part of this report:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your request for comment on S. 1087, a bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of American Samoa, has been assigned to this Department by the Secretary of Defense for the preparation of a report thereon expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

S. 1087, if enacted, would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to transfer, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the government of American Samoa, title to all property, real and personal, which is located in American Samoa on the date of enactment and which is owned by the United States and within the administrative supervision of the Department of the Navy on such date. The bill requires the transfer of the property to be within 90 days after the date of enactment. Special provision is made for any personal property which was located in American Samoa on July 1, 1951, and which was made available to the government of American Samoa by the Department of the Navy, but which has been consumed or disposed of since such date. The bill provides that title to such property shall be deemed to have been transferred to the government of American Samoa on July 1, 1951.

The property to be transferred by the bill was acquired by the Department of the Navy during the period of naval administration of American Samoa. This property comprises 215,845 acres, acquired at a cost of \$68,049.40, and improvements have been constructed at a cost in excess of \$3 million. July 1, 1951, was the effective date of Executive Order No. 10264 of June 29, 1951 (16 F.R. 6419), by which administration of the territory was transferred from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior. The Departments of the Navy and Interior on June 28, 1951, entered into an agreement with respect to the transfer of responsibility for the administration of the government of American Samoa from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior. The agreement provided that the Navy would transfer to the government of American Samoa all land at American Samoa under its control and the improvements thereon. Since this transfer of responsibility, these lands, buildings, and property have not been used by the Navy and have been utilized by the present government of American Samoa under a revocable permit from the Navy Department.

Evaluation of the military requirements for this property discloses that the property is

excess of current and mobilization requirements.

In view of the foregoing, the Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, interposes no objection to the enactment of S. 1087.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. SAMPSON,
Captain, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief
(For the Secretary of the Navy).

REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO FURNISH ABSTRACTS AND EVIDENCES OF TITLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 456, Senate bill 931.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 931) to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso in the third full paragraph on page 941 of volume 25 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of March 2, 1889, as amended (40 U.S.C. 256), is hereby repealed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 487) is as follows:

The purpose of S. 931 is to repeal the proviso in a paragraph of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended (40 U.S.C. 256), which provides that, in the procurement of sites for public buildings, it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to require of the grantors in each case to furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title that the Attorney General may deem necessary.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The section of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, referred to in S. 931, has application only to a small percentage of the number and value of real property acquisitions of the Government, namely, sites for public buildings as distinct from sites for military reservations and other defense requirements, flood control and reclamation projects, Veterans' Administration facilities, national forests, and other similar Federal acquisitions. The limited applicability of the act places an inequitable burden on grantors who are required to bear the expenses provided for therein.

It is sometimes necessary to acquire sites for public buildings by condemnation, rather than direct purchase, because the title offered for sale to the Government is defective, the Government is unable to agree with the owner of the property as to price, or the time within which the Government must secure title to or possession of the sites is so short that it is not feasible to negotiate with owners of the sites for voluntary sales and for evidences of title. Since the requirement for furnishing of title can only be enforced under the act in cases of direct purchase, the

cost of furnishing evidences of title in condemnation proceedings must be borne by the Government.

There have been instances where a person was willing to donate realty to the Government, but refused to bear the expense of procuring evidences of title. A grantor who cooperates with the Government in a voluntary sale of his property for valuable consideration is required to procure or bear the expense of procuring evidences of title. This has resulted in withdrawal of proposed donations of realty to the Government, undue delays in the acquisition of building sites, added costs to the Government in the prosecution of condemnation actions, and condonation of grantor's avoidance of the requirement to furnish evidences of title.

With repeal of this proviso, existing law makes adequate provision for the procurement of any evidences of title which the Attorney General may deem necessary, and further provides that the expenses of procurement, except where otherwise authorized by law or provided by contract, may be paid out of the appropriations for the acquisition of land or out of the appropriations made for the contingencies of the acquiring department, independent establishment, or agency.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

It is the opinion of the committee that because of this old proviso which S. 931 will repeal, the General Services Administration is the only agency of the Government acquiring land which requires the grantor to furnish the title evidence. This is often circumvented by requesting that the land be acquired by the Attorney General through condemnation proceedings, where this law would not apply. In some cases it may actually foster condemnation proceedings rather than amicable agreement with landowners. Enactment of S. 931 would make the acquisition of sites for public buildings the same as the acquisition of sites for military installations and other facilities. The committee feels that repeal of this proviso will accelerate the acquisition process for sites for public buildings, will not result in a net additional expenditure in the long run, and recommends its enactment.

ESTIMATED COST

Repeal of the proviso by S. 931 would appear to increase the cost to the Government of conveyances of sites for public buildings by the cost of obtaining evidences of title. The extent of the increase would be dependent on the number of sites acquired. It appears that in the long run the Federal Government is now paying for the cost of title evidence. The majority of the public building sites are acquired by condemnation proceedings through the Department of Justice, which pays for the necessary evidences of title. Where sites are acquired by negotiated purchase from the owners, it is assumed that the purchase price includes the cost to the vendor of furnishing satisfactory evidences of title. The increase would apply only to the few donations of property. Accordingly, it is believed probable that a net savings to the Government will result.

AGENCY COMMENTS

This legislation was requested by the Administrator of General Services, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, as shown by the following communication:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith, for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency, to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to

the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961.

The third full paragraph on page 941 of volume 25 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 2, 1889, as amended (40 U.S.C. 256), provides that all legal services connected with the procurement of titles to sites for public buildings, other than for lifesaving stations and pierhead lights, shall be rendered by U.S. attorneys, with the proviso that, in the procurement of such sites, it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to require of the grantors in each case to furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title that the Attorney General may deem necessary.

This section of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, has application only to a small percentage of the number and value of real property acquisitions of the Government, namely, sites for public buildings as distinct from sites for military reservations and other defense requirements, flood and reclamation projects, Veterans' Administration facilities, national forests, and other similar Government acquisitions. The limited applicability of the act places an inequitable burden on grantors who are required to bear the expenses provided for therein.

It is sometimes necessary to acquire sites for public buildings by condemnation, rather than direct purchase, because the title offered for sale to the Government is defective, the Government is unable to agree with the owner of the property as to price, or the time within which the Government must secure title to or possession of the sites is so short that it is not feasible to negotiate with owners of the sites for voluntary sales and for the evidences of title referred to in the act. Since the requirement for furnishing evidences of title can only be enforced under the act in cases of direct purchase, the cost of furnishing evidences of title in condemnation proceedings must be borne by the Government.

Experience has shown that many owners did not receive or procure evidences of title at the time they acquired the realty and are dilatory in, resist the procurement of, or refuse to procure the required evidences of title. If the evidences of title are not furnished by grantors within a reasonable time and the realty is urgently required, the Government must resort to condemnation proceedings.

There have been instances where a person was willing to donate realty to the Government but, not unreasonably, refused to bear the expense of procuring evidences of title. Nor should a grantor who cooperates with the Government in a voluntary sale of his property for valuable consideration be required to procure or bear the expense of procuring evidences of title.

In summary, the statutory requirement that grantors furnish, at their own expense, evidences of title has resulted in withdrawal of proposed donations of realty to the Government, undue delays in the acquisition of building sites, added costs to the Government in the prosecution of condemnation actions, and condonation of the grantor's avoidance of the requirement to furnish evidences of title.

If subject proviso is repealed, section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), makes adequate provision for the procurement of any evidences of title which the Attorney General may deem necessary and further provides that the expenses of procurement, except where otherwise authorized by law or provided by contract, may be paid out of the appropriations for the acquisition of land or out of the appropriations made for the contingencies of the acquiring department, independent establishment, or agency.

Repeal of subject proviso would appear to increase the cost to the Government of conveyances of public building sites by the cost of obtaining evidences of title. However, GSA acquires the majority of its public building sites by condemnation proceedings through the Department of Justice; and the necessary evidences of title are obtained by the Department of Justice and paid for from that Department's appropriated funds. With the exception of a few donations of property, the remaining acquisitions of public building sites by GSA are effected by purchase from the owners; and it is reasonable to assume that a vendor will include in his purchase price to the Government an amount which is more than adequate to protect himself against unforeseen contingent expenses in furnishing evidences of title. Accordingly, it is unlikely that repeal of subject proviso would result in a net additional expenditure of Federal funds. It is probable that there would be a net savings to the Government if, in the case of purchases of property, the Government furnishes at its expense such evidences of title as it deems necessary.

For these reasons, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget by letter dated December 28, 1960, advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 457, Senate bill 51.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 51) to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 3, line 15, after "(c)", to strike out "to the greatest extent practicable", and in line 18, after the word "work", to strike out "subject to such conditions and limitations as may be contained in appropriations made for such work"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Presidential Office Space (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). It shall be the duty of the Commission to initiate and carry out a program of construction and remodeling in accordance with proposals (a) and (c) of plan one of the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, dated May 31, 1957, including remodeling of the east wing of the White House and construction of the necessary access tunnels: Provided, That proposal (a) of said report shall be modified to provide for renovation and remodeling of the old State, War and Navy Building to provide Presidential office space.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of seven members as follows:

- (1) Two Senators appointed by the President of the Senate;
- (2) Two Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;
- (3) Three persons appointed by the President of the United States from the executive branch or from private life.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Commission members appointed from the Congress and the executive branch shall serve without additional compensation. Commission members appointed from private life shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of Commission duties. All Commission members shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of Commission duties.

(e) Within the limits of its appropriations, the Commission is authorized to appoint such personnel, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary.

SEC. 3. In the performance of its duties the Commission shall—

(a) after consultation with the President, approve all design, construction, interior decorating and landscaping plans;

(b) determine the methods for selecting and approve the selection of the architect;

(c) utilize the services of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, in awarding contracts for the performance of the construction work; and in supervising the progress of such design and construction work;

(d) take measures to assure that all lumber, fixtures, and other materials removed from the Executive Mansion or other buildings are carefully examined by appropriate Federal or other authorities for the purpose of segregating and safeguarding any of such materials which are of such historical importance that they should be permanently preserved;

(e) provide for (1) the preservation of any such material which is of permanent historical importance and (2) the sale, donation, destruction, or other disposition of the remainder of such material in the manner most consistent with its symbolical value and without commercial exploitation;

(f) from time to time, but at least once annually submit to the Congress and the President a report on the progress of the work under its supervision. Upon the conclusion of its work the Commission shall promptly submit a final report;

(g) the Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its final report.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Commission, including funds for such construction, remodeling, renovation, and equipment as the Commission may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 488) is as follows:

The purpose of S. 51, as amended, is to establish a Commission on Presidential Office Space and authorize it to carry out a program of construction and remodeling in accordance with proposals (a) and (c) of plan 1 of the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, dated May 31, 1957, including remodeling of the east wing of the White House and construction of the necessary tunnels, with proposal (a) modified to provide for renovation and remodeling of the old State, War, and Navy Building to provide Presidential office space.

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 51, as amended, would authorize establishment of a Commission on Presidential Office Space. The Commission would be composed of seven members, two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three persons appointed by the President of the United States from the executive branch or from private life. Commission members appointed from the Congress and the executive branch would serve without additional compensation. Members appointed from private life would receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of Commission duties. All Commission members would receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of Commission duties.

It would be the duties of the Commission,

after consultation with the President occupying the White House at that time, to approve all design and construction plans, determine the methods for selecting and approve the selection of the Architect, and to utilize the services of the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, in awarding contracts for the construction work and in supervising the progress of the design and construction work. Such work performed by the Chief of Engineers would be on a reimbursable basis. Measures would be taken to assure that all lumber, fixtures, and other materials removed from the Executive Mansion or other buildings are carefully examined to determine their historical value, and their proper preservation and distribution. Reports on progress of the work would be submitted to the Congress and the President from time to time, but at least once annually. Upon conclusion of its work the Commission would promptly submit a final report, and would cease to exist 30 days after such submission.

The report of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space was published as House Document No. 211, 85th Congress. The proposals of plan 1 that would be authorized by S. 51, are essentially the same as plan 5 of the report, and are as follows:

(a) Renovate and remodel the old State, War, and Navy Building, in lieu of constructing a new building to house only the White House Office on the site, extend the White House grounds to include the site and building, and connect it to the White House by tunnel.

(c) Remodel the West Wing of the White House for use as quarters for visiting dignitaries.

S. 51 would also authorize remodeling of the East Wing of the White House. This was considered by the Advisory Commission to be a constant feature of all plans studied. It is used as an adjunct to the West Wing for office space, but is inconvenient because of the distance involved. It is proposed that the remodeled East Wing be occupied by the social staff of the President and First Lady, the White House Police, for gallery and museum purposes, and similar activities not directly related to operations of the White House Office.

The bill authorizes the Commission to appoint its own staff, which it is believed would not be large. The committee is of the opinion that an existing engineering and construction organization could be advantageously and economically used in supervising the design and construction of the improvements, and that such work could be performed by the Corps of Engineers rapidly, efficiently, and at minimum cost.

The other feature (b) of plan 1 of the Advisory Commission provided for other organizational units of the Executive Office to

be housed in Federal Office Building No. 7 to be located on the square north of Pennsylvania Avenue between Jackson Place and 17th Street, and connect it to the White House Office building by a tunnel. Construction of that building has been authorized and funds appropriated for design, site acquisition, and initiation of construction.

DISCUSSION

For the first 110 years of our Nation's history the offices of the President were housed in a structure designed and intended for residential purposes. Official business activities were intermingled with personal and family activities. Only the impacts and pressures of office requirements upon the family needs of the President eventually raised the question of suitable facilities for the Office of the President. Even then the response to the old question was construction of the temporary West Wing in 1902. Since that time each recurring need for larger and more efficient quarters for the President and his office staff was partly satisfied by makeshift improvements or by the alteration of a structure originally built as a temporary addition to the White House.

To meet the changing requirements of the President's Office the West Wing has been successively altered and enlarged and other structures obtained. That wing was completely rebuilt in 1934, but a plan approved in 1946 to enlarge it was later rescinded. The East Wing was built and occupied in 1942. The State Department activities were removed from the State, War, and Navy Building in 1947. The building was then reassigned for use by the offices of the President and renamed the Executive Office Building. That building is in bad condition, and contains many deficiencies in design, space arrangement, and location, and does not solve the problem of housing the President's Office with its attendant functions.

Within the field of Federal administration during the periods of our Nation's growth in size, population, greatness, and responsibility, large office buildings like the Pentagon, Interior, Agriculture, General Accounting Office, House Office Building, and Senate Office Buildings, were carefully planned, designed, and built to accommodate Government agencies in accordance with their particular needs. Many other large office buildings have been authorized, are under construction, or have been completed at and in the vicinity of our seat of Government.

The offices of the President, however, have never operated in structures planned, designed, and constructed to serve their own unique functions. The result is that the office facilities of the Chief Executive of the United States are outmoded, overcrowded, inefficient, and not consistent with effective and well-coordinated management of the highest office of the executive branch of the Government.

The President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space gave careful study and consideration to various plans to provide adequate and efficient housing for the Executive Office of the President over a long period of time. The plan recommended in its report will provide a solution to the problem.

ESTIMATED COST

The estimated cost of the work that would be authorized by S. 51, as presented in House Document 211, 85th Congress, based on construction costs current in 1957, is as follows:

(a) Renovate and remodel the old State, War, and Navy Building and connect it to the White House by tunnel.....	\$12,000,000
(c) Remodel west wing of the White House.....	1,270,000
Total.....	13,270,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee considers it of utmost importance to provide adequate space and facilities for the Executive Mansion and the Executive Office commensurate with the dignity and importance of the high position of the President of the United States. It believes that enactment of S. 51, will provide the necessary authorization to fulfill the needs of the White House Office, provide security and privacy for the President and his Office, and retain and enhance the traditional character of the White House and its surroundings.

U.S. OFFENSIVE IN COLD WAR WITH RUSSIA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Oskaloosa Daily Herald of June 30 entitled "Why Can't U.S.A. Take Offensive in Cold War With Russia?"

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

WHY CAN'T U.S.A. TAKE OFFENSIVE IN COLD WAR WITH RUSSIA?

Why must the United States always be on the defensive when Mr. K. and the Communists are involved? Just once we would like to know that America, land of the free and home of the brave, has taken the initiative in the cold war.

Almost every day we read of failures in our foreign policies, with every evidence we are losing ground in the struggle to control men's minds and preserve the ideals of freedom.

Entrenched bureaucracy bears the brunt of criticism, and its power is so strong that even our national administrations can make no headway toward the application of common sense in our affairs with the nations of the world.

The military is blamed with bureaucracy, too, but even this one bulwark of defense of the homeland bows to sacrosanct meddling of the fumbling underlings of the State Department, foreign aid, and national policy.

The Russians have a realistic goal of world domination and never hesitate to apply the psychological approaches that gain ground, enslave free peoples, and counter our moves. The Red goal never changes, even though the antics of the Communist leaders may shift from brotherly love to hate and back overnight.

Just because we are pledged not to fire the first shot is no excuse for holding our diplomatic and counterintelligence punches until the Reds land the first blow. Recently we have been so wrong in our timing—in Cuba, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Laos, and now in South America.

These are days when America could use another Teddy Roosevelt, who is remembered for his "Fear God and take your own part" and "Speak softly and carry a big stick."

CREDIT OF CERTAIN SERVICE FOR PENSION PURPOSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 459, House bill 2953.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 2953) to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 490) is as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the tacking of two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war. For example, World War I, and World War II, or during World War II and the Korean conflict in order to qualify under the 90-day-service requirement for non-service-connected pension.

The Veterans' Administration has reported:

"In meeting the days-of-service requirement, two or more periods of service separated by as much as several years during the same period of war may be tacked; but the combining of separate periods of service in different periods of war is not authorized, even though the interval might be shorter. We see no basis for this distinction, and accordingly favor enactment of H.R. 2953 * * *."

The Veterans' Administration advises that this bill would be negligible as to cost.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,

April 3, 1961.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This report on H.R. 2953, 87th Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 6, 1961, is furnished in response to your request.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the tacking of two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war in satisfying the 90 days' service requirement for payment of non-service-connected disability pension to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Tacking would also be authorized in determining the eligibility of their widows and children for non-service-connected death pension.

The bill is substantially the same as H.R. 8098, 86th Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives on May 2, 1960. The bill was pending before your committee at the close of that Congress.

Where other requirements are met, pension is authorized for veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, who served (1) 90 days or more during one of those periods, or less if discharged for a service-connected disability, or (2) 90 consecutive days or more ending during World War I, or beginning or ending during World War II or the Korean conflict. These service requirements also serve as a basis for payment of death pension benefits to the widows and children of these veterans.

In meeting the days-of-service requirement, two or more periods of service separated by as much as several years during the same period of war may be tacked; but the combining of separate periods of service in different periods of war is not authorized, even though the interval might be shorter. We see no basis for this distinction, and accordingly favor enactment of H.R. 2953.

It is not possible to furnish an estimate of the cost of H.R. 2953 if enacted. However, it is believed that the cost would be negligible.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget with respect to a similar report of February 20, 1961, on the bill to the chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that there was no objection to the presentation of that report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,
J. S. GLEASON, JR.,
Administrator.

DECISIONS ON APPEALS BY BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 460, House bill 866.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 866) to amend section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 491) is as follows:

The bill requires that decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals shall be in writing and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated.

The following excerpt from the report by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, giving the background of the bill, is reprinted for the information of the Senate.

"A special subcommittee composed of experienced lawyers held hearings from April 5 to May 3, 1960, on various bills to provide for judicial review of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. During the course of these hearings it was established that opinions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals did not contain findings of fact and conclusions of law and that it was not possible to tell from the opinion of the Board what basic facts were found to exist or what conclusions of the law the Board considered applicable. All the opinions at that time were merely narrative recitations of a portion of the evidence with generalized statements of law so that it was impossible to tell from decisions of the Board why a particular claim was either allowed or denied. Following these hearings the Board has experimented with a revised format for its decisions to more clearly set forth its findings and conclusions. While recent examples of Board decisions which have been made available to the committee represent an improvement, the committee believes that this requirement is one of fundamental importance and should be a matter of law rather than administrative practice.

"The committee believes that careful consideration of any claim requires analysis of all of the evidence with a determination of all the material facts which are found to have been proven. It is only when a determination of the material facts has been made that it is possible to decide the rules of law which must be applied. In the view of the committee a principal reason for requiring the Board to make findings of fact and conclusions of law is that it requires the members of the Board to use more care in the analysis and decision of each case that comes before it.

"The hearings in the 86th Congress of the special subcommittee resulted in the reporting of H.R. 12653, a bill to establish a special court with exclusive appellate jurisdiction over decisions of the Administrator. The question of requiring the Board to make findings of fact and conclusions of law was extensively considered during the course of the hearings but was not included in H.R. 12653, as the committee believes that this matter should more appropriately be considered in a separate bill. If a separate appellate court is established as provided by H.R. 12653, this bill will have another important purpose which was expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States as follows: 'the orderly functioning of the process of review requires that the grounds upon which the administrative agency acted be clearly disclosed and adequately sustained

(*SEC v. Chenev Corp.*, 318 U.S. 80, 93, 63, S. Ct. 454, 462, 87 L. Ed. 626-1943).'

"H.R. 849, 87th Congress, and other bills provide for the creation of such a court.

"The committee feels that the importance of requiring findings of fact and conclusions of law by the Board cannot be overemphasized and that it is fundamental to the successful exercise of appellate review. Since it also has an important function entirely unrelated to the review process, that is, the improvement of administrative adjudication, it should be considered in a separate bill. While, as recognized above, the Board of Veterans' Appeals has made changes in the format of its decisions along the lines contemplated by this bill, the committee believes it well to have such a provision written into the law.

"An independent tribunal with appellate jurisdiction of veterans' claims was established in England more than 40 years ago. A typical example of the 'statement of case for hearing' in connection with an appeal from the Ministry of Pensions to the Pension Appeal Tribunal appears hereafter in this report.

"The committee does not consider it proper to direct that this particular form shall be used by the Administrator as a statement of findings of fact and conclusions of law. Examples are included for purposes of information and to show the contrast with the format employed until very recently for opinions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals—two examples of which appear thereafter. There are also included examples of recent board opinions in the new format which shows that improvement can result from more clearly stating the findings and conclusions underlying a decision. However, while the committee believes an improvement has been made by the new format, material facts have been omitted in some cases and so-called conclusions of law have failed to cite the applicable section of the appropriate law."

COST

The bill does not increase or create any new benefits. It does not create any new positions, so it does not result in any estimable increased cost. It is expected the bill will ultimately result in savings in administrative costs by reducing the number of claims and * * * the numbers of persons employed in administrative adjudication.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS FOR BENEFITS TO VETERANS DISCHARGED BEFORE DECEMBER 31, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 461, House bill 6269.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 6269) to extend the provisions for benefits based on limited periods immediately following discharge from active duty after December 31, 1956, to veterans discharged before that date was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 492) is as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill seeks to amend appropriate provisions of title 38, United States Code, to provide that in all cases whenever a veteran is discharged or released from active duty he shall be deemed to continue on such duty during the period of time immediately following the date of such discharge or release required for him to proceed to his home by

the most direct route and, in any event, until midnight of the date of such discharge or release. The present law has this provision in effect for only those cases separated from active duty after December 31, 1956.

The Veterans' Administration recommended this proposal in a formal submission to the Congress and the committee concurs in the finding of the Veterans' Administration that this legislation "would achieve a desirable uniformity of treatment which would eliminate the rather arbitrary distinction based on when the discharge occurred."

The Veterans' Administration cannot estimate the number of individuals involved but does state the number would not be large and, accordingly, the cost would be relatively small. In this connection it should be borne in mind that no monetary benefits would accrue under the amendment prior to the date of enactment.

The report of the Veterans' Administration follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill to extend the provisions for benefits based on limited periods immediately following discharge from active duty after December 31, 1956, to veterans discharged before that date, with the request that it be introduced in order that it may be considered for enactment.

The proposed bill would amend section 106(c) of title 38, United States Code, to provide, in all cases, that whenever an individual is discharged or released from active duty he shall be deemed to continue on such duty—for the purpose of veterans' benefits—during the period of time immediately following the date of such discharge or release required for him to proceed to his home by the most direct route, and in any event until midnight of the date of such discharge or release. This rule is now limited by section 106(c) to those separated from active duty after December 31, 1956.

Historically, the existing law is an outgrowth of section 102(12) of the Service-men's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act. That law, which became effective January 1, 1957, applied the principle to the new program of dependency and indemnity compensation which it established for service-connected deaths. When this principle was later extended to all veterans' benefits, it was not made applicable to discharges or releases earlier than 1957.

The proposed bill would achieve a desirable uniformity of treatment which would eliminate the rather arbitrary distinction based on when the discharge occurred. Moreover, we do not anticipate that serious administrative difficulties would be encountered if this bill is enacted, even though it will involve a few cases of persons discharged from service many years ago.

The cost of the proposed legislation would depend primarily on the number of individuals who, prior to January 1, 1957, suffered injury, disease, or death during the period from time of notice of discharge to midnight of the date of such discharge or release, or until the termination of the period of necessary travel time if later. We are unable to estimate the number of such individuals who would thereby become eligible for veterans' benefits. The number affected, however, would not be large and accordingly the cost would be relatively small. It should also be noted that under this proposal no monetary benefits would accrue under the amendment prior to the date of enactment.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS OF VETERANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 462, House bill 7148.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 7148) to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 493) is as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill provides that if a veteran dies at a Veterans' Administration facility in any State, including territories, District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, the remains may be transported to the place of burial in any State or the Canal Zone.

Present authority permits the Veterans' Administration to transport the body to a place of burial in the continental United States or Hawaii when the veteran dies in a Veterans' Administration facility located in the continental United States or Hawaii. The body, however, may not be transported to a place of burial which is within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or any territory or possession of the United States, unless death occurs in a VA facility located in the commonwealth, territory, or possession.

Since the enactment of Public Law 86-624, the Hawaii Omnibus Act, the Veterans' Administration has been in the position that if a veteran dies while hospitalized in a facility located within the continental limits, the body may be transported to Hawaii, as an example, but not to Puerto Rico even though the veteran may have been transferred by the Veterans' Administration to the United States from Puerto Rico for treatment purposes.

The Veterans' Administration, which requested this legislation in a formal submission to the Congress, believes that it will not involve more than 12 or 15 cases in any one year and the annual cost would not exceed \$5,000.

The report of the Veterans' Administration follows:

MAY 11, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a bill to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial.

The bill would amend section 903(b) of title 38, United States Code. This subsection now provides that when a veteran, properly admitted for hospital or domiciliary care, dies in a Veterans' Administration facility in the continental United States or in Hawaii the body may be transported to the place of burial in the continental United States or Hawaii. The body may not be transported to a place of burial which is in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in a

territory or possession of the United States. To the contrary, if such a death occurs in Puerto Rico or in a territory or possession, the body may only be transported to the place of burial when such is within Puerto Rico, the territory or the possession; i.e., in whichever death occurs.

Our proposal would provide that if a veteran dies in a Veterans' Administration facility in any "State," as defined generally for purposes of title 38 (i.e., each of several States, territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico), or the Canal Zone, the remains may be transported to the place of burial in any State (as so defined) or the Canal Zone.

From 1925 to its repeal in 1933, the World War Veterans Act, 1924, provided for transportation to the place of burial within the continental United States, its territories, or possessions of the body of a veteran of any war who died away from home and at a place to which he had been ordered for the purpose of receiving medical, surgical, or hospital care. Under the Veterans Regulations issued pursuant to the Economy Act (Public Law 2, 73d Cong.), transportation was permitted only to the place of residence, the nearest national cemetery, or any other place requested by the next of kin if the expense in respect thereof would not be greater than to the place of residence. No authority was contained under the Veterans Regulations for the transportation of the body outside the continental United States.

The policy established in 1933 has been liberalized on three subsequent occasions. The most recent amendment was made by the Hawaii Omnibus Act (Public Law 86-624) to authorize the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to be transported to and from Hawaii on the same basis as is permitted with respect to any of the other 50 States.

Since the enactment of the Hawaii Omnibus Act we have the rather incongruous situation that if a veteran dies while hospitalized in one of our facilities anywhere in the continental United States we may transport the body to Hawaii, but not to Puerto Rico—even though the veteran may have been transferred by the Veterans' Administration to the United States from Puerto Rico for treatment purposes. We see no logical reason for continuing this unequal treatment.

We are unable to estimate the cost of this legislation with any exactness but we believe that it is unlikely to be more than 12 or 15 affected cases in any one year and that consequently the annual cost would not exceed \$5,000.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report to the committee.

Sincerely,

Deputy Administrator
(For and in the absence of
J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT OF TITLE VI OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the next measure on the calendar, Calendar No. 463, is Senate bill 1690, to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, in order to increase certain limitations in payments on account of operating-differential subsidy under such title. That measure will not

be brought up today; but I wish to serve notice on the Senate that it may well be brought up next week.

MELVIN H. BAKER AND FRANCES V. BAKER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 464, House bill 4206.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 4206) for the relief of Melvin H. Baker and Frances V. Baker was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 495) is as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay \$12,760.04 to Melvin H. Baker and Frances V. Baker of Buffalo, N.Y., in full settlement of their claims against the United States based on an overpayment of their income tax for the year as the result of the erroneous inclusion of a dividend paid in 1954 in the 1953 income tax return.

STATEMENT

The facts and circumstances surrounding this claim and the recommendations of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives thereon are contained in House Report No. 117, as follows:

"On March 16, 1954, Mr. and Mrs. Baker filed their joint income tax return for the calendar year 1953. As has been noted in the Treasury Department report to this committee on the bill, that return reported as income a dividend which was not actually received during that calendar year. This was a dividend of the National Gypsum Co. which was declared on October 27, 1953, which was to be payable to those stockholders who were record owners of stock on December 14, 1953. However, the dividend was payable on January 4, 1954, and therefore the amount paid was not available in 1953. As an actual fact, it was not received by the taxpayers until January of 1954. Therefore the inclusion of the amount of the dividend in the 1953 return was clearly erroneous. This error was not discovered until 1958 when Mr. and Mrs. Baker were considering some estate and gift tax matters.

"The dividend of \$15,293.60 was also correctly included in the return for 1954 as taxable income. The erroneous inclusion of the same amount in the 1953 return resulted in an overpayment of Federal income taxes for that year of \$12,760.04, and this is the amount which is stated in H.R. 1593.

"This committee has carefully considered the question of relief under these circumstances, and has concluded that this is a proper case for legislative relief. It is unfair for these taxpayers to have to pay taxes on the same income twice. While the Treasury Department questions relief because of the general situation regarding limitations periods, it does not appear from the report of that Department that there is any question concerning the reporting of the income or the amount paid. It is difficult to see how the retention of this overpayment could be justified if it were not for the fact that a claim was not filed within the period referred to in the Treasury report. In fact that report states "If a timely claim had been filed, the taxpayers would have been entitled to the amount stated in the bill." Accordingly the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

The committee agrees with the conclusions reached by the House and it is, therefore, recommended that H.R. 4206 be favorably considered.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to the Congress on the proposed legislation.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 27, 1959.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of January 19, 1959, for this Department's views on H.R. 1593 (86th Cong., 1st sess.), entitled "A bill for the relief of Melvin H. Baker and Frances V. Baker."

H.R. 1593 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of \$12,760.04 to Melvin H. Baker and Frances V. Baker, of Buffalo, N.Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. The bill recites that such sum represents overpayment in income tax for the year 1953 as a result of the inclusion of a dividend from National Gypsum Co. declared on October 27, 1953, but not payable until January 4, 1954.

The records of the Internal Revenue Service disclose that Mr. and Mrs. Baker filed a joint income-tax return for the calendar year 1953 on March 16, 1954, with the office of the district director, Buffalo, N.Y. On this return there was reported as income a dividend which was not actually received.

The 3-year period of limitations for filing a claim for refund of income tax paid with the return for 1953 expired on March 16, 1957. The taxpayers did not file a claim for refund within the prescribed period. If a timely claim had been filed, the taxpayers would have been entitled to the amount stated in the bill.

The Department is not aware of any reason justifying the failure of the taxpayers to file a claim for refund within the 3-year period prescribed by law. It would appear that it is a matter peculiarly within a taxpayer's own knowledge as to whether he has or has not received a dividend in a particular year.

Congress has determined it to be a sound policy to include in the revenue system a statute of limitations which, after a reasonable period of time, bars taxpayers from obtaining refunds of tax overpayments and bars the Government from collecting additional taxes. Such a provision is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. In the absence of special circumstances, which do not appear here, granting special relief would discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated and would constitute an undesirable precedent.

In view of the foregoing, the Treasury Department is opposed to the enactment of H.R. 1593.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID A. LINDSAY,
Assistant to the Secretary.

STATUS OF NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS GRADUATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 465, House bill 4349.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 4349) to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates in a status comparable with U.S. Naval Academy graduates was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 496) is as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to place the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps (Regular) graduates in a status comparable to that of U.S. Naval Academy graduates, with respect to the form of the Regular commission received by members of this corps.

DISCUSSION OF THE BILL

This bill relates to the form of the Regular commission received by the Regular Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates. This legislation neither increases, decreases, nor otherwise affects the period of obligated service for these graduates.

These Regular graduates are those who are appointed as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve upon entering the NROTC as a freshman in college, and who obligate themselves to accept upon graduation an appointment in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps. These individuals should not be confused with the NROTC (contract) students who agree only to serve in the Reserve after graduation. The bill does not apply in any way to this latter group.

Under present law, the Regular graduates obligate themselves upon entry as a freshman to serve on duty a minimum of 3 years as a Regular officer following graduation. This period was increased administratively to 4 years several years ago for the new entering classes.

Under existing law, these graduates, before they have completed 30 months of active service, must make application for retention in active service as a Regular officer in the event that they decide to make a career in the Navy or Marine Corps. If they fail to make application, their Regular commission is terminated at the end of their 36 months of service and they serve their remaining obligation as a member of the Reserve. In effect, therefore, under existing law they must request to stay in as a Regular officer in the Navy or Marine Corps.

The bill repeals existing provisions of law relating to the requirement for application to remain on active duty as a Regular officer. As a result of this bill, these officers will have to make application in order to get out of the service at the expiration of their obligated tour. As noted above, under existing provisions an officer in this category must apply if he wishes to remain in the active service as a Regular officer. The procedure provided in this bill is the same as that now applicable to the U.S. Naval Academy.

Both the Navy and Marine Corps urgently need a greater portion of the NROTC graduates to undertake a permanent career as a Regular officer. The Navy highly recommends this bill as assisting in this matter, since it repeals one of the distinctions in the form of the Regular commissions now awarded to this group as compared to the commission received by the graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy.

COST

The Department of Defense advised that this legislation has no cost implications.

PERMANENT INDEFINITE APPROPRIATION TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 466, Senate bill 739.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 739) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to the method of computing interest

earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, to provide for permanent indefinite appropriation to said fund, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out the comma and "(a)"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "three" and insert "four", and, after line 19, to strike out:

(b) Subsection (c) of said section 17 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) There is hereby appropriated to the fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next following the date of enactment of this amendatory paragraph, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such amount as may be required to prevent the estimated balance in the fund at the end of any such fiscal year from being less than the estimated total of lump sum credits and voluntary contribution accounts of present and former employees or Members, minus the estimated total of annuity payments made to such employees or Members or to the survivors of such employees or Members, and chargeable to such credits and accounts."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 17 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, 70 Stat. 759 (5 U.S.C. 2267), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of public-debt obligations for purchase by the fund. Such obligations issued for purchase by the fund shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield computed as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of four years from the end of such calendar month, except that where such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest on such obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such average market yield. The Secretary of the Treasury may purchase other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States, on original issue or at the market price only if he determines that such purchases are in the public interest."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to the method of computing interest earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund."

The excerpt from the report (No. 497) is as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this measure is to provide a method for fixing a fair and equitable rate

of interest on money borrowed by the U.S. Treasury from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

BACKGROUND

Retirement and disability fund

The civil service retirement and disability fund was created by the original Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920. Deductions from employees' salaries (including Members of Congress), matching amounts contributed by the Government, appropriations from the general fund of the Government, interest earned on fund investments, and donations, gifts, and legacies made for the benefit of civil service employees are credited to the fund.

The fund is a separate entity within the total financial structure of the Government and reflects the fiscal posture of the civil service retirement system. The Retirement Act requires that any balance in the fund not needed for current payments of benefits or refunds shall be invested in Government bonds.

Currently, slightly in excess of \$10 billion of the fund is invested in Government bonds.

Interest rates

(1) 1920 to 1954: During this 34-year period, the interest was fixed at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury at a constant rate of 4 percent on all but a relatively small amount in the fund representing voluntary contributions by employees, which was invested at a fixed rate of 3 percent.

(2) 1954 to 1956: Effective July 1, 1954, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to his authority under the Retirement Act reduced the rate of interest to 3 percent.

(3) 1956 to present: Public Law 854, 84th Congress, amended the Retirement Act at the request of the administration to provide that the rate of interest be equal to the average coupon rate (rounded to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent) borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of 5 years from the date of original issue. Initially, the rate of interest under this formula amounted to 2½ percent. Currently, the rate is 2½ percent.

COMMENT

The administration and the committee agree that the present law which measures the interest rate on the basis of borrowing costs in past years is improper and should be replaced by a formula which takes into account what the Government is required to pay currently in the open market for its new borrowings. Under such a formula the retirement fund would be neither subsidized nor penalized, and the U.S. Treasury would neither be given a bargain nor forced to pay a premium. The present coupon rate formula currently provides a rate of 2½ percent on retirement funds newly invested. The market yields formula would provide a rate of some 3½ percent on newly invested funds.

Under the bill, the new formula would apply only to future investments. Special issues presently held by the fund would be allowed to mature gradually over a 15-year period. Thus, the fund would benefit to the extent of some \$6 million additional interest the first year and a cumulative like amount in each succeeding year over a span of 15 years, at which time the total increase in interest would amount to between \$90 and \$100 million a year.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A public hearing on this measure was held May 12, 1961. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission and many employee organizations testified in support of this measure. No adverse testimony was received from any source.

AGENCY VIEWS

Following are letters from the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission supporting enactment of this measure:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Senate Report No. 1656, 85th Congress, 2d session (covering H.R. 11574, independent offices appropriation bill, 1959), requested that the Commission, in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office and on the basis of new quinquennial valuation of the civil service retirement system by the Board of Actuaries, submit recommendations for keeping the retirement fund current and providing for the Government's future liabilities on a sound basis.

In response to this request, the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget on November 19, 1959, submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations their joint report and recommendation on financing the retirement system. Copies of this report are attached. Separate report on the subject was submitted by the Comptroller General of the United States.

In his 1961 budget message presented January 18, 1960, the President proposed enactment of the joint Commission-Budget Bureau recommendations on a long-range policy of financing the retirement fund. Two items in the joint report are of special concern to the Commission.

The Commission recommends a change in that part of the law prescribing the method for determining interest rate on investments of the civil service retirement and disability fund. The Retirement Act now provides for investment of the fund in special issues which bear interest based on the average rate borne by all Treasury marketable interest-bearing bonds with maturities of 5 years or more from the date of issue. This formula, based on coupon rates, presently gives the fund an interest rate lower than that paid by the Treasury on current borrowing for equivalent periods from other sources. Section 17(d) of the act should be amended to authorize payment of interest at a rate equal to market yields of issues not due or callable until after the expiration of 3 years. If such a new standard were established, the Treasury Department would reinvest the fund at the new rate as its present holdings mature. Thus, conversion of the investments to the new basis would take a number of years, producing a gradual increase in the rate of earnings toward an ultimate level of 4 percent or thereabouts, if present money market conditions prevail for a considerable period.

The Commission firmly believes that employee contributions to the system should be maintained in the fund on a fully funded basis. As to the Government's liability, we also believe it would be desirable to provide a clear and definite legislative indication that the benefits promised in the Civil Service Retirement Act are underwritten by the full faith and credit of the United States. This could be done by making provision for automatic appropriations to the retirement fund to supplement agency contributions when necessary to assure that the benefits provided by the system can be paid without reducing the balance in the fund below the total to the credit of employees. Adoption of this recommendation will assure that the employees' contributions are at all times protected and that financial means will be available when needed to meet the Government's share of benefit payments. This approach would assure that the fund would not decline below the amount to the credit of the employees, which is estimated to level off at around \$9.5 billion. While authorization of a permanent appropriation would

be an exception to the desirable policy of annual appropriations which are reviewed by the Appropriations Committees, we believe this exception is justified as a means of preserving the equity in the fund which employees build up through required or voluntary contributions.

Draft of bill to cover these items is attached. The Commission strongly recommends that this legislation be introduced and enacted into law.

The Bureau of the Budget advised on January 16, 1961, that it continues to support this legislative proposal as its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1961.
Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 17, 1961, Roger W. Jones, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission at that time, transmitted to the President of the Senate proposed legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to the method of computing interest earnings of special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, to provide for permanent indefinite appropriation to said fund, and for other purposes.

For your convenience, a copy of the proposal is attached.

A bill, S. 739, to carry out the proposed legislation was introduced by you on January 31, 1961.

Recently, the Commission has reviewed this proposal and continues to recommend strongly that the legislation be enacted into law.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the Commission's continued support of the proposed legislation.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1154, so that the bill will be laid before the Senate as the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

SCHOOL BAND TO TOUR EUROPE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article that gives me a great sense of pride in our fellow Americans. Seventy-five young musicians, accompanied by their director, his assistants, and chaperons, are giving of their

time, talent, and funds to extend the hand of friendship throughout Europe and are representing America, through the endorsement of the people-to-people program. No Federal assistance to underwrite expenses was accepted. This is a project sponsored by individuals and private concerns who are interested in the exchange of ideas with the peoples of countries across the seas.

I am confident, of course, that this project will generate a great reservoir of good will. I am quite happy to know, among other things, that some 21 of the young musicians will be from the State of Illinois. That is a great tribute to the musical talent being developed in our State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "School Band To Tour Europe," which was published in the Republican-Times, of Ottawa, Ill., on Monday, June 26, 1961.

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

SCHOOL BAND TO TOUR EUROPE

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—A project 10 years in the making—the School Band of America—moved toward its goal today, a 4-week tour of Western Europe.

The 51 boys and 24 girls between the ages of 15 and 21 that form the band began assembling in New York City for a plane trip to London Tuesday. The group includes 22 Illinois student musicians.

In Europe it will play nine concerts, starting July 2 in London.

Interspersing the concert appearances will be tours of points of interest in England, Holland, Belgium, Western Germany, Switzerland, and France. The group will return July 24.

Although the School Band of America is on a good will tour during which its 75 members hope to exchange ideas with their counterparts in Europe, each is paying his or her way or having paid by a sponsoring group in this country.

The project was first considered in 1951 by Edward T. Harn, coordinator of music education for the Bloomington schools. Harn says he mulled over the idea until 1959, when he took a trip to Europe and asked music teachers there how they felt about a tour by an American student band.

Their enthusiasm, he said, sent him back determined to promote a trip.

In October 1960 details of the forthcoming tour were spelled out in a nationally circulated musicians' magazine and within 30 days, Harn said, some 250 youthful musicians had applied.

Audition centers conducted by music teachers were set up in Massachusetts, Ohio, California, and in Bloomington. Applicants who could not attend the auditions submitted tape recordings and character references.

From the 250 applicants, Harn selected the 75.

Harn said he obtained endorsement of President John F. Kennedy's People-to-People Music Committee but turned down a proposed Government grant of \$70,000 to aid the project.

Each band member paid \$755 to cover costs of the 4-week trip.

Where a member was unable to pay the trip cost, a group in his home community underwrote the expenses.

To meet the cost of orchestrations, instruments and other equipment, Harn said he called on old friends and associates. They spread the word, he said, and soon manufacturers and musical instruments and music publishers swamped him with offers.

One firm loaned the band four \$800 bass horns and eleven \$350 cornets; another firm supplied the percussion instruments; music stands came from a third firm; the U.S. Navy loaned arrangements of the national anthems of countries the band will visit; a publishing company gave Harn some dance band arrangements.

Via chartered flight, the band, Harn, 3 assistant directors and 13 chaperons fly to England to begin 3 days of rehearsals at Ramsgate. The band plays its first concert July 2 at Victoria Embankment Gardens in London, its second the next day at Stratford-on-Avon.

Harn has taught music in Illinois schools for 18 years. He received his master's degree from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Illinois musicians in the band include:

Mary Finnigan, Crystal Lake; Barbara Stumm, Bloomington; Pamela Backus, Harvard; David Gershenson, Fairfield; Edward Zentera, Glenwood; Jack Allen, Champaign; Albert Carnine, Bloomington; Rita Mentzer, Normal; Nancy Hampton, Glenwood; John Landefeld, Western Springs; Guy Parks, Batavia, and Tom Reeves, Belvidere;

Also William Epperson, Centralia; Kent Gummerman, Bloomington; Steve Rettemayer, Canton; Neal Tidwell, Centralia; Kathleen Farr, Canton; Linda Sweetin, Bloomington; Arthur Elff, Bloomington; John Barr, Lisle; Janalee Francis, Gibson City, and Robert Armour, Belvidere.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that in accordance, I believe, with assurances given by the majority leader, no record votes will be taken today on the cultural and educational exchange bill or on any of the amendments which may be submitted to it.

My understanding is that there are some 10 amendments to be offered. I am further informed that perhaps as many as six rollcalls will be requested.

I think now it is assured that there will be no yea-and-nay votes today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that there will be no yea-and-nay votes today, but it is the hope of the leadership that we can have some debate on S. 1154, the cultural exchange bill, so that we can be prepared—again, I hope, on a time-allocated basis—to proceed to the conclusion of that bill on Monday.

It is further anticipated that next week we shall very likely bring up:

Senate bill 901, the oceanography bill. S. 2043, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

S. 1459, a bill to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees.

S. 1488, a bill to amend section 508 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to attorneys' salaries.

S. 1690, a bill to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

Then one bill which was not brought up today was H.R. 6611, an act to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes.

It was felt, in view of the nature of this particular proposal, it would be better to bring it up next week.

That will be the schedule, and I urge on all Members of the Senate, and I know the minority leader joins me, to be prepared to be on the floor every day from Monday next until we adjourn sometime in the summer—or later, in the fall.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to ask the majority leader another question. So that we may make some specific preparation, would it be the majority leader's intention, after action on the pending bill, the consideration of which we shall resume on Monday, to consider the oceanography bill, which, in my judgment, is also quite controversial?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that is the wish of the minority leader, we will be delighted to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

NEW YORK TIMES PRAISES KENNEDY FARM PROPOSALS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when the New York Times praises administration farm programs, it is news. The New York Times has viewed the Nation's farm problems consistently from the standpoint of the consumer and especially the taxpayer.

Thursday morning the New York Times carried an editorial praising the good sense in the administration's proposed wheat and feed grain bills.

The editorial properly contends that farmers must pay the price of limiting production if they are to enjoy improved income.

Mr. President, the administration's farm program is going to accomplish the dual purposes of reducing the heavy cost of the farm program while improving depressed farm income. What has been for a long time one of the most serious economic problems and burdens in America—overproduction on the farm—is beginning to approach at least a partial solution.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE FARM BILL

When the Congress killed a section of the omnibus farm bill that would have increased the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture, the lawmakers appeared to be rebuking the Kennedy administration. But when it included programs for wheat and feed grains in the same measure, Congress tacitly conceded the administration's point that strict control of agricultural production is sensible and necessary.

Much of the farm surplus has accumulated in these commodities. Earlier this year, Congress passed an emergency feed grains control program that gave growers higher price support and acreage retirement payments. But it imposed upon them meaningful restrictions designed to set practical limits to the abundance.

Upon this model, which has worked well, are based the wheat and feed grains programs in the omnibus bill. If the administration resists the temptation to lure farm votes with sky-high price supports, a reduc-

tion of the agricultural surplus should be advanced substantially by these programs. The effect on taxpayers and consumers is not yet entirely clear; but this approach hardly can be more expensive than commodity storage, and it should increase farm income and purchasing power.

What the Congress predictably refused to grant was authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate other commodity control programs and to put them into effect with a minimum of logrolling, revision, and demagogery. This was opposed by the lawmakers themselves, and also by processors, warehousemen, and other elements that benefit from plentiful supply.

An agricultural production sensibly planned to meet the Nation's requirements is the cornerstone of sound farm policy.

U.S. DISARMAMENT AGENCY MERITS BROAD SUPPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week the majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] introduced the administration bill, S. 2180, to create a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. He has kindly consented to add my name as a co-sponsor. I appreciate this very much, because I want to make my support for this landmark legislation as visible as possible. It is my belief that creation of the U.S. Disarmament Agency will be an important step toward freeing mankind from the scourge of war and insuring the survival of the world.

We and our allies face a dual challenge: to extend freedom and to maintain peace. In order to achieve these twin goals, we have an obligation not only to be strong, but also to strengthen the mechanisms of peace.

In his letter accompanying the draft bill, President Kennedy wrote:

Today, ability of man to master his environment threatens to outpace his ability to control himself. The world is more and more interdependent, and the people of the earth can now look beyond this planet to a new age of discovery, but they have not yet been able to banish the primitive threat of war. The ingenuity that has made the weapons of war vastly more destructive should be applied to the development of a system of control of these weapons.

These words eloquently remind us that more than a year ago the President, then still known to us as the Senator from Massachusetts, spoke at the University of New Hampshire, saying:

The most gaping hole in American foreign policy today is our lack of a concrete plan for disarmament.

Plans for disarmament—specific, workable, acceptable plans—must be formulated with care, with precision and, above all, with thorough research. For peace, like war, has become tremendously complicated and technological. It is to the proper and effective solution of these complex technical problems of disarmament that I wish to direct my attention today.

A new Disarmament Agency will need strong leadership, imaginative thinking, and a national priority of attention and funds.

But we owe it to ourselves—to all mankind—to try to give peace more than our words and our hopes. "Give me a fulcrum" Archimedes is reported to have said, "and I can move the world." Perhaps this new Agency could provide our Government with such a fulcrum. And perhaps then we, too, could move the world on the road to world peace.

The President has redeemed his campaign pledge by submitting legislation to create the U.S. Disarmament Agency. It is now up to Congress to act swiftly to approve this carefully drawn blueprint, so that the establishment of a functioning Disarmament Agency at the highest levels in our Government can begin without delay.

The President has been greatly assisted in the drafting of this bill by his Special Adviser on Disarmament, the Honorable John J. McCloy. Mr. McCloy's distinguished record of public service is well known. It was he who guided postwar Germany along the first steps toward democracy and membership in the Western alliance, as High Commissioner for Germany. He has now earned our new thanks and congratulations for his work in drafting this bill.

In his letter to the President accompanying the draft bill, dated June 23, 1961, Mr. McCloy wrote:

The purpose of this legislation is to establish an agency at an authoritative level in the Government, with the exceptionally broad competence, functions, and resources required to work toward the objective of a peaceful world society in which disarmament, except for the forces needed to apply international sanctions, is the accepted condition of international life. An agency of such far-reaching scope should be able to bring its point of view and recommendations promptly to the highest level of government. The agency should have primary responsibility within the Government for disarmament matters, but there must be close cooperation and coordination with other affected agencies, particularly the Department of State, since a disarmament program must take into account the national security; foreign policy; the relationships of this country to international peacekeeping agencies, including the United Nations; and our domestic, economic, and other policies.

The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the heads of other affected agencies, and I agree that the performance of these tasks requires the establishment of the new agency which would be created by the enactment of this bill.

Clearly Mr. McCloy is aware of the magnitude of the step we should take. He recommends that the new U.S. Disarmament Agency be under the direction of the President and the Secretary of State. That puts the Agency in a somewhat special relationship to other parts of our Government, recognizing that considerations of disarmament and arms control are so important that they merit the President's continuing attention, while also taking account of the fact that any steps toward disarmament must be carefully dovetailed with the activities of the Secretary of State. Mr. McCloy concludes as follows:

I must stress that organization, machinery, and competent people alone cannot guarantee the success of the mission of our country to prevent war, curb the arms race, and create lasting conditions of peace. But they can assure that the best effort of which we are capable is directed toward these ends.

A question that may occur to a great many is this: Does it make sense to talk about disarmament while enacting the record defense budgets which are needed to maintain our military strength? Does it make sense to create a new Dis-

armament Agency just as we move into a sharply focused crisis over Berlin?

I believe it does make sense, because it expresses to all mankind the fundamental dedication of our Nation to the search for peace. The creation of a Disarmament Agency will be an enduring symbol of that conviction, even as we are forced to renew and increase our military strength to counter the Communist challenge.

We must repair the roof even while it is raining. In the past we have not been adequately prepared to take advantage of all arms control opportunities. The unhappy fact is that on more than one occasion we did not have the data, we did not have the carefully worked out policies, to enable us to move forward as constructively and rapidly as possible in the Geneva test ban negotiations.

The opportunity for fruitful negotiations at Geneva may now have passed. The recent Soviet insistence on a tripartite control commission, with a built-in Communist veto of inspection provisions, makes a mockery of their own professed desire for disarmament.

But the Communist leaders recognize the unparalleled dangers of nuclear war and the frightening consequences of a further unbridled arms race extending on without end. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to hope that they will again be willing to negotiate constructively and seriously for the ban on the testing of nuclear weapons which would be a sound first step toward a working, enforceable system of arms control and disarmament.

If and when their attitude changes, we should be fully prepared to negotiate acceptable agreements. I know of no better way to insure such preparation than to enact the bill, S. 2180, to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security, as rapidly as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles by Mr. Marquis Childs outlining the many factors which bear on the awesome decision now facing the President with regard to resumption of nuclear testing. Mr. Childs eloquently describes the many competing considerations which must be taken into account.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 4, 1961]

FEAR IS THE SPUR ON TEST DECISION

(By Marquis Childs)

So profoundly has the international landscape been altered by recent events that neither public opinion nor the political currents centering on the issue of war or peace have caught up with the change. The old arguments, the old slogans, the fears and hopes of the recent past, have almost overnight been outdated.

A measure of the change is that it can now be said with virtual certainty that the disarmament talks that were to have begun at the end of July will never be held. The end of this long road is already tacitly accepted both by Washington and Moscow.

Negotiation for a nuclear test ban is continuing in a semicomatos state at Geneva only because neither side wants to take the

blame for breaking off the talks that have continued for more than two and a half years. How much longer the three delegations—British, American, and Soviet—will sit around the conference table is anyone's guess.

All this might have been foreseen in late March. At that time the Kennedy administration, having got agreement with the British on the full details of a nuclear test ban treaty, reopened the talks that had been recessed the previous October. Even before the formal discussion could begin the Soviet delegate, Semyon Tsarapkin, let it be known that Russia would insist on a three-headed control commission, with each head having a separate and independent voice—the built-in veto.

But because some progress had been made and because hopes had been so high that nuclear control and inspection duly ratified in a treaty would be a step toward disarmament and a way out of the nuclear jungle, Britain and the United States persisted. President Kennedy had said in the campaign last year that he intended to make another determined effort to reach an agreement. In the first days of his administration, with some encouragement out of talks held in December between Soviet and American scientists in Moscow, the ultimate problem seemed to be one of persuading the Senate and the American people to accept a treaty providing for mutual inspection to police a test ban.

The sole issue that remains, and it is a momentous, a truly awesome issue with the most far-reaching and frightening consequences, is if and when the United States is to begin testing nuclear weapons. Here, as with the flickering Geneva talks, each side is reluctant to make the break, knowing how much turns in world opinion on where the blame is placed for starting a new round of nuclear armaments.

Premier Khrushchev has said that if the United States begins new tests the Soviet Union will follow suit. Some officials believe Moscow wants to prod us into taking the first step in order to justify, to the accompaniment of a loud propaganda blast, a Soviet test series essential to bring Soviet weapons up to the American level.

Six weeks ago a momentous top-secret briefing was held in the President's office with all his principal advisers present. The case for and against testing was presented as objectively as possible by Harold Brown, director of advanced research for the Department of Defense.

Brown's presentation centered on two potentials that might be developed with further tests. One was the so-called neutron bomb—hydrogen fusion set off without the trigger of an atomic explosion, which kills all life without causing physical destruction. The other, even more deeply shrouded in secrecy, was the neutron flux which, if it can be developed, would have the force of an antimissile missile, causing the enemy's projectiles to fall inert without exploding.

The 25 or 30 men in the room listened largely in silence. Occasionally Gen. Curtis LeMay, designated as Chief of Staff of the Air Force and along with the most of his service a zealous advocate of starting new tests, prodded Brown on one point or another. In the end the President is said to have concluded, despite the wide range of opinions expressed following Brown's presentation, that the decision could wait for perhaps as long as a year. It could wait, that is to say, if the preparations for ultimately resuming testing were pushed in the meantime.

Now the President has named a special committee of scientists to pass on all the evidence and in particular to try to determine whether there is any real reason to believe that the Soviets have gone ahead secretly during the 2½-year moratorium to

develop new weapons systems. But this can at best be a delaying tactic. For with fear as the spur, the pressures will grow to take the plunge.

[From the Washington Post, July 5, 1961]

HOW THE WORLD LOOKS AT TESTING

(By Marquis Childs)

The only nuclear tests subject to detection during the past 2½ years were those set off by the French in their proving ground in the Sahara. Each of the four French shots was greeted with cries of anguished indignation by the African nations to the south of the Sahara.

Any pollution of the atmosphere by these primitive tests was negligible. Its menace to human life, either present or future, could hardly be subject to proof. Yet the very word "fallout" has taken on such dire and fearsome connotations that it sets off a wave of protest and that is particularly true in the underdeveloped and uncommitted countries.

It is a reality which cannot be ignored by policymakers in the West even though weapons tend to brush it aside in their zeal to get on with the job of perfecting ever newer weapons series.

World opinion is an important factor in weighing all the elements that must go into the decision on whether to resume weapons tests. The Soviet Union means, if possible, to place the blame for a new round on the United States.

A longtime objective of Soviet propaganda has been to identify the United States with nuclear armament and the indiscriminate use of mass death. That was particularly true before the Soviet arsenal included these weapons. But even since then one goal is plainly to try to neutralize the massive deterrence of the West, and swing the balance back to manpower under arms in which the Communist bloc far exceeds the West.

This is difficult to combat if only because the United States is the only nation ever to have used a nuclear weapon. Moreover, the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were used against Asians. Propaganda to one side, that has had an impact among peoples of color impossible to exaggerate.

Would you have used it against Germany if you had had the bomb before V-E day? is a question repeatedly asked. Was not the war against Japan virtually ended when you decided to try out the weapon into which you put such a vast expenditure of effort and money? These are doubts and fears deeply rooted in Asian minds.

The crew of the Japanese fishing boat, the *Lucky Dragon*, suffering from radiation as a result of sailing into a restricted test area following one of the Eniwetok explosions helped to dramatize such fears. Leftwing and anti-American propagandists were only too happy to make use of the incident. In the French film, "Hiroshima Mon Amour," newsreel shots taken immediately after the bomb exploded showed the full horror to theatergoers in many countries.

The conscience of the world is deeply troubled. A new round of tests, even though they should all be conducted underground with no contamination of the atmosphere, will have an incalculable effect. It can be counted upon to increase the trend toward neutralism in England and the Scandinavian countries as well as in Asia and Africa. Reports to the State Department indicate that important segments of opinion in Britain would be alienated if it could be clearly shown that the United States initiated a new test series.

Add to this the fact that disarmament negotiation has all but been abandoned as a consequence of, first, the Soviet insistence in every negotiation on the three-headed monster—the built-in veto—that would prevent any effective control and inspection. Secondly, in the preliminary talks in Wash-

ington between John J. McCloy, the President's disarmament negotiator, and Soviet delegate, Valerian Zorin, the latter has insisted on trying to get McCloy to talk substance rather than the framework for discussion which was to have begun among several nations at the end of next month.

It seems evident that Zorin wants to make a case which he will take before the United Nations General Assembly in the fall charging the United States with refusing to discuss disarmament. It is a sad commentary that this comes just as the administration has moved to create a Disarmament Agency—the Agency for peace that President Kennedy talked about in his campaign.

"Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." That injunction from the Book of Proverbs has a special meaning for our time. The nuclear test talks had seemed to offer a way out of a long dark passage. To close the door with an order to resume the tests will have the look of an irrevocable step backward.

MR. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by the Federation of American Scientists. The FAS is a nationwide organization of 2,000 scientists and engineers of all fields concerned with the interrelations of science and world affairs. Their statement expresses full support for the proposed U.S. Disarmament Agency. It also includes comments by five leading American scientists—Hans A. Bethe, Herman Kahn, Donald G. Brennan, Ernest C. Pollard, and Polykarp Kusch. Some of these scientists may not agree fully on the policies that the United States should adopt, but they unite in their support for the Agency which will provide a new framework of information and coordination for the all-important task of disarmament.

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

SCIENTISTS HAIL KENNEDY'S DISARMAMENT BILL; URGE PROMPT, BIPARTISAN ACTION BY CONGRESS

The Federation of American Scientists hails as a giant step forward the President's June 29, 1961, proposal to establish a permanent Government agency to undertake research, planning, and negotiation for the disarmament and arms control agreements which are and will continue to be necessary for minimizing the risks of nuclear war.

The President's proposal deserves widespread and enthusiastic bipartisan support in the Congress. Its prompt enactment is essential now, as much as ever before, to the deceleration of the arms race. Congress must also recognize and support the new agency on a continuing basis with ample funds.

This federation has for more than a decade urged our Government to establish a high-level Disarmament Agency. A year ago FAS stated, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the first atomic explosion:

"It is clear that our best efforts toward arms controls will be unavailing if the Soviet Union is intransigent. But the only way in which we can determine whether they share our goal is by negotiating with them. The goal of such negotiations is an arms control plan—perhaps the first of a series—which will increase our chances of survival and avoid significantly unequal effects on the military strength of East and West.

"If we make a complete effort to this end and fail, we will know that Russia is seeking arms control agreements only to improve her

relative military position or to gain propaganda victories. If we do not make a complete effort, we will have failed to do that which it is in our power to do and which a minimum regard for our safety and our responsibility to mankind requires.

"This goal will not be easily attained. The federation appreciates, perhaps more clearly than many, that workable arms control agreements are difficult to create, propose, and negotiate, even when all parties recognize that such agreements are essential to survival. The scientific and technical problems, as well as the military, diplomatic, and administrative problems, of negotiating an arms control agreement are exceedingly demanding. Solution of the problem requires, at the very least, conviction throughout our Government of the importance of the goal, thorough investigation and evaluation of proposals, and creative thinking to develop all possible routes to agreement.

* * * * *

"On this 15th anniversary of the nuclear arms race, let us recognize that while time is short, time still remains. We must no longer fail to do our utmost toward seeking arms control. The tragedy of ultimate failure is so great that we must make survival the first order of business and devote generously to the study of disarmament whatever talent and resources may be usefully employed."

The need for this agency was eloquently expressed by President Kennedy more than a year ago in his speech at the University of New Hampshire in which he said:

"The most gaping hole in American foreign policy today is our lack of a concrete plan for disarmament. * * *

"However, as each year passes, the possibilities of disarmament—or, to use a more realistic term, "arms control"—become more difficult. It is harder to limit growing nuclear stockpiles than the shipment of raw materials—harder to prevent surprise attacks once they can be launched from underground, underwater, or outer space. The engines of death are multiplying in number and the destructiveness on every side—the institutions of peace are not.

"No issue, in short, is of more vital concern to this Nation than disarmament; no issue could demand more priority of top-level attention than disarmament; and yet, this Nation has no consistent, convincing disarmament policy.

* * * * *

"Plans for disarmament—specific, workable, acceptable plans—must be formulated with care, with precision and, above all, with thorough research. For peace, like war, has become tremendously complicated and technological. It is to the proper and effective solution of these complex technical problems of disarmament which I wish to direct my attention today. First, let me make it plain that I do not believe all the problems of peace can be solved by increased research—science and technology cannot fill our present gaps in vision, in leadership, and in sound, creative planning. But research can give us the vitally important knowledge which we must have if we are to lay the ground work for effective control of today's vast and complex weapons systems.

* * * * *

"But mere governmental reorganization is not enough. A new agency is not enough. Its recommendations must be integrated into our diplomacy and defense at the highest levels. Its work must be both supported and implemented by the State Department, the Defense Department, the AEC, and above all by the President himself, for only he can overcome the resistance likely to arise in those agencies. It will need strong leadership, imaginative thinking, and a national priority of attention and funds.

"But we owe it to ourselves—to all mankind—to try to give peace more than our words and our hopes. 'Give me a fulcrum,' Archimedes is reported to have said, 'and I can move the world.' Perhaps this new agency could provide our Government with such a fulcrum. And perhaps then we, too, could move the world on the road to world peace."

President Kennedy is to be congratulated for redeeming his campaign pledge to urge creation of such an agency. We trust that the President will now make every necessary effort to mobilize the public and the Congress to the fulsome and bipartisan support of the Disarmament Agency.

The goal of disarmament will be difficult to attain, and the route to that goal will be long and arduous. But the job will never be done unless we equip ourselves for the task. And the creation of the Disarmament Agency is an elementary and long-overdue first step along that route. That first step must be taken promptly.

Comment by Prof. Hans A. Bethe, theoretical physicist and chief of the theoretical physics division at Los Angeles during World War II. Dr. Bethe has been a consultant to the Los Alamos Laboratory since 1947 and was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Geneva test ban negotiations. He won the Atomic Energy Commission's Enrico Fermi award in 1960 for his contribution to nuclear physics. Dr. Bethe is a member of FAS.

"For a long time there have been need for organized thinking on disarmament and for an agency within the Federal Government responsible for this thought and for the preparation of international negotiations. I urge top-priority consideration and support for the bill to establish the U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security."

Comment by Dr. Herman Kahn, physicist and mathematician, strategic analyst, and military planner. Dr. Kahn is the author of "On Thermonuclear War" (Princeton, 1960). He has also written and lectured widely on civil defense and other aspects of national security policy.

"It is disgraceful that we have not created such an agency long ago. While organization and research alone will not make the world safe, they are likely to play a major role in facilitating any action. We must make an effort with the scope, vigor, and imagination embodied in the draft bill."

Comment by Dr. Donald G. Brennan, research mathematician and communication theorist at the Lincoln Laboratory of MIT. Dr. Brennan is the editor of "Arms Control, Disarmament, and National Security" (George Braziller, New York, 1961) and was guest editor of the fall 1960 issue of *Daedalus*, devoted to arms control. Dr. Brennan is a member of FAS.

"The President's Disarmament Agency bill is excellent and will, if enacted and suitably funded, at last equip our Government to do the hard work and intensive scientific, political, military, and economic research necessary for the formulation and evaluation of arms control measures. To those of us who have long sought and supported such legislation, the bill contains all of the necessary authority to tackle systematically our most serious national problem—the preservation of our Nation and the prevention of nuclear war. In the 1960's, the President's bill, if enacted, may prove to be our single most important step toward decelerating the arms race."

"Creation of the Disarmament Agency by Congress should, therefore, be prompt, enthusiastic, and nonpartisan."

Comment by Prof. Ernest C. Pollard, biophysicist and formerly chairman of the department at Yale University. Dr. Pollard was chairman of the advisory committee on science and technology of the Democratic

Party and worked at MIT Radiation Lab and for the War Department's Office of Scientific Research and Development during World War II. Dr. Pollard is a member of FAS.

"I believe this agency is essential for long-term planning for peace. It is the only way to avoid negotiation in crisis many times in the future. In my opinion, passage of this bill is the most important action that Congress can take this summer."

Comment by Dr. Polykarp Kusch, nuclear physicist and 1955 Nobel laureate in physics. Dr. Kusch is chairman of the physics department at Columbia University and was active in atomic physics during World War II. He served on the advisory committee on science and technology of the Democratic Party.

"A great many of the factors that make contemporary war a historically unprecedented hazard have a technological origin. It is also true that the same technology that creates this hazard can bring men together and can be used to improve the lot of all men everywhere. It is my belief that every effort should be made to use the knowledge of science, the skills of technology, and every other talent of man to promote the cause of peace. I am certain that a new agency, free of domination by the military and other traditional agencies of Government, will find new and novel approaches to make our now rapidly increasing knowledge and skill real weapons in forging the peace."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] without losing my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTOBAHN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in January of this year the Berlin Illustrirte, the German pictorial magazine published in West Berlin, issued a special edition in English devoted exclusively to West Berlin. It depicts the cultural, religious, economic, political and social life of the 2½ million people who live in that island city. It is well worth reading.

One article written by Mr. James P. O'Donnell, formerly Berlin correspondent for *Newsweek* and the *Saturday Evening Post*, is entitled "Autobahn." It tells of Mr. O'Donnell's ride from West Germany through Russian controlled middle Germany into Berlin, but more importantly, it describes the importance of this highway as a means of communication between Berlin and West Germany.

Mr. O'Donnell sets forth very clearly the history of the rights of the United States to use the autobahn based upon the London protocols of September 1944. In accordance with those agreements American troops pulled back from Thuringia, upper and lower Saxony, and parts of Mecklenburg, territory then inhabited by 9 million Germans. Russian troops pulled back from West Berlin, the population of which was then 2 million. The Western Powers are in Berlin by virtue of the authority of the same agree-

ment which put the Russians in territory originally conquered by American troops. The Russian troops were invited to occupy territory conquered by U.S. troops, such as Magdeburg and Helmstedt—invited by us. So, also, were the three Western Powers invited to occupy West Berlin by the Soviets. This was all agreed to in London in 1944. The right of access to Berlin stems from these same agreements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Autobahn" by Mr. O'Donnell be printed immediately after my remarks in the RECORD.

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

AUTOBAHN

(By James P. O'Donnell)

Some call it "nightmare highway." To the tens of thousands of Americans who have served in Berlin since 1945, the long yellow ribbon of cement highway from Helmstedt to Berlin has become the Burma Road of the cold war.

For the millions of Americans who have never seen this autobahn, but whose national destiny is now engaged by solemn pledges to keep open the access route to free Berlin, it is time again to describe what is happening along this most important road in the world.

On the map, the drive looks simple enough, 110 miles, due east, a double-lane superhighway, not unlike the drive from Baltimore to Philadelphia, or the length of the New Jersey Turnpike. The ride should take less than 3 hours. But here, through the last 15 years, a mass of hedgehog controls has grown up, a kind of medieval madness in the heart of central Europe.

We come to the first of many autobahn ironies. All the time we will be driving from Helmstedt, a provincial town in West Germany, to Berlin, the historic capital of Germany. And yet the Iron Curtain barriers here are more formidable than any international frontier in Western Europe today. Indeed, more stringent, and time consuming, than the border of the Soviet Union itself, where one enters at Brest-Litovsk. How did it all begin, how did this menace of a permanent traffic jam become a serious threat to world peace? Today, for what must be the 40th or 50th time, I approach the Helmstedt checkpoint, destination Berlin. The scene is normal, or what passes for normal here at Helmstedt.

At the first or allied checkpoint a brisk British major, Royal Signals, leading a convoy of some dozen lorries, is presenting his military travel orders to a young Soviet captain, one copy in English, one in Russian. The captain peruses them, stamps them, makes a notation in a book. Then he salutes and waves the convoy through. The major returns the salute. All is formal, has become ritual. It is a political ballet—with no last act.

A kind of play within a play, the routine is swift compared to what we shall soon see; but every small gesture is articulate. The nonchalant Britisher is asserting the Western allies' right to proceed to Berlin unmolested. The silent Soviet captain is asserting his right to control—to see, but not to oversee. Premier Khrushchev, in November 1958, tried to write a brusque last act to this symbolic pantomime. He dropped the hint, seeming simple but loaded with chicanery, that Moscow was about to turn over the functions of this Soviet captain to the Communist East German authorities. One has only to drive another few hundred feet ahead to discover why this scheme was, in fact, a loaded ultimatum.

For beyond this casual allied checkpoint today looms the mammoth control apparatus

of the East German Customs and Paramilitary Police (called Vopos)—a half-mile of loading and unloading sheds, scales, barriers, custom booths, tollgates, passport checks, currency controllers. Through this grim gauntlet, like wary beetles in a bottleneck, are slowly weaving the giant diesel trucks which today and every day keep open the lifeline to Berlin.

East German officials are examining the papers of all civilian traffic, allied or German, and the bills of lading, in sextuplicate, of all Berlin trucks. But the East Germans act in the presence, and under the orders of, the Soviets. The removal of the Soviet captain, Khrushchev's threat to give marionettes their own strings, would make the East Germans sovereign here at Helmstedt. Their present throttle on Berlin traffic would then become a stranglehold.

Thus this autobahn has become a barometer of Bolshevik intention. "Finnegan blockades," on again, off again, are the most frequent form of nerve warfare. As an American civilian, not traveling on military orders, I too must pass through this East German control. It is slow but perfunctory.

Meanwhile I chat with truckers who left West Berlin at dawn. It is past noon now and they are clearing their last papers, a mere 4 hours delay. In the past, I have seen them stacked up for from 7 to 70 hours. But today the green light is on—from Moscow.

So familiar is the scene, and so heartening the spectacle of the truck-and-trailer parade, that I forget for the moment that my mission is not to push on to Berlin, but to pause here and roll back the newsreel of memory, back in 1945 when this autobahn mummery began.

In the high summer of 1945, the first weeks of the Four Power occupation of Germany, the Red army established a control point here at Helmstedt, a most casual one. A single watch house was set up by the side of the road, later two small peppermint pole-barriers, manned by one or two Soviet soldiers, usually noncoms. Their job was to examine the travel documents of Americans, British, and French proceeding to and from the German capital.

These travel orders had an attached Russian translation. Sometimes the Soviet GIvan would scan them dutifully, hold them upside down, or simply wave you on. In lieu of proper travel orders, often a passport, a used airmail envelope, or a life insurance policy would do in a pinch—anything with a stamp or "Propusk."

Usually this lonely Soviet sentinel was friendly, although now and then one met a morose Asiatic. Sometimes he was sober, more often pleasantly spiffed. One lonesome corporal from the steppes once delayed me simply to show off pictures of the gal he left behind the Volga, a Slavic Lili Marleen. We were allies.

How did this Soviet picket first get here, in his small striped watchhouse, here at Helmstedt, 25 miles west of the Elbe River? Not, as so many people wrongly assume, by right of conquest. He came by invitation of the Western Powers, part of the same troop shift that brought the Western garrisons into Berlin.

Today, as I drive off now toward the Elbe, I recall yet once again those hectic days of early April 1945 when troops of the American 9th Army were rolling down this same stretch of Autobahn on the high road—we thought—to Berlin. Helmstedt itself was taken on April 9. Three days later, April 12, the day of the death of President Roosevelt, advance elements of the U.S. 2d Armored Division captured the large city of Magdeburg, and were assembling on the Elbe River to prepare a crossing.

Now comes a curious moment in American military history. I stood on the west bank of the Elbe that morning and watched ele-

ments of a combat command make a routine river crossing. Once across the Elbe, in early afternoon, our GI's ran into brisk fire from the last-stand German battle group. Suddenly came the order to pull back. This road to Berlin became the road not taken.

Important today is not the now fruitless debate whether American troops should have rolled on into Berlin, how difficult or easy it might have been in a military sense. The pullback order on the Elbe was a high-level political decision, in strict accord with wartime protocols signed in London in September 1944 between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union. This wartime agreement, dividing Germany into zones, and providing for a special Four Power status for the German capital of Berlin, is the basic document on which our Western rights along this Autobahn still rest. If they are not absolute, they are substantial.

There is a direct link between the presence of the Soviets at Helmstedt, on German soil captured by American armies, and the Western presence in Berlin. It was confirmed by Marshal Zhukov in his first meeting with General Eisenhower in Berlin, on June 5, 1945. Indeed, the Red army marshal insisted that the American armies still deep in the German provinces of Mecklenburg, the two Saxonies, and Thuringia be withdrawn before the formal entry of Western troops into Berlin in early July 1945.

It is about a 30-minute drive from Helmstedt to the Elbe Bridge. Today a new steel bridge is a reminder of the hocus-pocus Marshal Sokolovsky, Zhukov's successor, played with the old war-damaged bridge, one of the signals of the Berlin blockade of 1948. In those days there was less Soviet attention to the fine legalities. Stalin was confident he could starve Berlin into submission. All through traffic along the Autobahn ground to a halt; barriers were down for almost a year.

The roaring miracle of the airlift, and the silently effective weapon of counterblockade won a victory that could have been more complete. The Jessup-Malik agreement at the United Nations, followed by the 1949 Paris Treaty reaffirmed, yet once again, the Western presence in Berlin. But these fresh agreements failed to nail down what all close observers of Autobahn realities already knew to be necessary—unhindered transit between West Berlin and West Germany, what General Clay and Mayor Reuter called a policy of the open road. Under the blockade, indeed because of it, two utterly different German economies had emerged. West Berlin was now linked to the rapidly reviving, soon booming economy of West Germany.

A basic overland link was this same Autobahn. Driving today from the Elbe Bridge, through the heart of the communized zone of East Germany, more than a decade since the blockade, what we are really watching is one economy flowing through another, like a river with hostile banks, a free economy rolling through a slave one.

It is a unique spectacle. Now we are but an hour from Berlin, entering the pine and lake country of the plain of Brandenburg. The loneliness of the "zone of silence," Soviet Germany all round us, is broken by the intermittent but welcome roar of the great trucks, 20-tonners, heading out from Berlin, westbound.

I pause by the roadside to make a precise count. Every 2 minutes, a truck heading west passes a truck bound east. These Berlin truckers salute each other, now with horns, now with winker signals, fiercely proud that their long-distance hauling is keeping a great city alive.

Where are they heading? Those lumbering west are loaded with finished industrial products—radios, generators, TV's, machinery, processed foods, to be sold in the markets of West Germany, in Holland and in

Belgium, in France and as far off as Italy. Berlin-bound trucks bring bulkier products, raw material for the factories, fuel, and food for the Berliners. A careful breakdown will show, however, that for every three trucks heading toward Berlin, two return unloaded. One empty truck is normal—it represents the lower economic value of bulk imports versus quality exports. But the second empty truck symbolizes the margin of subsidy. Berlin industry must someday balance its books by filling this second ghost truck.

The inspiring show of free-flowing traffic does not last long. In another half hour, we approach the checkpoint of Dreilinden. The scene here is the Helmstedt open-air roadshow in reverse, right at the city limits of Berlin. But somehow, perhaps because it is nightfall, or the rain, or the garish floodlights, it seems more forboding. There are almost as many trucks here, stalled by paper formulas, as I have met along the 110 miles of open road.

Travelers from the Western World tend to be anxious, overanxious, to pass this last dreary control and breathe the free air, the wonderful free air, of West Berlin. For 40 minutes now I stand in a queue with a few other foreigners—a Belgian calico salesman, a Swiss doctor and his Italian wife, a French student at the Free University of Berlin. But most of our companions in the long line are German. What are they talking about?

Despite a score of flaming red placards, screaming hostility, inciting German against German, one is soon aware how little it all registers. Despite an occasional gruff Vopo, despite two Soviet officers who survey all and say nothing, these Germans, West and East, are fraternizing. They exchange a hundred little barbed comments that point up the great absurdity—this artificial gulf that today separates the Germany of Goethe, Beethoven, and Schiller from the Germany of Luther, Bach, and Kant.

As Western statesmen proceed, yet once again, toward the summit, let no one stumble into the illusion that the Berlin problem is a local issue. Proposals for a free city, a kind of Danzig on the Spree, are dangerous nonsense. No solution of the Berlin issue is better than a bad solution, and no solution will be lasting that does not remove the barriers today separating Germans from Germans.

This is the real lesson of the autobahn. In 1945 the Soviet armies advanced to the Elbe, and behind that advance the commissioners of tyranny have spent 15 years practicing 20th-century colonialism in Eastern Europe. The attempt to strangle and engulf Berlin is part of the master plan. Our Western response, tardy but emphatic, has thwarted that plan. Every truck that enters Berlin inspires not only all Berliners, it keeps a little light burning in Dresden, Warsaw, Budapest, Prague, and Bucharest.

"A TIME FOR COMPASSION—A TIME FOR EXCELLENCE"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on June 15 and 16 over 1,200 delegates to the Eighth National Conference on Economic and Social Development gathered in Washington. Their program centered upon one particular aspect of legislation which occupies our attention. Members of farm, labor, church, civic, business, and women's organizations joined to discuss foreign aid. Government leaders were called upon to inform these men and women about prospects and programs for the Peace Corps, ICA, food for peace, land reform, cultural exchange—almost every area under consideration as foreign aid.

After President Kennedy's address at a meeting of the full conference on Friday noon, my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] spoke. His address was a realistic appraisal of foreign assistance. I believe the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] deserves consideration and thoughtful attention.

I ask unanimous consent to have a transcript of the address printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A TIME FOR COMPASSION—A TIME FOR EXCELLENCE

(Address by the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to the Eighth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, June 16, 1961)

First of all I want to say what a great opportunity it is to share this platform today with the President of the United States. The President gave us a splendid message. In a sense, it was a fighting message. I think the President, above all others, knows that we are having difficulties in the Congress with our foreign aid program. What the President was attempting to say and what he said so well and so directly to you was that we need your help. It was a "call to arms," so to speak, a call to action. If you are going away from this luncheon today with only the thought in mind that you have had an experience that few other Americans have had; namely, that you heard the President—that you saw the President, and that he looked good, that his voice was strong, that his message was splendid—if that is all that you are going to do after this luncheon, then I hope you enjoyed the meal.

Very frankly, I think luncheon speeches should have a greater purpose than merely trying to prolong the time of the meal. A luncheon speech should be, at least in this instance, a dramatic call to action for you to go back to your communities, to mobilize support—first, of understanding and then of our international efforts here in the Congress of the United States, and, indeed, in the many organizations that you represent.

I am very pleased that the President today saw fit to speak to us so candidly about the problems of waste, the problems of mismanagement, as well as about the achievements, the fulfillments, the accomplishments and the victories of our international program of our foreign aid. In our visits occasionally (when I say "our visits" I mean the Members of the Congress when we have the privilege to visit with the President and his advisers and Cabinet officers) we have urged that this record of achievement be brought to the attention of the public, along with the headlines of mistakes.

Let me just lay it on the line to you. This world is not a Communist world. The Soviets are not winning. The nations around the periphery of the Soviet Union have not fallen into the lap of the Kremlin, people do want to be free and, above all, they want to remove themselves from the unbelievable burdens of misery which have been their lot throughout the centuries.

I think it is about time that those of us who carry this banner of compassion, of understanding, and of freedom stand up and be a little more erect, a little more confident, a little more willing to face the facts of life, the good as well as the bad, or the bad as well as the good. When we do, I think that the picture will seem a little more reasonable and a little more pleasing.

I told a story at Brandeis University which Mr. Taft may remember. An English anthropologist visiting the early American

Colonies went back and wrote a report on his observations of the life of the Indian. He wrote the following in his professional journal in the early years of the 18th century: "I visited the Colonies. I observed the habits of the Indian. All Indians walk single file, at least the one I saw did."

His account reminds me so much of those who constantly condemn our foreign-aid program as being wasteful, inefficient, ineffective, a loss, a failure. These critics hear of some one place, or some area in which foreign aid has not done its job. Yes, my fellow Americans, if you want to judge the foreign-aid program on the abuses that you have found in it, the mistakes that we have made, then, indeed, all foreign aid is a loss, at least the one instance I saw was a mistake, and I have drawn my conclusions from it.

Now, this is not to say that the foreign-aid program cannot stand revision. It is, in fact, getting a good working over every hour of the day. I left a 2-hour session this morning. May I say that our conversation with representatives of the administration was not exactly a love feast. It was a frank, honest, heart-to-heart talk, a heated discussion over what some of the members of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee thought ought to be in a foreign-aid program. It was a critical examination of military assistance; a critical evaluation of political judgment; a careful examination of economic assistance; and an even more careful examination of what we call long-term financing, the development loan. This kind of discussion is desirable. But some Members of Congress need to be reminded that we are examining this program to strengthen it, not to destroy it. Make no mistake. The United States of America will not forsake her responsibilities. We have no choice but to continue aid. We cannot stop. We cannot fail to shoulder our share of the world's responsibilities. We cannot withdraw into the caves. We have to stand on high ground. And since this is the case, I think we ought to know what we stand for, and what we are going to do as we make our stand. That is your task when you go back to your communities.

I'm not here to explain all the intricacies of foreign aid; the experts have appeared before you. But I am here to ask you to mobilize civic groups, to mobilize political action, to let the world know and, first of all, to let the Congress know, that you want a foreign aid program—a foreign aid program that fulfills, No. 1, the democratic dimension of promoting economic, political, and social reform. We want a foreign aid program that offers to the people of the world a better life. We would want it even if there weren't any Communists around to scare us into it.

There isn't anything new in the world situation. There is just a new awareness of it. May I say there is a classic example of this awareness in respect to Cuba. All at once Americans are excited about Cuba, and there is reason to be. But let me tell this audience that the poverty of Cuba of yesterday was there 3 years ago. The people were sick, they were the victims of economic exploitation. They had no knowledge of political liberty or freedom then or now.

So what were we concerned with? What was the talk in this Nation about Cuba prior to a year ago? The Hilton Hotel, the country club. I remember motions and amendments brought to Congress for tax exemptions for some people who needed no tax exemptions. And I say that we are possibly paying the price for that callous indifference to human need. Possibly Castro is the burning flame that will remind us of our social and political and economic and moral responsibilities in this hemisphere. I think he is.

I am not for foreign aid just because it promotes an opportunity for America to send people around the world. I'm for it because it is in my heart. I am for the foreign-aid program, I am for what we are trying to do, bilaterally, unilaterally, multilaterally, through the aid administration, through our multilateral institutions, and through the United Nations, because it is the right thing to do.

I want to say to this audience—and I am sorry that some of our Government people have left—if our motivation is out of fear, if our motivation is only to stem from some other political system—and if that is our only motivation, then we weaken the strength and purpose that is ours or could be ours. I want Americans to get on fire with a righteous cause. I want us to be so on fire with the belief in people, in their destiny, their enlightenment, their enrichment, their better life, that nothing can stop us. I want Americans to have a cause, a purpose, a dedication, and I want that dedication to be so clear that even the most illiterate person in the farthest corner of the world can understand it without any detailed explanation.

This sense of purpose ought to be like a neon light on the horizon of the world. We should declare war, not in the sense that some ask for, but as former President Truman once said, against man's ancient enemies. We intend to win a war against poverty, against hunger, against disease, and Ignorance. Let me tell you something. We can win it. There isn't a single force that can stand against us. We are either going to win it or we are going to lose ourselves, that's what this oneness of the world means.

Sometimes I wonder what comes over us. We stand in amazement at the ability of man to orbit this earth. We know how rapid transportation is. We talk in terms of flying to one part of the distant world within an hour or 2 hours. Yet for some reason or another, we think that the social and economic injustices that are literally on our back door are not literally in our own home. They are. You cannot escape the evil of the earth. You cannot escape its restlessness. You cannot escape the misery of your neighbor, no matter how many walls you build. We are attempting to tear down these walls. We are attempting to extend the hand of partnership as a good neighbor. We are not, as I said to a group yesterday, seeking to dominate anyone. America must never become a dominator—it must become a cooperator.

We need really to be a part of all humanity, not apart from it. We need to get off from the high stand and get down with the people. If we don't, they will accept our money, take our technicians, and turn against us, just as surely as you are gathered in this room.

Now, none of this is new, but it does carry a new sense of urgency. Sometimes I wonder whether we can get these results through peaceful evolution. I have wondered whether or not those who have so much today are willing to share it. I have seen very few examples in history, fellow Americans, where the mighty and the powerful and the aristocrats of privilege have been willing to give it up, without violence. I am reminded again and again of the chapters of history from time immemorial of where the handwriting was on the wall, but people were blind, and refused to see it or to read it or to understand it. I am hopeful that somehow or another, this time we will be able to get people to understand before it is too late.

We have, indeed, talked about world revolution. There is a "revolution," that's a fact. Like our President, I am not afraid of that word. I believe in revolution, revolution for progress. I believe in revolution to eliminate injustice, and inequities. And I

believe in the change that is required by the technology and the demands of our time.

I don't think it is enough just to send Federalist Papers, the Declaration of Independence, and a copy of the Constitution to people to preach our doctrine of freedom. These are important. But what is more important is to have the spirit today of those who wrote those documents, of those who signed the Declaration of Independence when they said, "We pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

They didn't say, "We are going to pledge 1 hour a week of our life," or "10 percent of our fortune," and "very little of our honor." They pledged it all, and I am of the opinion that until the forces of oppression and tyranny in this world understand that those of us who believe in and live in freedom are willing to pledge it all, there will be no victory, there will be no change for the better.

Now we have seen what all of this means in daring plans—Marshall plan, and point 4. These can excite the world. Point 4 is still good language my friends. Don't you forget it. Point 4 stands for something throughout this world. Technical assistance? Yes.

Now, I believe there is another historical policy change. I mentioned it to you, and the President outlined it for you so well. We are determined that our aid shall be deployed as an incentive for genuine economic, political, and social reform. I am happy to be a part of this administration, of this Government to be a working part of this. I want to make it quite clear that if any of you are supporting foreign aid because you think we are going to support the status quo, you are in the wrong meeting, you are in the wrong group, you have the wrong purpose. There needs to be a fundamental change. Our goal isn't to buy any flag-waving friendship of corrupt dictators or corrupt governments. Our goal is to promote a real partnership, and to promote it with the people, some of whom our people have never met.

To some of my friends in the State Department, let me say, "Get acquainted with the other side of the street." Let me say to our friends in this Government, "Get acquainted with the people that elect us." Very few men are elected in the country clubs. Very few men are elected by the so-called political and social elite. I enjoy the good life, but as a politician in this great America, I know that my stay in office is dependent upon my service to the overwhelming majority of the people of my constituency. Our foreign-aid program is entirely the same way. But all too often we have been afraid to offend the powers that be. Those powers that be do not need to be offended. They just need to be reminded that we are not engaged in the pursuit of the preservation of the past. We are engaged in the pursuit of orderly change for the future.

Your discussions here today have all included this point—land reform. I know you mean it. But land reform needs to be more than a token. May I say to those who love freedom, "Either divide your land freely or someone is going to do it for you, forcibly." We must talk this way to friends and neighbors throughout the world.

Now regarding social welfare. I know one of the reasons our foreign-aid programs have had some trouble abroad. We haven't wanted to use the word "welfare" at home, and you know it. You can't export something you don't have, and you can't export something that you are ashamed of without having people discover your duplicity. You cannot say that planning is antifreedom in America, and then demand that people overseas plan. You can't say in this new foreign-aid program that you need a country administrator to coordinate things, to see that

everything is planned and orderly and then deny the same kind of coordination back home. I am for planning. I am for the better use of human and physical resources. I am planning without coercion. I am for planning through cooperation, and I emphasize the word "cooperation," which leads me to another point.

Just before I came here today I asked certain members of our Government, "How many Government people do you have promoting cooperatives overseas?" I left a committee room where there were 11 military assistance specialists and 3 for other programs. I complement our military. They know what they are doing. They have been given a mission and they perform it. But I want to know how many people this Government has on its payroll in the State Department, in ICA, or any place else to promote consumer cooperatives, producer cooperatives, credit unions, farmers' cooperatives, health cooperatives, housing cooperatives.

I want to know how many specialists we have, how many consultants. Have we tried to take an inventory of our talent at home? With whom are we working abroad? Who are the people that we can talk to and work with? I want to know because cooperative housing is a must in Chile, and in Peru, and farmers' cooperatives are the only way that I know to save this area of the world from collectivism. They answer the Communist collective. This is the democratic cooperative. And everybody knows it.

And let me make it quite clear to you, if I have anything to say about it, and I am, there will be no foreign-aid program reported from committee until I find out how this Government intends to promote these objectives in specifics. I can make good speeches and I am not making a bad one now. It is one thing to talk about health, it is one thing to talk about land reform, it is another thing to spell it out in detail. And some of us are slow learners. I like to see it audiovisual. And we are going to insist that we see it. As a matter of fact, specific planning is being required of witnesses in the present hearings.

Let's have our embassies, as well, reflect this country. Yes. I am going to lay it right on the line. I don't think the activities at embassies should be reported only on the social page of the newspapers. I don't think the American people ought to get the idea that foreign embassies in this Capitol and American representatives in other Capitals are primarily engaged in social functions at embassy receptions. Of course, they're not and I am not saying they are. Yet I submit, my friends, that a larger section of the metropolitan press of this city is given over to the report of social activities than they are to accounts of how many children are going to school in Peru; or how many children are going to school in India; or how many hospitals do we and others in cooperation with us plan on building next year.

I would like to read in the newspapers that we are discussing a foreign-aid bill of approximately \$5 billion which will be spelled out in schools, hospitals, land, jobs, industries, teachers, doctors, nurses, and all that we can understand. And I would like to read that we are talking about more than \$5 billion—there is more that you don't see and you know it. We have investments in many multilateral activities which must receive the same kind of scrutiny as the main bill.

Now, when I speak of revamping our embassies, I mean just that and we need your help. The Congress has taken a dim view of labor attachés. Yes, that is right. Some Members of Congress have just denied money which could be designated for labor attachés. Listen, my friends. The Communist movement, if that's what you are primarily worried about, seeks as its first target the

labor movement. We need an inventory of all the available competent labor talent in America. We need to have priority to strengthen every American embassy throughout the world with good, honest, trade unionists who understand the importance of organization, of collective bargaining, and of all that the labor movement means in a free society.

I am for representation allowances, but if as much time were spent in the Congress of the United States in debate on whether or not we ought to have a cultural attaché, a labor attaché, a social welfare attaché as to whether we should have representation allowances, we would have a better country and a better foreign policy.

I have been around. You know I am not a theorist about this. I don't lay any claim to perfection, that's why we need men like Dean Sayre. I am not like him, I know. I have never run on the "Purity ticket." I submit that our embassies need to exemplify what this country really is.

This country is agriculture, for example. I noticed the other day where a certain country was going to have some of its farmers go to Russia to find out about agriculture. Well, may I say, this is what we might call studying failure. I have much respect for many of the Russians. I have a great deal of respect for their science. But I want to tell you something, my friends. Do not downgrade our agriculture in the eyes of the public and in the world's public image of America. Agriculture is the greatest success story America has to offer today. There has never been anything like it. Never.

And I want our embassies to be filled with educators; people who understand health and health problems; administrators for cooperatives; labor specialists; social welfare specialists; we need people to work with others on the scene, on the spot, in these areas of human improvement.

We need the best of our people, as the President said today. This means that they must come forth from industry, from labor, from cooperatives, from education. We need the best because this is a time for excellence. We cannot afford mediocrity. Our Foreign Service people must understand theirs is not merely a job; it is a mission. They must recognize that this new foreign-aid program does not provide an occupation; it offers a challenge. They must know that their assignment is not merely an opportunity for travel; it is a chance to work and to build.

I am saying that our oversea missions should reflect the whole of the American community. We Americans are not all diplomats, at least not Machiavellian diplomats. We are doers, we are builders, we are teachers, we are healers, we are producers. We glory in the love of learning and in the excitement of achievement. We are dedicated to human welfare. We have more voluntary organizations dedicated to human welfare than does all of the rest of the world put together. And I am proud of it.

The Prophet Isaiah tells us, "Where there is no vision the people shall perish." The vision we ought to offer the peoples of the world, unashamedly and proudly, is that of democratic, social, and economic revolution. In order to do this, we must be willing to demonstrate concern and compassion. This is not just a job; this a commitment. We need to call upon all of our resources, not just the Government. The Government is just like the tip of the iceberg. The real strength of America is below, in the people, in the communities.

You and I dream of sending a man to the moon, and the President said we would do it, and he outlined how—with sacrifice, commitment, a plan, and a program. I say that within this same decade, we can do something even better. We can have a higher goal. In this decade, with less effort and

at one-tenth the cost, we could banish famine from this earth. Never again need a man know the pains of hunger. If this is our decision, I suggest that we announce our intention to banish hunger from the earth.

Let me ask you, Is one man on the moon more important in your lives than half of humanity committed to misery. Better than half of humanity now lives in misery.

Yes, we can create a world in which the family of man is no longer divided between those who live on the sunlit hills, and those who live in the sunless and dirty slums. We can build a great cathedral of freedom, which can house all of mankind. The road ahead is long. The President has told you that it may be three decades or more. I agree. But so what? If you are tired, retire. Get out of the way for people who are not tired.

The Chinese have a proverb that goes something like this: "A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step." We are making those single steps now, and I think that we are taking another step today, indeed, this very hour. You are dedicating yourselves to mobilization and that is the crux of this beginning. This is a mobilization meeting for peace. I love that word and all that it means. This is a call for progress, a mobilization of the minds and hearts of all Americans who are looking forward to a decade for developing brotherhood. And while we are developing brotherhood, let's live it.

Unless we set an example of human dignity, an example of respect for humankind and for human equality, \$5 billion of foreign aid, \$4½ billion of foreign aid will be a waste, a loss. In fact, it will be poison.

At every opportunity, I repeat that the fulfillment of human rights, the protection and guarding of those rights, the maintenance of human rights, the expression of civil rights, is no longer just morally required, and morally right. We have known that for centuries. Civil rights is no longer just politically desirable. Many men in public life know that. The fulfillment and the protection of, and the devotion to, human rights and the elimination of every trace of bigotry, discrimination, intolerance is an international security imperative. And you know it.

I must conclude now and return to my job—a job to which I am committed, the mission of being a public servant. But in leaving, let me remind you not to think of foreign aid merely in terms of the dollars—important as it is that people understand that 80 percent of our spending is for domestic investment, if we must use that argument. What the world needs to know more than anything else is that we care, that we believe in people, that we seek to alleviate their suffering. The world seeks to know that we are healers and teachers and providers. It wants to know above all, that we have faith in the destiny of others and others have faith in ours.

I think this is why we are here. And I now charge you with the responsibility of action. Don't you let us fall for one moment. Go to it.

Thank you so much.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

FEED SHORTAGE IN WISCONSIN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the feed shortage in northern Wisconsin has reached the crisis stage.

The light snowfall and cold temperatures last winter killed off old legume stands. Now the severe, devastating drought has shriveled hay and grain crops.

Even if rain should now fall, feed production will be no more than one-third of normal. Farmers will be forced to sell many cattle in order to feed the others.

The following three emergency measures should be adopted at once by the Department of Agriculture:

First. Release soil bank land and feed grain diverted acres in and near the drought areas for pasture or harvesting hay.

Second. Extend the already operating livestock feed program beyond the present August 15 termination date.

Third. Help transport hay from southern Wisconsin and other surplus areas into the drought area.

The drought emergency is especially severe in the following counties, which have been designated by the Wisconsin State ASC Committee: Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Iron, Florence, Sawyer, Rusk, Price, and Taylor.

FARM PEOPLE SUPPORT SOCIAL SECURITY MEDICAL CARE IN WISCONSIN POLL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, medical care for our Nation's older people is not just a problem of our cities. In the country, too, on the farms and in the small towns that make up rural America, the need for adequately financed, modern medical care is great.

How to pay for the miracles of modern medicine is a question which has aroused a great debate throughout our land. The pros and cons of each method are being carefully weighed, not only by the older people who have the most immediate interest, but also by all other citizens who will share in the costs and benefits of any Government medical program.

The distinguished weekly farm newspaper, the Wisconsin Agriculturist, in its issue of July 1, 1961, published a poll taken among farm people in Wisconsin.

Mr. President, the Wisconsin Agriculturist has been remarkably accurate, in election after election, in predicting how Wisconsin farmers would vote. Often the predictions have completely contradicted the expectations of most observers and reporters, but the Wisconsin Agriculturist has been amazingly accurate.

The conclusions of the poll are most interesting, and, I believe, highly significant. Of all those who said they had heard anything about medical care for the over-65 group financed through the social security system, a full 61 percent stated that such a plan should be adopted. Only 8 percent said it should be turned down.

These figures are all the more remarkable because farm people, and others who live in country areas, are traditionally conservative. The evidence of this poll clearly indicates that a large majority of these people support a program of old-age medical care financed through the efficient and time-tested social security system.

The reasons are plain—and they have nothing to do with shopworn labels like "radical," "Socialist," and "visionary."

As one Polk County, Wis., homemaker said, quoted in the Wisconsin Agriculturist:

I sure do think old people should have medical help. I know one old couple that's trying to get along on \$30 a month. He got sick, and one batch of pills cost \$8.

In a nutshell, that is the problem. Old age is a time of low income for many people. And the cost of modern medical care has skyrocketed.

Mr. President, I add that, of course, old age is also the time of expensive illness. The fact is that medical costs for people over the age of 65, by and large, average 2½ times larger than those for people who are younger.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Medical Care for the Aged?" from the July 1, 1961, issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED?

(Wisconsin Agriculturist pollsters asked farm folks what they thought about it. Almost two-thirds favored some kind of hospital or medical bill.)

Elderly people have become quite a problem. Modern medicine lets more people than ever before live to advanced years. Each new miracle drug and every spectacular cure means that more people will reach retirement age, and more will live longer after retirement.

Those who have the good sense to plan for old age, and are lucky enough not to have their plans upset, can generally provide for themselves during their years on life's summit.

But others, many of whom never planned any farther ahead than the next paycheck, and some with just plain bad luck, find they have to pinch pennies and give up the simplest luxuries just to keep themselves fed, clothed, and sheltered. Some are not able to support themselves, and fall back on relief to keep body and soul together.

Old age is traditionally a period of low income for a major segment of our population.

When sickness strikes an elderly person, any one of a number of things may happen. The individual may have plenty of money to pay for his or her own medical expenses, and he will settle all the medical bills promptly.

Or perhaps the elderly person lacks funds to pay the bills. Many bills are forgiven or paid by public or private welfare agencies. In many other cases, children step in and pay their parents' medical bills.

NOT GETTING MEDICAL CARE NEEDED

Just the same, it's argued that many elderly people aren't getting the medical care they need. Many of them aren't aware of the free care they can get, while many would rather die with dignity than take the undignified step of asking for charity.

In order to solve the problem of health care for the aged, it's been proposed that we expand social security benefits to include medical care for persons over 65.

Arguments have been hot and heavy on both sides. On one side is the emotional argument that old people shouldn't be dependent on charity, and that many aren't getting the care they need.

The other side has pointed out that no matter how medical care is provided to those who cannot pay, it's the taxpayer who ends up paying the bills anyway. Some physicians proclaim that they'd rather treat people free when they can't pay than have the Government step in and pay the bills.

To bring some order out of the chaos of charge and countercharge, the Wisconsin Agriculturist has taken a poll of Wisconsin farm families to see how one segment of the public feels about Government health care.

The poll indicates that 61 percent of those who have had this controversy brought to their attention are in favor of a program of medical care for the aged. Here are the questions asked by our poll takers, and how Wisconsin farm folks answered them.

Congress has been considering a plan to help people 65 or older pay their hospital and medical bills through expansion of the social security system. Have you heard anything about this proposal?

	Men	Women	Total
Yes	74	70	72
No	19	21	20
Not sure	7	9	8

If you have heard about plans for Federal old-age medical and hospital insurance, in general what do you think of them?

	Percent
Some plan of this kind should be adopted	61
Help of this kind should be given to people on relief, but to no others	13
A plan of this kind should be turned down	8
Undecided	18

Men and women had pretty much the same ideas about Government medical care programs. Women in the 35-49 age group appeared to be less in favor of these programs than women in other age groups.

Quite a few people interviewed had some comments to make.

"If this plan is adopted, it should lighten the welfare load," said a Clark County farmer.

He echoes the feeling of many who would like to see the burdens of local units of government lightened. Local welfare spending comes pretty much out of property taxes, while the Federal programs proposed as a part of social security would be paid by taxes on income and payrolls.

This would have the effect of shifting much of the welfare load from the property owner to the wage earner.

There is considerable feeling about people who make a habit of living off the public, too. One young Sauk County farmer puts it this way: "I work hard and have no sympathy for others. I believe in a pension for those who have hard luck and sickness. There are too many who won't work hard now or even save for old age because the Government will keep them."

A Polk County senior citizen was concerned about abuses in a medical care system. "Yes, I think it's fine to help older folks with medical bills," he says, "but once you start helping, some of them will run to the doctor every day. And not just to one doctor. They will go to all they can and set up a howl like they will die over a pain in the big toe."

Others are enthusiastic about a Federal health plan. "It's a good idea," says an older La Crosse County farmer. "I hope they can work out something satisfactory."

And a Polk County homemaker put it this way: "I sure do think old people should have medical help. I know one old couple that's trying to get along on \$30 a month. He got sick, and one batch of pills cost \$8."

We certainly have a hotly contested issue here, and it's undoubtedly going to get hotter. Our population is gaining elderly people every day, and their medical care problems are mounting with their numbers.

ARTICLE DESCRIBES HUGE GRANTS TO SMALL TOWNS FOR URBAN RENEWAL

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a striking article in the July 3 issue of the Wall Street Journal, by Donald A. Moffitt, describes how small towns have received large grants for urban renewal projects from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The reporter has focused attention on several small communities in Texas, which are receiving amounts totaling as much as \$478 per resident. But the story itself is applicable to many small towns throughout the Nation. The Government has approved grants totaling \$41 million for 77 towns, each with a population of less than 15,000. Another \$37 million has been earmarked for grants to small towns, and Mr. Moffitt reports that the total is climbing by the day.

To qualify for a Federal grant, a town generally has to pay one-third of the cost of a project. The Federal Government supplies the remaining two-thirds. Some towns are reported to have built streets, parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, and tennis courts, all of which are normally considered local responsibilities. Mr. Moffitt reports that these projects have been used by some towns as part of their shares of urban renewal expenses.

Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal has been accurate in its reporting in the past, and if the report to which I have referred is accurate, this is a scandalous situation. Congress certainly did not intend that slum clearance and urban renewal funds should be used for those purposes. There is no question that this is extremely wasteful and extravagant. It represents an administration of housing legislation passed by the Congress in a way which I think does not reflect the views of a majority of the Members of Congress and which is likely to damage the prospects for having in the future programs of urban renewal and effective slum clearance, which the American people overwhelmingly favor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article describing this situation be printed in the RECORD, and I am asking the Housing and Home Finance Agency to give me its comments on it.

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

GRASSROOTS GRANTS—SMALL TOWNS SCRAMBLE TO GET SLUM REMOVAL AID FROM UNCLE SAM—RESTORING WINK WILL COST \$891,868—TOWNS SPLURGE ON PARKS, SWIMMING POOLS—A LETTER TO LYNDON HELPS

(By Donald A. Moffitt)

MERCEDES, TEX.—Ever since the drought of the 1930's the municipal finances of this small town in the south Texas citrus belt have been a tangled mess.

The city defaulted on its bonds and went into bankruptcy in 1941. In later years it was either unable or unwilling to collect enough taxes to pay off the defaulted bonds and still maintain essential services. As a

result, no new streets were built; sewer and water lines began to disintegrate, and police and fire protection fell off.

But, of late, Mercedes' fortunes have taken a decided turn for the better. In recent months some \$160,000 worth of new street paving has been laid and \$400,000 more is planned. Sewer and water lines have been replaced and extended at a cost of \$234,000. A \$285,000 residential development project is getting under way. Altogether, nearly \$1.7 million is being pumped into this town of 10,963 people.

The wherewithal for most of this transformation is coming from Uncle Sam, under the terms of the Federal urban renewal program.

MONEY FOR SMALL TOWNS

Urban renewal usually brings to mind the massed population of big cities, crowded tenements and traffic congestion—problems notably missing in Mercedes. However, although the Federal program was originally aimed at curing blight of this sort in major metropolises, more and more of the program's funds, as Mercedes' case illustrates, is being channeled to smaller towns. At last count, the Government had approved grants totaling \$41 million for 77 towns with fewer than 15,000 inhabitants. Another \$37 million has been earmarked for grants to small towns and the total is climbing almost daily.

Here in Texas, the strange twist in the urban renewal program is especially obvious. The State's two largest cities, Houston and Dallas, have yet to spend a cent of Federal urban renewal funds except for a small grant authorized for a planning survey. But 18 smaller Texas cities have jumped on the bandwagon to the tune of \$19,057,645 in aid.

The grants to these communities, though small in comparison with the big figures earmarked for projects in Chicago and New York, are still surprisingly large when they are broken down on a per capita basis. For example, in Wink, a tiny oil town in the mesquite-covered plains of west Texas, the city fathers are getting set to receive \$891,868 of Federal money, which, among other things, is expected to lead to a complete remodeling of the town's three-block business district. On the basis of Wink's 1,863 population, that's the equivalent of \$478 of U.S. funds for each man, woman, and child who lives there. Should New York City's urban blight prove proportionately as expensive to cure, it would require \$3.8 billion of funds from Washington.

A LETTER TO LYNDON

Smalltown officials have shown sharp political acumen in dealing with Federal urban renewal officials and this partly accounts for the big role they are playing in the program. When Wink's program did not proceed as rapidly as the townsfolk thought it should, a local businessman wrote to Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON complaining of the delays. The matter was referred to Housing and Home Finance Administrator Robert C. Weaver, who gave it "priority attention," and Wink got its authorization for the Federal money last week.

Urban renewal projects of all sorts are currently getting a big push from the Kennedy administration. The President has ordered HHFA officials to speed up processing of applications and he has wired the mayors of cities with projects: "Your city's rebuilding program can be accelerated and at the same time jobs can be provided to help meet our Nation's unemployment problem."

Texas cities, of course, aren't the only ones taking advantage of the Federal Government's generosity in urban renewal grants.

Some of the towns which already have received Federal funds for projects are East Granby, Conn. (population 2,434), which has

a grant of \$246,193; Braddock, Pa. (population 12,337), which has been granted \$2,050,559, and Lithonia, Ga. (population 1,667), with a grant of \$102,872.

REVAMPING SITKA

The Government also has earmarked \$430,000 for urban renewal in Sitka, Alaska, a town of 3,237 inhabitants, Atchison, Kans., with 12,529 people, is to get \$1,916,822. A grant of \$463,210 has been reserved for Princeton, N.J., a city of 11,890, when its renewal program gets underway. Princeton is mainly interested in buying two blocks of land next to its central business district in order to make a thoroughfare out of a jogging street that now causes a traffic bottleneck.

"Straightening the street, of course, could be done by the municipality," says Dr. Harry W. Hazard, executive director of the Borough of Princeton Housing Authority. "But we'd also like to develop the area so businessmen wouldn't move away, and part could be a place for our public library." Princeton's plans have been stalled several years, largely because of a suit by businessmen who contend their area isn't blighted.

Even Tuxedo Park, the wealthy New York community founded by Pierre Lorillard in the last century as a refuge for millionaires, has received a Federal grant for planning aid to prepare itself for a renewal project.

"There are no limits whatever on the size a city has to be to get urban renewal grants," declares W. H. Gelbach, Director of Administration Management for the Urban Renewal Administration (a part of the HHFA). "All a city has to have is an urgent and pressing problem and an approved, workable program for solving it."

Robert A. Robinson, director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency's regional headquarters in Fort Worth, observes, "Actually, it's easier for people in small towns to get together on an urban renewal program than in big cities." He explains the sharp upsurge in applications from smaller communities: "People in these towns hear about the program and find out they can get help with their streets and utilities. In some of the larger cities, on the other hand, there are conflicting interests which can't agree to have a program."

SWIMMING POOLS AND TENNIS COURTS

To qualify for Federal grants, localities generally have to pay one-third of the cost of a project, with the Federal Government picking up the bill for the remainder. Some towns are building streets, parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, and tennis courts—all normally considered a local responsibility—and are crediting the cost toward their share of urban renewal expense.

In Mercedes, quick-thinking city officials decided to include a much-needed new school in their urban renewal project and found that by doing so the \$355,000 school expenditure qualified the town for \$710,000 in Federal funds. Actually the school has been built outside the limits of the renewal project, but it was approved as part of the city's one-third contribution because it will serve residents living in the urban renewal area.

"This is the greatest thing that's happened to us in years," enthuses Mercedes Mayor C. A. Ripley. "We would never have been able to finance sewerage in this town by ourselves. We've done that, and now we're able to issue \$350,000 in bonds for a new civic center without even raising the tax rate."

Mercedes' South Side, once crisscrossed by curbless, dusty streets, now boasts of smooth paving. Across from modern one-story Travis School on South Georgia Street 13 modest but neat frame houses occupy what once was a block of untended weeds. These are homes built for occupants of condemned shanties; the former shanty dwellers are

buying the better quarters with loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration under section 221 of the National Housing Act. The law provides for 40-year mortgages on urban renewal relocation homes.

SPRUCING UP OLD HOMES

Here and there in the neighborhood carpenters are replacing leaky roofs, rotten siding, and falling porches for residents who've been told to get their homes in order. Many of these repairs are being made with special Federal loan help.

Folks here are so delighted with the turn of events that plans are being made for a second big project—to renovate Mercedes' old-fashioned downtown business district, tear down some buildings, and encourage owners to spruce up others. According to present planning, the town will even sport modern pedestrian malls in its downtown area. Cost of the project is expected to hit \$750,000, with the townsfolk counting on Uncle Sam to foot \$500,000 of the bill.

"Big cities," says Mayor Ripley, "have urban blight to a greater degree, but blight affects the economy as a whole to a greater extent in a small town. I've seen urban renewal projects in big cities and they're like roses in a weedpatch. In a small town like this, you can see the whole town change."

A few hundred miles to the north, residents of Wink are eagerly awaiting a similar transformation. "Our first project takes in 220 acres, about a third of the town," says Donald L. McBee, the 29-year-old director of Wink's urban renewal agency and recently elected president of the Wink Chamber of Commerce. Wink plans to spend \$670,000 of the Federal money to acquire 283 parcels of land which will be cleared and resold for an estimated \$143,000. The town plans to use some of the Federal funds to pay for \$149,779 in street improvements and \$85,016 in sewer and water line extensions.

Wink intends to upgrade its downtown area—a three-block section along State Highway 115, the town's main artery. All but 9 of the 30-odd buildings in the section will be torn down. The highway will be widened and large parking areas will be set aside.

Wink city officials hope businessmen will use the money they'll receive from the sale of the property to put up new stores downtown, but this is by no means a certainty. A dozen main street buildings are ramshackle frame structures already deserted by their owners for lack of business.

"To build up, you've got to tear down first," says Melvin N. Dow, publisher of the Wink Bulletin. "Will it be built up after it's torn down? We don't know, but we were at a point where we had to do something one way or another." He adds: "It's like everything else, a little gamble. But you can hardly spend money like this in a little town without doing some good."

Wink's troubles stem from the depression in the oil industry in the vicinity. In its boom days in 1929 and 1930, the town had a population approaching 25,000, compared with its present 1,863. Now, however, there's little new drilling in the area and producers are beginning to waterflood old wells to push the remaining oil out of the ground. Most of the town's wage earners work for a handful of pipeline companies and oil and gas well service firms in the area, and no new industry has been attracted to make up for the decreasing oil activity.

TOO MANY EYESORES

For this reason, some businessmen doubt that urban renewal will do too much toward reviving the town's economy. "The vacant stores around here aren't going to be built back," says Owen Partain, one of the dozen or so merchants who haven't closed up shop. Standing in the variety store bearing his name, he observes: "They're eyesores, though,

and I think most of us wanted to get rid of these eyesores downtown."

The program shows signs of producing a few worthwhile side effects, however. For one thing, the city recently began to enforce plumbing, electrical, and building codes and for the first time the Federal Housing Administration is making commitments to insure mortgages on homes in the town.

A DISSENTING VIEWPOINT

Wink citizens voted 187 to 5 in a referendum election, required by Texas law, in favor of having an urban renewal project, and opponents of the plan are notably scarce. One dissident, however, is Dick Strawn, owner of a liquor store and icehouse.

"I think it's one of the most un-American things that's ever been hatched up, myself," Mr. Strawn grumbles as he drags a 50-pound chunk of ice across the floor of his icehouse. "The Government's got all the business it can attend to. This giving and giving and giving has got to end."

Smalltown applications for aid frequently cause big headaches for Federal officials administering the program. "For one thing, we have to make sure we're not perpetuating a ghost town," declares Mr. Robinson, the HHFA regional administrator.

Another factor to consider is whether the urban renewal funds actually will be spent for that purpose. But Federal officials indicate their definition of urban renewal is broad. Take the case of Stanton, Tex., which recently asked for \$223,976 it wanted to spend mainly on street paving and sewers.

"There's no bedrock slum there," concedes an official who had a hand in processing the application. "There are only three real shacks in the whole town. But they do lack adequate streets, and many of the houses are old and substandard. It was touch and go there, but we gave them preliminary approval because there was so very little wrong with the town that with just a minimum effort they could have a topnotch place."

The official adds: "If I've ever been in a community that had the resources to do what's needed on its own, though, it's this one. We just gave them an incentive to do what they should have been doing all along."

HARPER'S MAGAZINE ARTICLE IS EVIDENCE OF NEED FOR PROPOSED SEC INVESTIGATION OF THE STOCK MARKET

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed a major investigation of the stock market, the first such investigation since the 1930's.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to express support for this proposed inquiry. Hearings on it are now being conducted in the House by Representative PETER F. MACK, JR., of Illinois.

The stock market is one of the basic institutions of the American economy. If there are irregularities in the stock market, the SEC Chairman, William L. Cary, has said that in recent months there have been evidences of a substantial amount of manipulation in stock prices, then they should be corrected before they harm the entire economy.

The proposed investigation is to extend over a period of a year and a half, and will require an initial appropriation of \$750,000. This would be money well spent. The confidence of the investor in the stock market is a basic requirement of our economic system. Any assault on this confidence can have very serious consequences.

The SEC inquiry will seek answers to such questions as:

First. Are the rules of the stock exchanges adequate to protect the millions of new investors who have flocked into the market in recent years?

Second. Are the rules being enforced?

Third. Have the standards of market operation been lowered?

Fourth. Should there be some regulation of the unlisted, over-the-counter market?

Fifth. Is there a need for new legislation?

Sixth. Can the \$20-billion mutual fund market be properly regulated under existing statutes?

We need a thorough study of broker-dealer practices, exchange rules, and mutual fund operations. Chairman Cary has reported evidence of brokers' failing to keep required records and books.

What makes this investigation especially timely now is the enormous growth in the number of investors, many of them woefully inexperienced and uninformed. This problem has been delineated in fine literary style by Peter Bart in the July issue of Harper's magazine. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A WARNING TO WALL STREET AMATEURS

(By Peter B. Bart)

(NOTE.—Dreams of the affluent society and the space age—plus an old-fashioned urge to gamble—have brought hundreds of thousands of greenhorns into the stock market. * * * Many of them are behaving so foolishly that they scare even the old pros.)

One of the more popular stories making the rounds of Wall Street saloons this spring concerned the fellow who called his broker and asked him to buy 400 shares of a company called Ultrasonics Precision. When the broker asked whether his customer knew anything special about the company the customer replied: "My barber told me to buy it—he's given me some good tips lately."

The transaction was completed, but 2 weeks later, after the next haircut, the customer called again. "I was all wrong," he said. "My barber recommended Ultrasonics Industries, not Ultrasonics Precision. Sell Ultrasonics Precision and buy me the right one." The broker did as directed only to find that his customer had cleared an \$800 profit on the wrong stock.

The story, and its several variations, may be apocryphal, but, like most such tales, it tells something of the tenor of the times. And the tenor of the times on Wall Street these days is deeply disturbing to many thoughtful financial men because there are too many barbers and friends of barbers acting exactly like the people in the story.

In short, Wall Street is worried about the growing role of the small speculator in today's market. It was this sort of worry that led Keith Funston, the tall and august president of the New York Stock Exchange, to flash a warning signal early this spring. Addressing the public in the manner of an impatient parent who had just caught his child with a hand in the cookie jar, Mr. Funston intoned: "There is disquieting evidence that some people have not yet discovered that it is impossible to get something for nothing." A month later he warned: "The behavior of the public makes a mockery of the word 'investing.'"

What triggered Mr. Funston's warnings was the sudden speculative fever that swept

the market in March, April, and May. Volume soared to record levels, the Dow-Jones industrial average hit a new high, standing-room-only crowds suddenly materialized at many brokerage-house boardrooms, and, in the words of one broker, "people raced around buying stock as if they feared there wouldn't be any left the next day."

The sudden mass enthusiasm for the stock market was attributed to several factors—the apparent end of the recession, the change of administration in Washington, the prospect of further inflation. But it also reminded Wall Street of an important change that has taken place in the securities business in recent years; namely, that the stock market has become a mass market. Although Wall Street has worked hard to bring about this change, it knows remarkably little about the new monster that it has created.

How will the mass market behave in periods when significant gains in the economy appear in the offing? How will it respond to sudden downturns and disappointments? Will it be able to contain its speculative surges? No one pretends to know the answers to these questions, but many analysts are extremely apprehensive about what the answers may turn out to be.

"We may be about to witness a phenomenon once deemed inconceivable, a wave of mass speculation that would have been impossible in the 1920's," said Bradbury K. Thurlow, vice president and treasurer of the Wall Street firm of Winslow, Cohu & Stetson, Inc. "The 1929 boom may actually have been only a trial run for the one now apparently getting underway." Mr. Thurlow pointed out that in 1929 only about 1,500,000 people owned common stocks, while today the number of share owners is estimated at 15 million. The big brokerage houses, noting that the number of stockholders has doubled in less than 10 years and that new accounts are opening at a record clip, hope for a share-owning population of perhaps 30 million in another 5 years or so.

The problem with a speculative boom in this sort of mass market, say Mr. Thurlow and many other analysts, is that it would inevitably lead to a spectacular bust, a bust which could destroy millions of investors as well as speculators and give the market a bad name for at least another generation.

This is a disquieting prospect for Wall Street leaders who have struggled long and hard to enhance the stock market's corporate image. Thanks to their efforts and expenditures, the symbolism of the bucket-shop and the backroom manipulator has been banished, and a new aura of gray-flannel respectability now surrounds the stock market. It is this structure of confidence and respectability which the outbreak of mass speculation threatens, and that is why Wall Street is uneasy.

NO MATTER WHAT, IF IT'S NEW

Although the speculative fever has affected all facets of the securities business, it has focused particularly on small, relatively unknown companies, especially companies selling stock to the public for the first time. So strong has been the swing to the little companies that some analysts have labeled it "the revolt against the blue chips."

The new issues were a fit target for speculation. For one thing, companies selling stock to the public for the first time generally issue a small amount of shares. And because there are so few shares in the hands of the public the price can be driven up even by a minor surge of interest. Moreover, the new shares usually are issued at prices designed to attract investor interest. In a bull market, these often are bargain prices indeed.

Finally, many of the new companies "going public" are in space-age industries and bear such melodramatic names as Datamation, Electro-Sonic Laboratories, Electronics Mis-

siles Co. Corporate names like these have pull in the market. (Agricultural Equipment Corp., a manufacturer of weed burners, recently changed its name to Thermodynamics, Inc., prior to issuing stock.)

As a result of these various factors, brokers have been besieged by customers demanding shares in the new issues, and the prices have taken off like rockets. Companies like Packard Instrument, Renwell Electronics, and Pneumodynamics have doubled within days of the stock issue. Stock in Alberto-Culver, a small producer of hair tonic and shampoo, was issued at \$10 and soared almost immediately to \$25 a share. Shares in one company bearing the non-space-age name of Mother's Cookie Co. leaped from \$15 to \$25 within 48 hours. Cove Vitamin and Pharmaceutical went from \$3 to \$60 in 3 months.

"My customers don't even want to know what a company manufactures or what its earnings prospects are," said one young Wall Street broker. "If it's a new issue they want it, whatever the case."

Some Wall Street firms have tried to cool the ardor of their customers. White, Weld & Co. refused to open accounts for customers who were interested solely in new issues. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith made a survey of 46 companies that had issued stock during the 1945-46 new-issues boom, and found that only two of the companies now are selling above the offering price.

These efforts in general, however, were without much effect. "In this kind of situation a broker is like a prostitute," reflected a high official of one old-line Wall Street firm. "If we turn away any business we know darn well they'll just take it elsewhere."

The basic problem with a new-issues boom, however, is that it tends to be self-propelling. Public enthusiasm for the newly issued securities encourages more companies to bring out stock—thus there are more new securities registration statements before the Securities and Exchange Commission at this time than ever before in that agency's history. Meanwhile, prestige underwriters who formerly snubbed smaller issues have suddenly developed a fondness for them because of the profits involved. And the small speculator is encouraged all the more to dive into the new-issues market because he sees such distinguished firms backing the shares.

CULT OF GROWTH STOCKS

Another reason it is difficult to bring order to the new-issues boom is that most new offerings first appear on the volatile over-the-counter market, where they are harder to control than on the exchanges. In fact, it is here that the most frenzied speculation has taken place not only in new issues but in established stocks as well.

The over-the-counter market is something of a misnomer, since there is no counter and no clearly defined market—that is to say, no central place where the shares are auctioned off as in the case of the New York Stock Exchange or the American Stock Exchange. The so-called market consists of some 5,000 dealers in offices scattered all over the country, each of whom has a battery of phones and a nervous stomach. Nonetheless, it is the Nation's biggest mechanism for trading securities, with five times as many stocks regularly traded as on the "big board" of the New York Stock Exchange. It has long served as a proving ground for small companies as well as a pleasant retreat for established concerns which shy from the publicity surrounding the major exchanges or don't want to disclose data required to attain a listing on the exchanges.

However, as a result of the fad for new issues and the general surge of speculation in relatively unknown companies, the apparatus for over-the-counter trading has been strained to the breaking point. Dealers in over-the-counter securities use words like "fantastic" and "unbelievable" to describe

their volume of business, and many say that they made more money in commissions during the first quarter of 1961 than during all of 1960.

If many of the oldtimers on the over-the-counter market have been awed by the tremendous volume, they've been equally aghast at the way in which the public has cast aside the traditional yardsticks used in evaluating stocks. These yardsticks involved such considerations as the dividend yield (5 percent was considered reasonable) or the "price-earnings ratio"—the relationship between a company's earnings and the price of the stock. (If a stock sold at more than 10 or 12 times the company's earnings, many brokers used to consider it overpriced.) In today's market, with attention focused on so-called growth stocks, people clamor to buy stocks which have no yields and sell at 50 or 100 times earnings. Thus in May IBM was selling at 75 times earnings, Polaroid at 95 times earnings, and Fairchild Camera at 60 times earnings.

"It's possible to argue that the IBM's and Polaroids are well worth their current price," notes Stephen H. Weiss, of A. G. Becker & Co. "But in a market like this one the good growth stocks tend to cast their aura of glamour around dozens of small, unseasoned companies operating in roughly parallel fields. The result is astronomical and unjustified prices for unknown, unstable stocks."

The cult of the growth stock traces its origins to several sources. For one thing, it's in keeping with the speculative spirit of the times. For another, most people in the upper tax brackets prefer to maneuver among the esoteric, low-yield growth stocks and pay a capital-gains tax limited to 25 percent rather than pay higher taxes on dividend income. Finally, investors figure that the growth stocks hold out the brightest prospects for short-term appreciation rather than the once-popular but sluggishly performing blue chips.

The growth-minded mood of the current market was effectively, if unintentionally parodied not long ago by Comedians Lou Holtz and Jack Paar when Mr. Holtz confided to Mr. Paar on a national television show that he owned a stock listed on the American Exchange which would move from \$10 to \$1,000 in 10 years. The following day was a memorable one for the exchange's \$10 stocks. The favorite with the television-minded speculators was a company named MPO Videotronics, and trading in that stock couldn't be opened until a few minutes before the close because of a rush of buy orders. Alas, the company proved to be a double disappointment. To begin with, it wasn't the stock Mr. Holtz had in mind; and its principal product turned out to be television commercials.

As one Wall Street analyst commented on the whole episode, "Never have so many people invested so much money so stupidly."

TIGHTENING THE SCREWS

The Jack Paar-Lou Holtz incident was hardly the only case in which stocks suddenly took off under mysterious circumstances. In this case, of course, the underlying cause seemed to be innocent enough. In a number of other cases, however, the suspicion of manipulation hung over the market.

There is no way of knowing how much old-fashioned price rigging takes place in Wall Street today; i.e., the creation of an artificial demand to buy or sell a stock by influential insiders. Some financial men scoff at the idea; others insist, however, that price rigging persists to an alarming extent and is a very real threat to public confidence.

The position of the latter group would appear to gain credence from several recent actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission against prominent Wall Street firms.

The most spectacular case involved charges of massive rigging and illegal distribution of \$10 million worth of securities. In May, these charges resulted in the expulsion of Gerard A. Re and his son, Gerard F. Re, from the American Stock Exchange. Re, Re & Sagarese at one time was one of the largest specialist firms on the American Exchange.

The Re case aroused a great deal of comment for several reasons. For one thing, it was the first time since the establishment of the SEC in 1934 that the agency had taken action against a specialist. The specialist's role is a pivotal one on the exchanges, since he is charged with the responsibility of maintaining an orderly auction market in those securities assigned to him.

Moreover, one of the many prominent men who had been victimized by some of the Re deals was Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange.

As part of its crackdown on market manipulation, the SEC announced that it would undertake an investigation of the American Stock Exchange. Meanwhile, it brought disciplinary action against Bruns, Nordeman & Co., for manipulating the price of shares in Gob Shops of America, a small chain of Rhode Island stores, and against an underwriter, R. A. Holman & Co., on charges of holding back shares in a stock sale in order to create an artificial demand. The SEC also warned underwriters against so-called tie-in sales in which newly issued securities are sold on condition that the buyer later will purchase an additional amount on the open market.

While the SEC was cracking down on some of the more blatant market malpractices, the exchanges also were tightening the screws in other areas. The New York Stock Exchange, for example, recently stiffened its requirements for getting a stock listed. The New York and American Exchanges have stepped up their so-called stock watching activities, in which staff members quietly investigate situations where prices suddenly spurt or volume soars for no apparent reason. The New York Exchange also reminded companies on the big board of their obligation to disclose immediately any information that might have an effect on the prices of listed securities.

The big board's warning was precipitated by a series of incidents in which important companies were especially obvious in leaking information in advance of official announcements. One big electronics company, for example, took groups of reporters and security analysts out to see an important new computer several days before the story was to be released for publication. The visits generated sufficient rumors to push up the stock by 5 points during the 2 days immediately preceding the announcement.

It is this sort of practice which has given new currency to the old Wall Street saying: "Buy on the rumor and sell on the news." The reasoning behind it is that when important news is brewing about a company—a merger, stock split, or important new product—the stock will rise until the story hits the papers and then will decline. The effect is to put the squeeze on the gullible investor who is impressed by what he reads in the paper—and to increase the flocking of lambs into Wall Street for shearing.

Burton Crane, the stock market columnist of the New York Times, traced the market performances of 28 companies which had announced stock splits and found that nearly all had climbed in the weeks prior to the announcement. However, far more stocks fell than rose during the period immediately following release of the news. Thus some cynical members of the financial press refer to many of their stories as "near news" rather than news. "Near news" is information that has been methodically leaked to all persons who might possibly

have interest in the story and who might be in a position to profit from advance knowledge.

The expanded role of "near news" has coincided with the growing importance of special stock deals in that part of the public relations industry which specializes in publicizing and distributing financial and business news. More and more companies now include some sort of stock arrangement as part of the total remuneration paid to public relations agencies. For instance, many corporations grant stock options to the public relations agencies which allow them to buy stocks at their original low prices well after they have increased in value. The effect has been to focus the attention of the public relations people on the price of the stock rather than on getting out the news, so that some agencies have become stock touts rather than publicists.

These practices raise deeply disturbing questions: Does the small investor or even the small speculator get a fair break in the market? Does he have proper access to corporate news? Is he victimized by market riggers? When speaking for public consumption on these questions, nearly all Wall Streeters take the position that (a) the market is basically honest, (b) they are nonetheless concerned lest ardent speculation or a few well publicized cases of price rigging may seriously shake public confidence in the market.

"You can never do away with the insiders, and you can never get around the fact that some people inevitably are going to know things and profit from this knowledge while others will remain in the dark," said one experienced Wall Street analyst. "Thus people are certainly not competing on equal terms in the stock market. But, nonetheless, within this framework we must strive to make things as equitable as possible. In the stock market everyone should be equal, even though some people inevitably will be a little more equal than others."

It was the great misfortune of Dr. Irving Fisher, the distinguished economist at Yale from 1893 to 1935, to have achieved immortality with a misjudgment. Said Dr. Fisher in 1929: "Stock prices have reached what looks like a permanently high plateau."

Not many people talk about "permanently high plateaus" any more. Many Wall Street analysts currently seem to subscribe to an economic adaptation of Newton's law that every action has an equal and opposite reaction. They theorize that every boom runs to excess and inevitably generates some sort of correction or downturn in the market. This principle places the analysts in something of an ambivalent position, to be sure, since, though Wall Street thrives on booms, it also knows that the greater the boom, the greater may be the correction.

POISED TO RUN AWAY

At present, there are fears that Wall Street may be poised for a speculative boom of runaway proportions and that the shakeout or correction which will follow may do a great deal of damage to the investing public.

There is much disagreement over what may trigger the shakeout. It could be an unexpected diplomatic crisis in Berlin, southeast Asia, or some other trouble spot; or a sudden flood tide of corporate larceny—the ruthless milking of corporate assets by high executives—which, according to J. K. Galbraith, was a factor in the 1929 crash; or a loss of public confidence due to disclosures of serious manipulation, or any number of other factors. If conditions were sufficiently sensitive, it wouldn't require too catastrophic an incident to set off a shakeout since the movement of relatively few shares establishes the prices for all shares of stock. (Only a small percentage of the total amount of stock in existence is actively traded in the market.) If and when a break

does occur, the market will be propelled downward by a number of forces. For instance, insiders in companies whose stock has only recently been issued to the public—and has enjoyed great increase in value—may well try to unload a good part of their holdings. And other paper millionaires will no doubt join them.

Whatever the causes, however, surprisingly few Wall Streeters are prepared to suggest steps to ward off a bust. In a society of mass affluence, they reason, there's little that can be done to prevent people from gambling away their money. Lifting margins or curbing the activities of nonregulated lenders would be of little use, they argue, because most of the speculation in today's market takes place on a cash basis. "If the public wants to shoot craps, there's nothing we can do about it," says one high SEC official.

There are, of course, several long-range measures that could be taken and that have the support of Wall Street; chiefly, increased efforts to educate the public in the economics of the stock market and in economics in general. Secondly, just as investors should be better informed, so should their brokers. The big Wall Street houses have done much in recent years to improve the caliber of their staffs. But there are still too many ill-prepared, ill-educated brokers in the securities business, who mislead their customers—if not cheat them.

These are problems that must be tackled over the long term. On the more immediate level, some Wall Streeters and independent observers favor several short-term devices to curb the excesses in the market:

1. A crackdown on the advertising placed by some investment advisory services which make get-rich-quick promises.

2. A further increase in the staffs maintained by the SEC and the major exchanges to watch for price rigging and other irregularities.

3. Continued warnings to the public by the exchanges themselves—and even by officials in Washington—against the dangers of excessive speculation. (Mr. Funston issued another such warning in mid-May.)

4. A greater effort at self-policing by the financial community in general. For instance, prestige firms should refuse to underwrite stock offerings for undercapitalized and poorly managed enterprises.

5. A tightening of SEC rules governing new issues, which would require fuller disclosure of financial information by companies involved, and the certification of the accuracy of such information for small as well as large stock issues. (At present, no certification by accountants is required for stock offerings of \$300,000 or less.)

6. New legislation giving the SEC stricter controls over securities trading and over new issues, enabling it, for example, to bar doubtful companies from selling stocks to the public.

These reforms—not to mention more radical proposals—are likely to run up against the laissez faire instincts of the financial community. However, there are now increased stirrings in Washington for Congress to take a hand in the regulation of the market. Whether new controls come from Wall Street itself or from Washington, there is growing recognition that something must be done: Having transformed the securities business into a truly mass market, Wall Street must now face the responsibilities which this change entails. Whether it will or not is an open, and urgent, question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we in this body have a responsibility to the American investor to make sure that the market into which he puts his money is a fair one, and that its rules and regulations are adequate and well enough enforced to keep it that way.

For this reason, I join with Representative PETER F. MACK, JR., of Illinois, in urging widespread support of this investigation.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as part of a continuing interest in the activities of the Small Business Administration, I recently queried small businessmen in Wisconsin as to their opinions about the SBA, because I have heard many informal criticisms.

Their comments, both favorable and unfavorable, have been summarized in a letter I have sent to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who was chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on the operation of the SBA.

I believe that the letters make it clear that the small businessman is constrained to comply with regulations which are extremely burdensome. For example:

One businessman wrote that his most recent loan application required approximately 1½ man-months of administrative time and three-quarters of a man-month of secretarial time just to complete the forms. He pointed out that for the average small business, this time expenditure was almost prohibitive. Another businessman said it took his firm 90 days to complete its application forms for an SBA loan.

There are other criticisms, but the one which I have stated runs repeatedly through our inquiries.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I referred and six representative letters of comment on the Small Business Administration from Wisconsin businessmen be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JULY 7, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Recently, I wrote to small businessmen who had borrowed from the Small Business Administration in Wisconsin asking their opinion of the SBA. The reaction was divided.

A number of the replies contained favorable comments on the operation of the SBA.

Complimentary references to local branch personnel of the SBA stressed the efficiency of SBA personnel, and were of a general nature.

The criticisms of the SBA were registered along more specific lines. The main discontent, appearing in nearly all of the critical replies, was over the redtape encountered in obtaining an SBA loan.

One businessman wrote that his most recent loan application had required approximately 1½ man-months of administrative time and three-quarters of a man-month of secretarial time just to complete the forms. He pointed out that, for the average small business, this time expenditure was almost prohibitive. Another businessman said it took his firm 90 days to complete its application forms for an SBA loan.

Other criticisms centered on the high collateral requirements for SBA loans, the short terms of some loans, and the interest charges, which are regarded by some businessmen as being overly high. One businessman said that the 5½ percent interest charge on his SBA loan was too high.

The Agency has also come in for some criticism on the grounds that it represents one more bureau in an already bureaucratized Federal Government.

I am enclosing copies of several representative letters from my constituents commenting on the SBA.

The SBA has not been unresponsive to some of these criticisms. In an effort to slash some of the redtape, the SBA has devised simplified application forms and other timesaving procedures.

To improve the Agency's lending program, the dollar limit on applications which can be approved by SBA regional offices has been increased. Previously, the field offices could approve participation loans of up to \$100,000 on their own authority. This limit has been raised to \$150,000. On direct loans, the regional offices will now be able to approve loans of up to \$50,000. The former limit was \$20,000.

Smaller loan categories have also been liberalized. With this increase in delegated authority, it is now possible for district offices of the SBA to process 75 percent of all loan applications.

Another innovation has been the abolition of the Loan Review Board, and the establishment in its place of three area loan groups, each authorized to take final action on application from the territory assigned to it. The Loan Review Board, which formerly passed on all applications coming to Washington, had become a bottleneck.

The SBA has also decided to place a less restrictive emphasis on collateral, and to give added value to a company's ability to pay off a loan on its reputation for sound management, earnings record, and previous credit experience.

The SBA has also embarked upon a program to reverse the decline in the share of small firms in Government procurement. The military services have agreed to inform the SBA in advance on research and development contracts so that the agency will have time to locate small firms capable of handling such contracts.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

FAVORABLE TO SBA

JAJ INDUSTRIES CORP.,
Delavan, Wis., June 28, 1961.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

(Attention of WILLIAM PROXMIRE, U.S. Senator from Wisconsin.)

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you very much for your letter of June 8. I am sorry we have not had the opportunity of answering this sooner.

We have been very pleased with our association with the Small Business Administration. Our loan is a joint loan with the local bank participating to the extent of approximately 25 percent. I think one of the most difficult things in handling a loan of our type was the acquainting of the bank with the purposes and policies of the Small Business Administration. I would think that there would be some additional information that could be passed on to the bank that would make these people more actively interested in long-term financing with the Federal Government through small business loans.

As you know, a loan of this sort is considered last resort financing. By this, I mean that we must be able to prove that we are unable to obtain this money at any other institution and therefore need the services of the Government.

I think the most important lesson we have learned from dealing with the Small Business Administration is that its policies are set up to teach us to help ourselves not to take anything away from us. I think we have learned this lesson well and now are

happily on a road to success. Our volume has more than tripled in the period of the loan and our profits have soared in even greater proportion.

As in all Government functions where every taxpayer can be a critic, we were somewhat hampered on a number of our activities by the gigantic redtape that was necessary on approval of our actions. We have always dealt very closely with the office in Madison, Wis., and felt that they were well aware of our problems.

As a former small businessman, you can understand that many decisions must be made and carried out in a short period of time. By keeping the local office aware of our every action, it was very simple for us to consult with them on interim borrowing, capital improvements, and many other phases of our loan administration. Our local bank was most understanding and this was never a problem with them.

Our problems did arise when we had to get approval of any changes in our original loan authorization and these changes had to be handled either through the Chicago office or through Washington itself. It would seem to me that more powers could be delegated to the local offices and they would be better equipped to deal with the problems.

Even though the Small Business Administration stresses the importance of having a participating bank in its loans, the participating bank only recommends changes as suggested by the borrower. These recommended changes then have to go through your chain of command and it does make things rather difficult when an important decision must be finalized in a short period of time. It is not possible to convey to Chicago or Washington the same background that you have given the local representatives. This would require numerous visits to these people and they are certainly too busy with other phases of the Small Business Administration, such as disaster loans.

In summing this up, we all agree here that this has been a wonderful thing for us. We have stopped and analyzed our past mistakes, planned more extensively for our future, and placed a new value on the dollar in business growth.

If we do have any problems in the future, we like to feel that we are free to contact you for any assistance.

Thank you for your personal attention in this matter.

Very truly yours,

F. J. CALLUM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CECRAFT MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,
Stoughton, Wis., June 26, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of June 8, requesting information regarding the SBA loan which this firm obtained in recent months, it is very gratifying to know that a Government agency can be of assistance to a small business such as ours. The transfer of this business from Milwaukee to Stoughton involved a considerable expense, therefore, using capital which should have been used for inventory.

Due to the intense competition from large mills, it was necessary for this firm to maintain a larger and more balanced inventory. Since this firm was unable to make a straight loan from a private institution, we solicited the help of SBA. We were granted a loan at a reasonable rate of interest and over a satisfactory length of time.

Since obtaining this money, to bolster our operation and carry a complete inventory, our business has increased even though homebuilding, in general, has not been as good as in previous years. This strengthened our firm to the degree that a large precur-

home corporation saw fit to give us a long-term contract, which will help give us the volume desired to be competitive with larger mills. Since the location of this mill is in a very heavily populated area we are in a position to serve southeastern Wisconsin and northern Illinois with our products at a lower cost of transportation.

As to your request for ideas of how improvements can be made within the SBA, as per our experience, I would like to state that the Chicago office of SBA handled our application very satisfactorily.

I feel that said office has taken into consideration the character of the individuals, their resourcefulness and aggressiveness in their operations, to warrant granting this loan. There were many factors connected with the progress of this firm and since the necessary capital to market its products was lacking, but due to its potential, the Chicago office made its decision to grant the loan and actually set this firm in a position to produce its products for sale to the general lumber dealers for their trade.

We recognize that a tremendous change is taking place in the homebuilding field and have been changing our business from a bulk production to a ready-cut or package distributor. SBA through its granting this loan has made it possible for us to do this conversion. By the same token it has and will increase our employment, which means more paychecks, more taxes, etc.

We are very pleased with the way in which this loan was handled, and if you have any further questions regarding our operation and/or our association with SBA, feel free to direct your communications to me.

Thanking you for this request, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
CECRAFT MANUFACTURING
CO., INC.,
MYRON C. TREMBLEY,
Director of Sales.

BJORKSTEN RESEARCH LABORATORIES,
Madison, Wis., June 19, 1961.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you for your letter of June 8 requesting comments on the operation of the Small Business Administration.

Our small business has had two loan arrangements with the Small Business Administration (not concurrent), as well as utilizing their services for some available published information and filling out various registration forms on request.

On the whole, we feel that this agency renders a useful service and are generally pleased with our relationships and past dealings with them.

A specific area in which this service might be improved is that of the ever-present redtape. In the first place, it would appear that loan application forms and procedures could be greatly simplified. The information requested in many cases would seem to be more applicable to big business than small business and the time required to complete these forms and supplementary information requested is quite large. The most recent application with which we were concerned required approximately 1½ man-months of administrative time and about three-fourths man-month of secretarial time just to complete the application. For the average small business, this time expenditure could be almost prohibitive. The amount of detail and attendant paperwork after approval of a loan is also appreciable and appears somewhat overlegalized.

In the case of one of our loans, the philosophy seemed to be the greater the need the less the willingness to grant it, which is also true with other lending institutions.

The above comments are not intended as criticisms of either the fine people with

whom we have dealt nor the overall agency, since, as previously stated, we believe the agency serves a useful purpose, but mean to indicate lines along which we, as users of this service, feel it might be improved.

Yours very sincerely,

BJORKSTEN RESEARCH
LABORATORIES,
JAMES E. HENNING,
Vice President.

CRITICAL OF SBA

FEDERAL REFRIGERATOR
MANUFACTURING CO.,
Waukesha, Wis., June 28, 1961.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciated receiving your letter relative to the activities of Small Business Administration and will try to contribute whatever I can, even though I feel strongly that this organization is set up only for the purpose of political propaganda. We went through all the mass of necessary detail in making application for a SBA loan. You possibly can recall this because we wrote and called, asking for whatever help you could contribute.

With the work involved in filling all of the data requirements and the time expended on the application, I sincerely believe it cost our firm \$10,000, only to be turned down after all the gymnastics were fulfilled.

I realize that Government money should not be squandered, but we were refused a loan even though we had a bank agreement for participation. Surely, any bank too has obligations to its depositors.

We were turned down on the basis of not having sufficient collateral and for not being able to show a history of profits. No consideration was given, or at least we were not so advised, that the shortage of working capital contributed to this inability and reasonable assistance could have changed our operations to a profit. Our bank does know of this and on that basis they were willing to help.

I do not feel that you will be able to help much in your endeavors. The SBA is not set up to help sincerity or integrity. It is strictly another governmental agency to perpetuate more people on the Government payroll.

However, I am answering your letter because I feel that anyone who is willing to write is worthy of a reply.

Yours very truly,
JOHN ROMADKA, President.

RUBBER ENGRAVING & STAMP CO., INC.,
Green Bay, Wis., June 27, 1961.

Mr. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PROXMIRE: In reply to your letter of the 8th, in which you inquire about our observations in dealing with the Small Business Administration, we wish to state that we did not go ahead with the deal even though the loan was authorized.

The main reason as to why we declined the loan was the steep monthly terms. We need a rubber vulcanizing press badly, in order to stay in business. However, the SBA classifies this press as machinery; therefore, loans are made on 5-year terms only. And since we needed \$18,000 plus insurance, the monthly payments were beyond our reach.

Mr. PROXMIRE, at present there is a used press available the same size as the one mentioned above, only 6 years old, which we can purchase for \$12,000, including the boiler to heat it with. However, it won't be available long because it is considered a "real buy."

The bank tells us that to get a \$12,000 loan, we have to apply to the SBA again. But that takes times, and we need more than a 5-year term. Mr. PROXMIRE, what can you do to help us?

To date, our summary of the SBA is that it is not a department to help small businesses in dire need like ours. Can you do anything to change it?

Very truly yours,
RUBBER ENGRAVING & STAMP CO. INC.,
EDLEE L. KARNZ, Manager.

BILTMORE APPAREL SHOP,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 23, 1961.

Mr. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your kind letter of June 8, with reference to my experience with the SBA.

I am certain it is no news to you that the small businessman, today, is beset with many problems, foremost among which is the desire and the knowledge that he must expand or else. With this thought in mind, I did approach the SBA, and was shown every courtesy, and my loan for \$20,000 was approved, but after studying the terms and conditions, under which the loan was to have been executed, I felt it impossible to retain my identity as a businessman and was compelled to turn it down.

I have not, as a result expanded as much as I would have liked, but the Lincoln State Bank, with whom I have done business with for the last 20 years, have and still are supplying my immediate needs.

I am sincerely grateful for your interest, and welcome this opportunity to express my sincerest good wishes for your continued good health and success.

Cordially yours,

JACK C. YOUNG.

THE GREAT HYMNS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CURTIS BEFORE THE SENATE BREAKFAST GROUP

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. On Wednesday morning, June 28, 1961, the Senate breakfast group was privileged to have as our leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] who, with his profound sense of true values, brought a wholesome and helpful message on the lasting spiritual value of great religious hymns.

In an age of materialism, and in today's world of change and awesome challenges, we can find great strength, reassurance, and inspiration in the great hymns which have lasted through the ages, as well as in the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE SENATE BREAKFAST GROUP, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1961

May I say at the outset that this morning I am unable to solve any or all of the perplexing problems that you, my colleagues, must face day to day. I am not qualified to do that. I am of the opinion, however, that what we need today is not so much solutions to specific problems, as a sense of direction and an abiding faith in certain fundamentals. In support of this contention, I call as my witness Mr. William Gladstone, who is so well known for his accurate description of the Constitution of the United States. It is a different quotation

of Gladstone that I wish to use in this discussion. Gladstone once said—

"I am convinced that the welfare of mankind does not now depend on the state and the world of politics; the real battle is being fought in the world of thought, where a deadly attack is made with great tenacity of purpose and over a wide field upon the greatest treasure of mankind, the belief in God and the Gospel of Christ."

One of Washington's great preachers of our generation, who in recent months has passed to his reward, was Dr. Oscar Blackwelder, of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation here on Capitol Hill. I loved to hear him preach. He said something once that I have never forgotten. He said in substance that what we needed at this time was not to grasp the spirit of the age, but rather to grasp the spirit of the ages.

We are often told that individuals sometimes formulate their own theology, or their religious beliefs, from hymns. I think that is true. This is natural and worth while. It also means that we owe a great debt to the successful and dedicated writers of hymns whose works have lasted through the ages.

Someone might write a so-called "popular song" that would bring great financial reward to the writer, yet that song might be questionable from the standpoint of its moral tone. It might appeal to our baser instincts both as to the melody and as to the suggestive words of the song. It is not so with a great hymn. A great hymn is something beautifully written, that we love to hear. It carries an eternal and divine truth. Hymns belong to the ages, rather than to the age. What we of our generation need is more great writers of hymns.

It is for that reason that I am going to vary our program this morning a little bit and relate some of the background of our great hymns. I must confess that this is not a result of original research on my part but it is largely taken from a great little volume that came to my attention more than a quarter of a century ago, entitled, "Hymn Lore," written by Dr. Calvin W. Laufer.

One of the hymns which has inspired men for more than 185 years, because it was first published in 1776, is "Rock of Ages." No doubt everyone here is familiar with it. The first two stanzas are as follows:

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee;
Let the water and the blood,
From Thy riven side which flowed,
Be of sin the double cure,
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.
"Not the labors of my hands,
Can fulfill Thy law's demands;
Could my zeal no respite know,
Could my tears forever flow,
All for sin could not atone;
Thou must save, and Thou alone."

It was written by Mr. Augustus M. Toplady at a time when he was having a religious controversy with John Wesley concerning his theological convictions. He wanted to prove where he stood.

The popular story of its genesis is that one day Toplady was caught in a shower and found refuge in the cleft of a rock near Blangdon Church, Somerset, England, where he was a curate. In the fissure of the rock he found shelter. This experience, it is supposed, inspired the hymn. Whether this is true or not, one thing is certain—the rocky crag, 70 or 80 feet tall, was often in his view. This, together with the Biblical passage referring to the "rock of ages," supplied the symbolism of the hymn. Whatever the source, for inner comfort, for assurance of heart, and for absolute confidence in Christ's redeeming work, the hymn is perhaps unexcelled.

At the funeral of Gladstone, who translated the hymn into Latin, Greek, and Italian, a great congregation sang it with such feeling that mighty England must have been consoled.

The next great hymn that I want to tell about was written in Washington, D.C. It is entitled, "God Be With You Till We Meet Again." While this hymn has been used at funerals, or at least it used to be, it was written to express the feeling of Christian people assembled for one purpose or another, who were about to part.

The author was Dr. Jeremiah Rankin and the hymn was written while he was Pastor of the First Congregational Church of this city. He was a popular preacher and was heard by Government officials from all parts of the country. In Washington, D.C., especially at that time, which was 1882, the officials in our Government, both the elected officials and those who served in the Departments were here for a while and then gone. This pastor had a feeling that he had in his congregation individuals who came in with every new Congress or new administration, people whom he would like to have always, but who would soon be leaving.

I will not read to you the entire hymn, but the first two stanzas and the chorus go like this:

"God be with you till we meet again,
By His counsels guide, uphold you,
With His sheep securely fold you,
God be with you till we meet again."

CHORUS

"Till we meet, till we meet,
Till we meet at Jesus' feet;
Till we meet, till we meet,
God be with you till we meet again."

"God be with you till we meet again
'Neath His wings protecting hide you,
Daily manna still divide you,
God be with you till we meet again."

This song became very popular at youth camps, summer conferences, and great gatherings that would last for several days where people from many parts of the country assembled, perhaps never to see each other again. Dr. Rankin was a Congregational pastor for 30 years and for 13 years he was president of Howard University here in Washington.

It is to the Reverend John H. Newman, who became a Cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church, to whom we are indebted for the hymn that has lifted the hearts of men and women since it was written more than 100 years ago, "Lead, Kindly Light, Amid the Encircling Gloom." It is reported that this hymn was written by John Newman in the time of illness, mental perplexity, and spiritual unrest. The future was vague, uncertain, dark and baffling. I want to read to you the first stanza of that hymn:

"Lead, kindly Light, amid th' encircling gloom,
Lead Thou me on; The night is dark, and
I am far from home;
Lead Thou me on: Keep Thou my feet; I
do not ask to see
The distant scene—one step enough for
me."

He wrote in the second stanza:

"I was not ever thus, nor prayed that Thou
shouldst lead me on;
I loved to choose and see my path; but now
lead Thou me on.
I loved the garish day, and spite of fears,
Pride ruled my will: remember not past
years."

Today this hymn can be the source of great strength to all of us who, like the writer, are perplexed, uncertain and baffled. It illustrates the point that we, with our human intelligence and training, cannot solve our

problems, but we can follow the lead of One greater than man.

The next great hymn that I would mention was written by Martin Luther. He set to music the theme of the 46th Psalm. This hymn was probably written as early as 1527 and published in 1529. The title of the hymn to which I refer is, "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God". The first stanza of that hymn is as follows:

"A mighty Fortress is our God,
A bulwark never failing;
Our Helper He amid the flood,
Of mortal ills prevailing;
For still our ancient Foe,
Doth seek to work us woe;
His craft and power are great,
And, armed with cruel hate,
On earth is not his equal."

I am not going to take time to read all of the stanzas but the last stanza closes with these lines: "God's truth abideth still, His Kingdom is forever".

"A Mighty Fortress Is Our God" is one of the most usable hymns. It is suitable for private devotions and for festal occasions. In times of crises it is always effective. Gustavus Adolphus' army sang it before the Battle of Leipzig, October 16, 1631, and again at the Battle of Lutzen in 1632. After the World War it was sung in services celebrating the armistice. It is a most comforting hymn of faith.

I would like to tell you now about a hymn that was published in 1825. Its author was Sir John Bowring, an Englishman who traveled widely and who at one time served as British consul at Canton. I refer to the hymn, "In the Cross of Christ I Glory." The hymn was perhaps inspired by the appearance of some ruins in China, but Sir Bowring wrote it before he actually reached China. It is believed that he heard many stories and reports concerning life, customs, traditions, and literature of China. His father was a manufacturer of woolen goods for China and as a young man he heard the reports of the missionaries to that land.

The story current about the hymn's origin relates it to the ruins of a cathedral in Macao, China. The cathedral had been erected by Catholic missionaries centuries before but had been demolished by fire and earthquake, the beautiful facade alone remaining, and surmounting it a cross. These ruins were supposed to have inspired the writing of the hymn.

The stanzas are short, so I'm going to read for you all four of them.

"In the cross of Christ a glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time;
All the light of sacred story,
Gathers round its head sublime.

"When the woes of life o'er take me,
Hopes deceive and fears annoy,
Never shall the cross forsake me;
Lo! It glows with peace and joy.

"When the sun of bliss is beaming,
Light and love upon my way,
From the cross the radiance streaming,
Adds more luster to the day.

"Bane and blessing, pain and pleasure,
By the cross are sanctified;
Peace is there that knows no measure,
Joys that through all time abide."

Sir John Bowring wrote other hymns including, "Watchman, Tell Us of the Night," and "God Is Love."

Everyone here is familiar with, and could no doubt recite, the 23d Psalm, which begins, "The Lord is my Shepherd." It is often called the Shepherd's Psalm. During the dark days of the Civil War, Dr. Joseph H. Gilmore was the minister of the First Baptist Church at Philadelphia. As the

tragic Civil War was in progress and there was no promise of early settlement, many religious people were depressed, and needed exactly the kind of help that the Shepherd Psalm could provide.

Dr. Gilmore preached a sermon one Sunday night on the 23d Psalm. Following the service he and his young bride were the guests in the home of one Deacon Watson and they discussed the service and the beauty of the 23d Psalm and thought it ought to be in a song. During the conversation in that home, the words of this hymn came to him. Only two lines were later changed. His wife had great confidence in the song and without his knowledge sent it to a publisher. About 3 years later he was the guest preacher in a Baptist church in Rochester and he was surprised to hear them singing, as he entered, the hymn that he had written. It was, "He Leadeth Me: O Blessed Thought." The first stanza of that hymn is as follows:

"He leadeth me: O blessed thought.
O words with heavenly comfort fraught.
Whate'er I do, where'er I be,
Still 'tis God's hand that leadeth me."

The First Baptist Church of Philadelphia is no longer there. A large office building is now on that spot, but on it is a plaque which recites the writing of this hymn and points out that there is where the church stood as well as the house of Deacon Watson. All of this happened back in 1862, but this great hymn is still an inspiration and help to millions of people around the world.

One of the greatest writers of hymns was Reverend Isaac Watts. Some years ago, when a Methodist hymnal was written it was found that it contained 53 hymns written by Watts. It was a hymn that he wrote based upon the 90th Psalm and written while he was still a young man that assured him a place as an immortal writer of hymns. That hymn was, "Our God, Our Help in Ages Past." Watts was an Englishman and the hymn was written just before the death of Queen Anne, in 1714, which proved to be a time of national anxiety and political unrest. You see, my friends, that we are not the only generation that has been called upon to live in times of anxiety and unrest and bewilderment.

I am only going to read the first two stanzas of this hymn, which are as follows:

"Our God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.

"Before the hills in order stood,
Or earth received her frame,
From everlasting Thou art God,
To endless years the same."

This hymn was sung at the tomb of England's Unknown Soldier. At the request of Robert Browning it was sung at his funeral. It was in constant use during World War I. It has continued to inspire men down through the ages.

The last hymn that I will mention is a hymn written for conferences and retreats. Its background is Lake Chautauqua in western New York, where for many years, beginning about 1873, hundreds of people, young and old, met for study and prayer. It was written in 1877 to fill the longing of eager students who came to enrich their spiritual life through communion with God in the great outdoors.

This hymn has as its scriptural foundation the words of Jesus when he said, "I am the bread of life." A well-known hymnologist calls the hymn a little gem. It was written by Mary A. Lathbury, who was the daughter of a minister and who had a distinguished career in teaching and writing,

and who died at the age of 72. She was known as the "Laureate of Chautauqua." One of her other hymns is well known to many here—it was entitled, "Day Is Dying in the West."

The hymn referred to as a little gem, is entitled, "Break Thou the Bread of Life." I will read to you its two stanzas and that will conclude my remarks:

"Break Thou the bread of life, Dear Lord, to me,
As Thou didst break the loaves, beside the sea;
Beyond the sacred page I seek thee, Lord;
My spirit pants for Thee, O living Word.
"Bless Thou the truth, dear Lord, to me, to me,
As Thou didst bless the bread, by Galilee;
Then shall all bondage cease, all fetters fall,
And I shall find my peace, my all in all."

JAN HUSS (1369-1415)

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the great Bohemian religious reformer, Jan Huss, born to peasant parents 592 years ago, was the first torchbearer of Reformation in Europe. He was an eloquent and learned preacher as well as a great teacher. As such he was esteemed highly by the people, but his popularity was secured at the price of clerical antipathy. His election to the rectorship of the university in Prague did not abate the opposition of the clergy.

In 1409 his excommunication was issued against a mounting public protest in his favor. He was overwhelmingly supported by the people, and the king and queen of Bohemia appealed to Rome to have the charges against him quashed. All this was of no avail. In March 1411 the ban was pronounced upon him, and ultimately the whole city of Prague was laid under interdict.

Huss then withdrew from the city and went to Kozihradek in southern Czechoslovakia. In 1413 he was taken to Constance in southwest Germany, to be tried there by a religious council on the charge of heresy. He was convicted and executed on July 6, 1415. On the 546th anniversary of the death of this great champion of freedom, I join with Bohemians and Czechs everywhere to pay tribute to his memory.

HEARINGS BY STATISTICS SUBCOMMITTEE OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most important economic documents that have been published in this country and, in the view of most critics, certainly the most important study of monetary policy that has been made since the Aldrich Commission study in 1908, which resulted in the Federal Reserve Act, was the study of money and credit that was made by the Commission on Money and Credit. This is an extremely interesting study, controversial in many respects. But it is most interesting to me because many of the recommendations in it are recommendations that some of us have urged for a long, long time in the Senate, particularly the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois

[Mr. DOUGLAS]. This position is joined in by some of the leading bankers, financiers, labor leaders, farm leaders, professors and other experts on monetary policy in the country.

The Joint Economic Subcommittee on Statistics of which I am chairman, has scheduled hearings on unemployment concepts. We are trying to get far more information than we have on the nature of various kinds of unemployment, and are trying to catalog and categorize the various kinds of unemployment that have troubled us.

I raise the point because in the report of the Commission on Money and Credit there is the following statement:

Unfortunately the data are not now available to estimate the current number of job vacancies and the proportion of unemployment attributable to inadequate demand as compared to structural, frictional, and seasonal causes. While it may not be possible to attain precise quantitative measures of these magnitudes, it is imperative that far greater effort and funds be devoted to acquiring better information. The Government should institute a major program to identify the precise kinds of unemployment information needed as an adequate guide for policy decisions and then to acquire the data on a timely basis.

Our hearings are designed to determine whether or not such a major program would be justified.

Recently Mr. George Gallup conducted a poll to determine how people felt about making a sacrifice for their country in the sense of paying higher taxes, and it was interesting to note that in the poll a substantial majority of the people indicated that they were not willing to pay higher taxes for defense, for any kind of foreign aid, or for a whole series of programs, but a very substantial majority was willing to pay higher taxes to train the unemployed in new skills so that they could fill jobs which are now unfilled because we do not have the skilled people to fill them.

This approach is an enormously popular concept in America. Interestingly, it is a concept which is very popular with Republicans and Democrats.

I ask unanimous consent that a report on that poll from the Madison, Wis., Capital Times be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

KENNEDY'S CALL TO SACRIFICE HAS YET TO SINK HOME

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—President Kennedy's call for greater sacrifices to strengthen the U.S. position here and abroad has yet to sink home with a great many Americans.

Of the major proposals specified by the President in his second state of the Union message, only one—expanding training for unemployed workers—is cited by more than half of the public as an item for which they would be willing to sacrifice to the point of increased personal taxes.

In his speech before a joint session of Congress, Kennedy asked for increased spending also for strengthening the Armed Forces, a greater civil defense effort, economic and military aid to other nations, the U.S. In-

formation Agency, and a stepped-up space effort with the goal of getting a man on the moon.

None of these other items, however, finds over half of the public saying they are willing to sacrifice in order to achieve the goal.

To see which items get the greatest priority from the public, the Gallup poll had its interviewer show voters a card listing the major items and ask this question:

"Here is a list of items for which President Kennedy has asked Americans to make sacrifices. For which of these would you be willing to make sacrifices, even if it meant increasing your own taxes?"

Top priority goes to the President's proposal that workers now laid off because of automation be given training in new job skills.

At the bottom of the list, the public puts increased military aid to other nations.

The vote on the complete list—Willing to sacrifice for:

	Percent
Retraining program for unemployed	67
Increase funds for improved Armed Forces	28
Strengthen civil defense program	28
Step up USIA propaganda efforts	26
Increase space research efforts	21
Increase military aid to nations	21
Increase military aid to nations	9
None of them	5
Don't know	5
	3

(Table adds to more than 100 percent since many people cited more than one item.)

Analysis of the results by party affiliation shows little difference between Republicans, Democrats, or Independents.

Voters from all three groups name the expanded training for the unemployed most frequently. This item is given somewhat greater priority, however, by Democrats (71 percent) and Independents (70 percent) than it is by Republicans (58 percent).

Democrats tend to give increased economic aid to underdeveloped nations slightly greater priority than Republicans do.

Among all three groups, increased spending for military aid to other nations ranks last.

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before any extensive program is undertaken, or a great deal of money is spent, it seems to me Congress should know what the conditions are. There is a very serious dispute between Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board and Dr. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, as to whether or not structural unemployment is as important as many people have argued that it is. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has argued that it is most important. He has implied that it is considerably more important than is the question of inadequate demand, whereas the head of the Council of Economic Advisers, an extremely accomplished and eloquent economist, Dr. Heller, drastically disagrees with him. Dr. Heller and Dr. Tobin, of the Council of Economic Advisers, in particular, have studied the problem in some detail and have presented to the Joint Economic Committee documented study indicating that a substantial increase in demand would go a very long way toward establishing all kinds of employment. In order to resolve this kind of question, it seems to me we need a great deal more of the kind of information that the report of the Com-

mission on Money and Credit has requested.

As I have said, this Commission consisted of people of such diverse and contradictory views as some of the following: David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank; Robert Nathan, of Robert Nathan Associates; Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of department of research, AFL-CIO; Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; and Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., president, the First National Bank of Chicago.

It seems to me that virtually all intelligent, thoughtful, and responsible people who have considered this subject recognize the very great need for considerable study in this area.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND LOW FOREIGN WAGES

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week on the floor of the Senate there was considerable discussion of the balance-of-payments problem and the problem of foreign imports and competition from abroad in textile areas and other areas. At his press conference, President Kennedy was asked about competition from abroad, particularly in the textile field.

Mr. President, the crux of the problem seems to come back again and again to the wage differential, the fact that in this country wages are considerably higher than in other countries; and it is alleged that not only are our wages higher, but that wage costs are higher—and therefore the total cost of production in this country is in many cases far higher than in other countries.

The very book to which I have referred, published by the Commission on Money and Credit, contains some interesting observations on this subject.

Before I get into that matter, however, I would like to point out exactly how sharp a discrepancy there is between wages paid in this country and wages paid in such countries as West Germany and Japan. The Joint Economic Committee furnished me with some figures showing that in 1960 the average hourly earnings in all manufacturing industries in this country amounted to \$2.29 an hour, with fringe benefits amounting to 35 cents; a total of \$2.64 an hour. These figures compare with those of West Germany, where the average wage is 62 cents an hour, plus fringe benefits of 20 cents, or a total of 82 cents an hour. In Japan the average wage is 30 cents an hour plus fringe benefits of 5 cents an hour, or a total of 35 cents an hour. These figures show that the wage in the United States is nearly three times the wage paid in West Germany, and seven or eight times higher than the wage paid in Japan, both in comparable industries.

As a matter of fact, the figures which I have just disclosed understate the case, if anything, because the Committee for International Trade Policy, which is not a committee which would overstate the case for protection, has indicated a greater discrepancy between United States

wages and wages in Japan. This committee believes that the best basis for comparison is in the field of unskilled wages. For all production workers in Japan in manufacturing, during 1957—this is not 1960, but 1957—the average wage was 17 cents an hour, whereas in the United States in 1956 it was \$1.98.

I ask unanimous consent that a table, designated table III, at page 42 of a booklet entitled "Labor Costs and International Trade" be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a table prepared by the Joint Economic Committee, to which I referred previously, showing the average hourly earnings in manufacturing industries.

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

TABLE III.—*Wage comparisons for selected industries in Japan and the United States*

Japan (All production workers)		United States (All production workers)	
Industry	Hourly earnings April 1957 (U.S. cents) ¹	Hourly earnings 1956 average (cents)	Industry
Food and kindred products.	17	183	Food and kindred products.
Lumber and wood products.	14	176	Lumber and wood products.
Chemical and related industries.	24	211	Chemical and allied products.
Textile mill products.	11	145	Textile mill products.
Stone, clay and glass.	20	196	Stone, clay and glass.
Primary metal industries.	29	236	Primary metal industries.
Fabricated metal products.	19	207	Fabricated metal products
Machinery	21	221	Machinery, except electrical.
Transportation equipment.	26	225	Ship and boat building and repairing.
Apparel and other finished products.	10	145	Apparel and other finished textile products.
Medical and scientific instruments, photo and optical; watches and clocks.	20	201	Instruments and related products.
All manufacturing.	19	198	All manufacturing.

¹ Converted at exchange rate, 1 yen equals 0.2778 of 1 U.S. cent.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, September 1957, "Employment, Wages and Foreign Trade," in U.S. Congress, "Foreign Trade Policy, Compendium of Papers on United States Foreign Trade Policy," 85th Cong., 1st sess., Washington, 1957, p. 774.

Average hourly earnings—manufacturing industries (1960):

United States: \$2.29 (plus fringe benefits \$0.35).

West Germany: \$0.62 (plus fringe benefits \$0.20).

Japan: \$0.30 (plus fringe benefits \$0.05).

Source: Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I bring this matter up not because I am arguing in favor of protection, but because we should give some recognition to the fact that wages are dynamic and that they change very rapidly and very drastically and differently in one country as compared with another.

The Commission on Money and Credit wrote exactly to that point when it spoke about the great difference between a country which has full employment and pressure against resources, especially against manpower resources, such as West Germany or Japan, as compared with a country which has considerable unemployment, and virtually no pressure to drive up wages, which is the situation in our country. They write:

In the absence of any important elements of market power, wages tend to rise faster when there are more unfilled job vacancies [demand for labor] relative to the amount of unemployment. There is no universally applicable guide indicating the amount of wage and price increase, if any, which is likely to be associated with a specified increase in demand for labor, or how much unemployment, if any, is likely to be associated with a particular wage increase.

The amount of additional aggregate demand needed to create a given number of new jobs, and hence a given reduction in unemployment, tends to be greater as unemployment declines. At some high level of unemployment, perhaps 8 percent, there is almost no pressure exerted on wages from aggregate demand. An increase in demand which then opens up 100,000 new jobs will reduce unemployment by almost 100,000 because workers of almost every skill category will be available in almost every local area. If unemployment falls because of further growth of demand, labor surpluses will tend to disappear in those skill categories and geographical areas where unemployment was initially smallest.

This is the situation in Germany at the present time.

Still further increases in demand will result in labor shortages and pressures for wage increases in these areas and skill categories, even though substantial unemployment may exist elsewhere. Each further increase in aggregate demand will reduce unemployment and will give rise to consequent pressure for higher wages. It is reasonable to expect that when unemployment has been reduced 4 percent the pressure for wage increases will be much greater than when unemployment was 6 percent, and that by the time unemployment has fallen to 2 percent, unfilled vacancies will be widespread and the demand for labor will bring strong pressure for wage increases.

This is the situation which has developed in Germany. In an article which appeared in the Sunday Times magazine section recently, entitled "Inquiry Into German Prosperity," written by Flora Lewis, that situation is underlined. This is what the author says about the situation in West Germany:

Unemployment is a joke. There were some 150,000 more jobs offered last year than there were people looking for work. Newspaper ads for cleaning women dressed up their allure with high-sounding appeals for "household economics, specialists," and "room attendants." A cartoon on the labor shortage showed a snooty lad just out of school leaning on a flashy sports car and replying to the urgent entreaties of a factory director, "Well, the car will suit me and the plant looks tolerable, so if there is a marriageable daughter in the house, I'm willing to discuss taking on that apprentice job."

There is a very striking and almost shocking difference between the shortage of jobs and prosperity in Germany, but of late the German situation has greatly

improved, although it is still far below the situation here.

The article continues:

A recent German survey chronicled an evening with the Schmidts, the average family. It did not mention Vati's (father's) job, but he must have worked in a garage or on the railways or in construction from the brawny look of him in an accompanying picture. On his DM600 marks a month (\$150), the family operates a tight budget.

Vati is listening to a radio play, according to the chronicler, and mutti (mother) is sitting in one of their heavy old-fashioned chairs catching up with her mending. They seldom go out, and when they have friends over, it is for a glass of wine or beer. The budget will not stretch to dinner parties. They are saving up for a television set. Their 16-year-old daughter, Renate, who earns DM60 marks a month (\$15) as a student secretary, has a radio of her own and keeps tuned to AFN, the American forces station, for jazz.

Mr. President, I have gone into this detail because I believe it is important in the ensuing debate that will take place on reciprocal trade that the groundwork be laid for a comparison of wages, recognizing that this is a dynamic situation.

The Joint Economic Committee compiled a study showing what has happened to wages in the United States and in West Germany and in Japan over the past 5 years. In order to make it accurate, I ask that the figures be corrected to reflect price increases.

What was disclosed to me was extremely interesting. It showed that in this country wages have increased from an index of 100 in 1956 to 115.7 in 1960. However, the price index has increased by about 9 percent, so real wages have gone up about 6 percent over 5 years, or roughly 1 percent a year.

In Japan the wage index has risen, not the 15 percent it has risen in the United States, but more than 20 percent—21.1 percent. The price index in Japan has risen 9 percent, so real wages have risen 10.6 percent, or almost twice as much as the increase in the United States.

The most interesting situation is in West Germany. Since 1956, wages in West Germany have risen by 37.4 percent. The West German price index shows an increase almost exactly the same as ours—9.6 percent. The wage increase in Germany has been 25.4 percent in only 5 years, an increase almost 5 times that in the United States.

The reason why I am emphasizing these figures is that I believe there are a number of ways in which we can persuade our friends and allies in West Germany to help us adjust our imbalance of payments, our loss of gold, and our other serious international problems to the fact that they are so efficient, that their standard of living is improving, and that they are able to compete with us so well. They are quite willing to try to make adjustments, but I think we must concentrate in the particular area of increasing wages. This can vastly improve the situation, which I think in West Germany is still unfortunate, because their standard of living is still far, far below that of the United States. While doing

so, they can equalize the competitive situation between our two countries.

Mr. President, the article in the New York Times also points out that the West German attitude on foreign aid is beginning to change. There are two other ways in which, I believe, West Germans can help us, and in which I believe they are helping us. The first is to help take some of the burden of aiding the free world off our back and alleviating that situation. The second is revaluation. The last paragraph of the article reads:

The attitudes are beginning to change. The sorry spectacle of the United States asking West Germany to help solve the winter gold crisis was a setback in the process of enlightenment and has made explanation of the need for giving more difficult. Nor, until a few weeks ago did the Bonn Government start using its powers to mold opinion in favor of the more enlightened self-interest that includes large-scale aid. To help others does mean some sacrifice for West Germans. They are up to it, but they are a goodly way still from generally recognizing their contribution as a political duty to the free world and as a moral privilege. It is up to the German leaders to open their people's eyes as well as the national purse strings.

Recently it was announced, when a loan was made to India, that West Germany participated more than any other country except the United States of America. For example, the West German participation was substantially greater than that of Great Britain. It was a very substantial contribution, something in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars. As I recall, it was about \$450 million. That is \$450 million which the taxpayers of the United States will not have to provide. It is the type of assistance which means much to us. We should certainly encourage the West Germans to continue such assistance.

It is understandable—and certainly anyone with political experience in this country recognizes it—that it will be hard for West Germany to move along that path instead of moving along the path of providing adequate wages for its people, when there is a serious shortage of jobs and there are many skills which deserve to be rewarded.

The only other area which seems to be really promising for assistance to us in solving our imbalance of payments from other countries, such as West Germany, is in revaluation. There is virtually no sentiment in the United States for devaluation of our money to try to solve our problem; but West Germany has recently revalued its currency by 5 percent. West Germany, understandably, wishes to go slowly in this field.

It seems to me that progress is being made on all fronts. This kind of adjustment will take patience. It will take earnest pleas, on the part of our leadership, to persuade West Germany and other nations to go along with us. Nevertheless, in view of the statistics, and in view of the progress which has been made in West Germany and other nations, we are moving ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Joint Economic Committee, to which I have referred, the article entitled "Inquiry

into German Prosperity," published in the New York Times magazine of June 25, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Comparison of changes in average hourly earnings on all manufacturing, cost of living, and real wages, in United States, Germany, and Japan, 1956-60

[1956=100]

	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
UNITED STATES					
Average wage index...	100.0	104.5	107.6	112.1	115.7
Consumer price index...	100.0	103.4	106.3	107.2	108.9
Real wages.....	100.0	101.1	101.2	104.6	106.2
GERMANY					
Average wage index...	100.0	110.0	117.4	124.2	137.4
Consumer price index...	100.0	102.9	105.8	107.7	109.6
Real wages.....	100.0	106.9	111.0	115.3	125.4
JAPAN					
Average wage index...	100.0	105.6	105.6	113.3	121.1
Consumer price index...	100.0	102.9	103.8	104.8	109.5
Real wages.....	100.0	102.6	101.7	108.1	110.6

NOTE.—Average hourly wages used to compute the indexes given above are probably not strictly comparable. The data do not include fringe benefits but do include, in the case of Japan, bonuses. If various fringe benefits such as insurance, retirement, family allowances, medical fees, etc., were included, it might change the comparative rates of increase over the period shown, though we have no basis for judging this.

Source: Department of Labor and United Nations.

INQUIRY INTO GERMAN PROSPERITY: CAN WEST GERMANY AFFORD TO BE LESS CONCERNED WITH MATERIAL WELL-BEING TODAY AND MORE WITH "ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST" IN THE FORM OF HELPING OTHERS?

(By Flora Lewis)

BONN.—The roads are clogged with cars. Forests of television antenna etch the horizon. The long waiting lists at the employment offices contain not the names of job-seekers but of employers trying to snatch up the few idle workers. It is obvious that West Germany is riding the crest of a boom, a wave of prosperity that has been swelling up for over 5 years now and shows no sign of receding.

No one disputes that the country is prospering. If the economists' weighty pile of statistics were doubted, there is the evidence of loaded shop counters, of clangling factory towns that sprout neat new suburbs like yeast, growing almost before the eyes. And yet, not even the economists can agree whether the country is rich or not, whether the prospects of well-being stretch indefinitely into a comfortable rosy future or whether the bounty of fortune must be codded and jealously saved lest gray times descend.

The insistence, not only by America but by India and the capital-hungry countries, that West Germany spread more of its new-churned butter on other people's dry bread has led to an angry argument over the true state of West German wealth. Is it sound and enduring? Is it solid and substantial, with more than enough to spare?

The answers, based on the same set of facts, are conflicting because the people who give them are really asking conflicting questions cloaked in common words. For wealth and prosperity are relative terms, determined by comparison, and the two are not always the same. Any measure of the soundness of West German prosperity depends at once on predictions for the future, comparisons with other nations of the present, and what is left from the past.

Wealth, in modern terms, is not only money and goods but the capacity to create more of both. Prosperity might be defined as the utilization of that capacity.

The West Germans point out that while their wealth has certainly grown, it developed from a point little above zero to which total war and collapse in defeat had reduced them. Theirs is a handsome country of gentle river valleys and wooded hills, but it has little of natural riches that need only be dug from the soil to be used. No oil, no water power, little iron and metals, no immensities of fertile plain, only coal which is no longer an unmitigated asset.

But it is a country rich in tools and skills, skills inherited from the past and steadily renewed, tools bought and made at a rate of expansion that surpasses that of any other Western nation. As a result, the value of everything the economy turns out has nearly tripled in a decade. West German economists estimate that their country is a little better off than Great Britain or about half as rich as the United States, measured by the per capita industrial capacity. And the assets are in busy use, in contrast to the American economic scene with its idle patches, so that prosperity smiles on West Germany.

Unemployment is a joke. There were some 150,000 more jobs offered last year than there were people looking for work. Newspaper ads for cleaning women dressed up their allure with high-sounding appeals for "household economics specialists" and "room attendants." A cartoon on the labor shortage showed a snooty lad just out of school leaning on a flashy sports car and replying to the urgent entreaties of a factory director, "Well, the car will suit me and the plant looks tolerable, so if there's a marriageable daughter in the house I'm willing to discuss taking on that apprentice job."

Nor, despite the warnings that are more superstitious knocks on wood than serious economic predictions, are there any signs that the West German boom is headed for a bust. With two economic collapses in the last generation, Germans are shy of optimism. But the major factors that lurked behind the American boom of 1929 and brought it crashing are nowhere to be seen in Germany. Speculation has been kept in check by the economy's insatiable appetite for investment capital; consumers still want a million things and they are gradually earning more with which to buy them; rising productivity and economic discipline have kept prices from spurtng out of buyers' reach although costs have been creeping upward.

The foundations of the economy, then, look sound and the prospects are good that prosperity will continue.

That does not mean, however, that West Germans live well by American sights. A recent German survey chronicled an evening with the Schmidts, the average family. It did not mention Vati's (father's) job, but he must have worked in a garage or on the railways or in construction from the brawny look of him in an accompanying picture. On his DM600 a month (\$150), the family operates a tight budget.

Vati is listening to a radio play, according to the chronicler, and mutti (mother) is sitting in one of their heavy old-fashioned chairs catching up with her mending. They seldom go out and when they have friends over it is for a glass of wine or beer. The budget will not stretch to dinner parties. They are saving up for a television set. Their 16-year-old daughter Renate, who earns DM60 a month (\$15) as a student secretary, has a radio of her own and keeps tuned to AFN, the American forces station, for the jazz.

Saturday night they go to the movies, a family comedy if they can find one, and stop

in at the neighborhood *gasthaus* on their way home. Vati invariably orders beer, but mutti is likely to choose a lemonade or a Coca-Cola instead. The other big beer night is Thursday, when vati has a regular date for cards and talk at the *gasthaus* with the boys. Mutti's regular fling is the weekly afternoon *kaffeeklatsch* with a circle of women who manage to sew and consume mountains of whipped cream on cake at the same time.

The Schmidts do not eat much fresh meat—it is too expensive for them—but they have their fill of sausages, cabbage, and potatoes, about 16 pounds of potatoes a week for the family of four including 7-year-old Karl. Rent on their 3½-room apartment is cheap—only DM82 (\$20.50) a month—because it is in an old, rent-controlled building. Their extravagances, aside from coffee, tobacco, and liquor which are all heavily taxed, are meager. The main one is Fifi, the dachshund, whose license alone costs \$1.50 a month.

It is scarcely a picture of luxury, but compared to the furious scrabbling of a decade ago, it is solid comfort and most people in Germany are rather pleased with themselves.

There is also, of course, the Duesseldorf set whose men drive black Mercedes 300's—the managerial car—and whose women buy copies of Paris couturier dresses in a local shop where, they trill, "It didn't cost any more than the original would in Paris."

Even in Duesseldorf, though, mink-lined driving gloves or solid gold bar-mixing sets for those who have everything would be looked on askance as wasteful oddities. Habit, caution limned on the mind by harsh experience, and a certain natural hardheadedness have kept even those who could be profligate from chasing after dazzling fripperies.

The very rich in Germany—and their proportionate numbers are smaller than in the United States—are for the most part people who have made all their own money. They show the characteristics of first-generation wealth still striking for more, rather than of established wealth that takes money for granted and thinks of using it instead of making it. A good many of these people were rich or well-to-do once before, but they had to build their shattered fortunes all over again.

It has been said, "West Germany is neither a nation nor a culture, but an economy." In a sense, it is true. Improvements in material welfare are the dominant preoccupation both of the great majority and of the minority of writers and preachers whose main objective since prosperity has been to combat crass materialism. Politicians extol the great issues but take infinite pains with the least pressing pocketbook items well before elections.

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's slogan "No Experiments" has brought regular success at the polls not simply because of its international political implications for security. His electorate also reads into it a promise of more of the goods they have been saving to accumulate, more of the job security they have won after almost half a century of wild business cycles, more solid steps in their steady climb to better living. And Adenauer unrelentingly does his best to keep the promise, not only because his own vote harvesting depends upon it, but also because he fears what unknown urges might spring from a population so recently led from a mass insanity if maddening symptoms of economic disease were to reappear.

Occasionally, when they happen to feel like philosophizing, West German businessmen and politicians wonder with sadness whether their country's democratic stability now rests on the four wheels of a car and the four legs of a refrigerator.

They do not know. No one really knows. But it is almost axiomatic in West Germany now to consider the cars and the refrigerators as the real pedagogues of democracy and possibly even its main support here, at least until the generations who were numbed into senselessness by inflation, unemployment, and defeat have passed from the scene.

Nor is it surprising that material things should mean so much to Germans now. Twice in this century Germany struck out with all its might in the name of glory, aggrandizement, mastery, and came to grief. In a mere decade, by concentrating on pins and needles, machines and profits, and ignoring the big soul-stirring words, West Germans have reached a level of general comfort and well-being beyond the dreams of their forefathers.

But such concentration does not provoke many urges to generosity nor to a sense of obligation for the plight of those less fortunate. On the contrary, the instinctive assumption of people here, ingrained by history, is to consider themselves have-nots who may have picked up a bit of luck but are not so foolish as to count on it. It is an attitude based on a history of being stragglers and, as so often happens with popular attitudes, has far outlived the facts.

The Germans came late to the status of nationhood. As a result, they did poorly in the grab for colonies when colonies were considered the fount of wealth. The feeling of getting less than their share was a habit of mind that expressed itself in colonial ambitions before World War I and in the scream for *Lebensraum* before World War II. It mattered little to the feeling that its premises were false. This sense of deprivation has persisted long after the facts of ruin disappeared.

West Germany received huge amounts of unexpected aid after the war, and while people took with gratitude they learned not so much the blessedness of giving as the worthiness of getting. It is enlightening to hear high officials rail at the waste, the inefficiency, and the dumb openhandedness of some current American aid programs to other countries.

While the criticisms are no doubt technically quite valid, they tend to lay down businesslike and neat criteria for foreign aid which—had they been in effect in Washington in 1949—would have virtually ruled out help for Germany then. There is a limit to how immediately and economically rewarding an aid program can be and still qualify as aid rather than plain commerce.

Still, the authorities at least are well aware that, as the official publication of a leading West German bank declared recently, "We certainly are well off, not the richest country in the world, but one of the rich few."

How much then can West Germany afford to help the poor many? To begin with, of course, what anybody can spare depends on what he thinks he should keep. In times of crisis, personal or national, it always turns out that the necessary is less than supposed. The gold and exchange surplus cannot be a source of aid; it is at most a means of converting domestic wealth into aid. So the question is: How much can fairly be drained off the creamy head of West German prosperity?

The money would have to come from either taxes or borrowing, public or private. A figure that has taken on the currency of a slogan among economic officials as a minimum reasonable foreign aid contribution is 1 percent of gross national product, in effect, a tenth of a tithe. For West Germany, that would be some \$700 million a year, and more as the economy expands. It would be roughly comparable to the U.S. foreign aid burden. Nor it "tithe" altogether the right word, for in addition to spiritual benefits it would mean benefits for the part of

the economy that received resulting export orders at the expense of the economy as a whole.

Foreign aid is for West Germany now—and the Germans are coming to see this—more a question of politics than of economics. Party politics before this fall's election are involved especially when it comes to tax changes. Although the per capita tax burden is rated by economists as at least as heavy as in other countries, it still falls in a way that favors the wealthy. This was deliberately contrived at the beginning of economic revival to encourage the formation of desperately needed capital.

Now many thoughtful Germans are seriously worried about the continued concentration of the country's wealth in a few manicured hands. But those hands have acquired a strong grip on their privileges.

International politics play the counter role. It is not only a matter of satisfying the insistent Americans. Immediate West German interests are involved. On the crudest level, there is the rivalry with East Germany for the favor of many neutral states. It is important to Bonn to maintain the diplomatic quarantine of the East German rump state. To many young countries, it is important to get capital and of little importance from where. Bonn has resources the East German Communists have never managed to create and can easily win this match by using them. But that is not a motive that carries very far.

There is, too, a much broader political interest to be served by large-scale German foreign aid. This is the enlightened interest of enlarging the area of well-being in the world. Some officials and politicians have grasped it. Most have not. People are used to thinking of development aid as America's affair. "You're the rich country," they say. And they are used to thinking of it as serving American purposes, rather than the cause of human welfare and freedom as a whole.

Preoccupied with their own revival, few Germans have yet come to notice that their ability to stay on their feet depends in part on helping others up. And they have not been on their feet for long. Although the ground is solid, they keep their eyes on it for fear they may be seeing things and a hidden precipice really lies ahead.

This attitude distracts their attention from the real stragglers of the modern world, and tends to promote the feeling of the newly rich that the poor have only themselves to blame for not being able to steer along the same rocky road to success.

The attitudes are beginning to change. The sorry spectacle of the United States asking West Germany to help solve the winter gold crisis was a setback in the process of enlightenment and has made explanation of the need for giving more difficult. Nor, until a few weeks ago, did the Bonn Government start using its powers to mold opinion in favor of the more enlightened self-interest that includes large-scale aid. To help others does mean some sacrifice for West Germans. They are up to it, but they are a goodly way still from generally recognizing their contribution as a political duty to the free world and as a moral privilege. It is up to the German leaders to open their people's eyes as well as the national purse strings.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Government Printing Office. At the centennial dinner held on June 27, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON of the 17th District of Texas, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, delivered

the principal address. I ask unanimous consent that this very fine, timely, and historical address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. OMAR BURLESON, OF TEXAS,
AT THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER HELD
AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, JUNE
27, 1961

Mr. Harrison [the Public Printer], Senator MILLER, representatives of the graphic arts, employees of the Government Printing Office, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, may I assure you that I respond heartily and enthusiastically to your invitation to be with you on this occasion.

For fear of sounding undignified, I did not address you as fellow employees of "Swampoodle." I was tempted to say "my friends up Tiber Creek." In doing so, I could have well known that, at least you had a paddle. You know those of us at the Capitol are down Tiber Creek and sometimes we have trouble finding a paddle.

In this highly scientific era, the harnessing of nuclear power and the ability to utilize it, we still have speakers for occasions such as this. I suppose we could use a robot of some kind—simply select the theme, push a button here, pull a lever there, and out comes an afterdinner speech.

It would probably be better than some we have all heard and better than the one near at hand.

There is, however, this thing certain. The speaker would not have the pleasure, satisfaction, and warm response of hearing these generous words of introduction accorded him by a longtime personal friend and associate. I am grateful.

As honored and as delighted as I am to accept this invitation to share this occasion with you, I have one regret which you will understand. I had hoped that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, the distinguished and lovable Senator from Arizona, would address you and that I would be privileged to hear him.

Of course, Senator HAYDEN has been around a long time. He says you never have to explain something you did not say. Most of us in the Congress have not yet learned that. Sometimes, you know, we must take more time explaining what we said than it took to say it in the first place. You who may have something to do with the committee hearings and the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will marvel that we could ever find that much time or space.

This is a time of celebration and it is a significant one. As you know, it commemorates the 100th anniversary of this great institution, the Government Printing Office.

As early as 1819, there were some farsighted men in the Congress and in Government service who recognized the need for the Government to have its own printing establishment, and in 1861, on the same day that Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated as President of the United States, this Office opened its doors.

It was during this period that it may truly be said that the United States of America passed through the period of infancy and youth to full maturity in the company of nations.

Although the history of this great institution may not appear spectacular to the layman, it, nevertheless, has had a tremendous influence upon the affairs of our Nation.

The beginning of the Government Printing Office, when it opened its doors on March 4, 1861, consisted of a small group of buildings—which is not a fact of great import—and a quantity of equipment, which is not significant, either—all purchased for the sum of \$135,000. What really counts is that the

purchase was instrumental in bringing into the Government service 350 people versed and skilled in the twin arts of printing and bookbinding. From the very day of the opening of its doors to the present, history has been silent about delays in public printing which, until then, had consumed so much of the time and interest of the Congress. It is reasonable to assume that such delays as may have occurred were never critical.

Among the original Government Printing Office buildings was the stable where, according to the records, there were accommodations for "one black horse and one bobbled bay horse; one wagon and a carryall."

The delivery section also had three or four bicycles, one of the latest design for delivery of emergency work and urgent messages. Come to think of it, even today the bicycle remains the fastest mode of travel over short distance in Washington traffic. That is, if the rider survives until he reaches his destination. Sometimes we in the Congress may suspect that the bobbled bay may have thrown a shoe on the way to the Capitol when a hurry-up order requires the delivery of copies of bills or hearings, but it invariably comes through in time to keep the legislative ball rolling and the delinquencies have seldom been more than a matter of minutes.

The dollar-and-cents value of anything is of no little interest to those of us in the Congress. Therefore, it is well to mention in passing that the Government Printing Office has had no space addition since 1939, when the volume of business was about \$21 million as compared to \$100 million during the last 2 or 3 fiscal years. There is a great need for an additional building and added facilities, which we hope will be realized in the very near future.

To me, the important part of any institution is the people in it. As all houses do not make homes, so do not brick and mortar and steel and machines make an institution such as this. An institution such as this makes the U.S. Government. Therefore, it comes down to the proposition that you and I, in whatever capacity we find ourselves, represent the Government to millions of our fellow citizens. This being true, we have a definite and a clear responsibility, responsibility of loyalty to the code of ethics for Government service, which I find in this little pamphlet, entitled "Presenting the Government Printing Office."

The history of the personnel of this Office convinces me that the people in it have and have always had this dedication.

I think it proper to mention the contribution of former Public Printer Augustus E. Giegengack, present here this evening, who was at the helm at the beginning of World War II, and under whose direction this Office performed a tremendous service during those trying years. He was awarded the Certificate of Merit for outstanding contributions to the war effort, and in accepting it fully recognized the contribution of 7,000 employees who made the award possible.

There is another former Public Printer here, through whose efforts a modernization program put the Government Printing Office abreast of the commercial industry in the employment of up-to-date printing processes. I refer to Mr. Raymond Blattenberger.

Of course, not all the operations related to public printing and binding are confined within the walls of the Government Printing Office. The preparatory work which must be done by the editors, the screening and processing of orders by the printing clerks before publication, is vital to all operations.

These people are doing an essential job and they must not go without credit. The Public Printer and those of you in executive and administrative positions will be the first, I know, to acknowledge that this Office

could not function as efficiently as it does if the preliminaries were not so competently handled by the printing clerks and departmental representatives.

There is no doubt that the present Public Printer, whom I have known for a long period of time and with whom I have closely worked, will carry on the enviable record of his predecessors in the fine traditions of this institution.

I predict that in this time of rapidly moving events, he will make his own record which will be a challenge to those about him and those who will follow.

Someone totally unfamiliar with the Government Printing Office, and of course, there are more who are not than who are, may ask what it is and what does it do. A number of answers might be given, depending on who responded to the question.

It might be called the largest printing office in the world—32½ acres of floorspace in a group of red brick buildings.

A community—with its dependents equivalent to a fair-sized city.

An investment of \$25 million in plant and equipment.

A \$100-million-a-year business.

A partner with the Congress in its legislative function.

It could be any of these. We could call it a partner with the Federal agencies in their essential operations and public undertakings.

A partner with the commercial printing industry in the placement of \$30 million worth of printing contracts annually.

A collaborator in research and development projects with printers and lithographers throughout the Nation.

Any of these descriptions would be accurate. The Government Printing Office is all of these things.

I prefer to think of the Government Printing Office as the people who are here—6,500 men and women who know their jobs intimately and do them well. Dedicated people who have grasped the ideals of those who went before them—so often their own fathers or grandfathers.

I am reminded here that, if this were a sermon, which definitely it is not, the text could appropriately be taken from the Book of Psalms in which we are admonished to "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set."

We in Government service should want to live and to work to see an America which will move forward, decade after decade, ever creating new and better jobs by producing more and better goods for more and more people. We want to see an America enriched by an old feeling that any ambitious young man or woman can rise above the circumstances of any environment. We want to see an America in which industry, labor, and agriculture will move forward to lift ever higher the standard of American living and to build ever stronger the bulwark of our national life. To move forward, to progress, but to never lose sight of the landmarks which our fathers have set.

It is not an impossible task and should not even be a difficult one. It is simple compared to that task which confronted the men and women of a few brief years ago. They did not inherit the most productive plant in all the world such as this; they did not inherit the most advanced technical processes in the printing industry. In many instances they had nothing but the labor of their bare hands, but they had vision, inspiration and a great faith. I do not think they whined and complained that the world owed them anything. They had a view which we find peculiar in some places today, and that is that the privilege of self-government carries with it the obligation of supporting it wholeheartedly. They were the people, and that was the spirit which built this country.

For that reason, just as this institution is a part of this great Nation and is many things, so is our country many things. It is the good and the bad, the ugly and the beautiful, the absurd and the superlative, the rude and the gracious. It is a scrap of paper enshrined in the Archives Building just down the street. A bridge over the Potomac River. A cracked bell in Philadelphia and a tomb out here in Arlington Cemetery.

America is the truckdriver saying, "This is a free country, and I'll vote for whom I darn please."

Just after the surrender of Japan, when the army of occupation moved in, a group of allied officers was given an audience by a venerable Japanese statesman. The old man was very impressed by the various uniforms worn by the men of the different nations. Turning to a British officer, he said, "I observe by the uniform that you are a subject of the British Empire." The officer bowed, squared his shoulders and replied, "I am."

Observing an American officer, the old man said, "And I assume from your uniform you are a subject of the United States of America." The officer snapped back, "Subject? I am not a subject of anything—I own part of it."

You and I have been proud of the fact that we are a part owner of this land in which we live, and we cherish it and hold dear this prized possession.

To rededicate ourselves to our country and to the jobs we hold, perhaps we would like to be reminded that:

"This beloved and mighty America to which I owe absolute allegiance is more than a land of lordly rivers, rolling plains, and mighty peaks.

"It is more than a country vastly rich with stores of minerals and ore; more than a people blessed with a genius of invention and enterprise, production and distribution.

"America is God's experiment in free government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

"The America to which I give my heart's full measure of devotion is God's herald in history, proclaiming to the world the dignity, the duty and the destiny of nations under free government."

In this tradition of service, I join with those of you who are no more than 25 years old (and, of course, that includes all the ladies) who, by reason of the advances of medical science, will likely live to be 125, and on the 200th anniversary, we shall meet here again.

In the meantime, thank you for your association and permitting me to be with you.

SS "HOPE" VISITS SAIGON, VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senate is well aware of the great value of the Project Hope medical mission ship, which is doing so much in southeast Asia to show that Americans are people with hearts. This was demonstrated on June 1, 1961, when the Senate adopted a resolution relative to the establishment of a White Fleet, a proposal designed to capitalize on the phenomenal success of Project Hope.

It is pleasing to be able to report that the American people are also well aware of what a potent force for good will Project Hope is. This awareness is evidenced by editorials such as the one which was published on June 17, 1961, in the Boone News-Republican in my home State of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that this

perceptive editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MERCY MISSION TO VIETNAM

This past Thursday the good ship SS *Hope* steamed into the Vietnamese port of Saigon for a 4-month medical mission that could not have come at a more propitious time. With Vietnam reeling under the forces of internal subversion, this evidence of American helpfulness may be more persuasive in putting the Vietnamese people on the side of the free world than military assistance.

The hospital ship is on the final leg of its yearlong good-will mission to southeast Asia. During 7 months in the waters off Indonesia, the *Hope*'s basic medical team of 15 physicians, 24 nurses, 30 medical technicians, and others earned the respect and friendship of the Indonesian people and of their Government. This hard-working staff of volunteers held 800 classes and lectures, treated 17,000 patients, performed 700 major surgical operations, and greeted 30,000 shipboard visitors.

It will cost \$3,500,000 to operate the *Hope* for 1 year, exclusive of the \$2 million in mutual security funds that were used to refit the 1,500-ton former Navy hospital ship. All the operating funds are being privately raised through solicitation of corporations, labor groups, and individuals. The Project Hope organization would like to send still more ships on medical teaching missions to Africa and South America if the necessary funds are forthcoming.

The Senate eased the way for a step-up in this type of mercy mission by adopting a resolution on June 1 supporting the establishment of a White Fleet. The President would have authority to establish such a fleet—to rush assistance to disaster areas, as well as to carry on a regular program of technical assistance and training—whenever he feels it would further U.S. foreign policy. That the Project Hope mission does bring good will to the United States is exemplified by the comment of the mayor of Sumbawa, an island in the Indonesian Archipelago, to one of the ship staff: "This is the first time foreigners came to Sumbawa who did not come to steal our rice. We will never forget what you have done."

TWO PHILOSOPHIES OF DEFICIT FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the June 28 issue of the Sioux City Journal appeared a timely editorial pointing out the two philosophies of deficit Federal spending: One is that there has not been enough growth to create the taxes on pay and profits to cover the spending demanded; and the other is that we spend too much. I happen to subscribe to the latter. Indeed, I would go further, and would state that when we spend too much, the inevitable result is retardation of growth, because inflation and the accompanying shrinkage in value of our money discourage thrift, investment, and business expansion. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ONLY WAY?

Sylvia Porter's column on today's editorial page discusses Federal budgets. Over the years, Sylvia points out, it has become traditional for them to be laced with red ink.

Even in the so-called boom years of the 1950's there have been deficits, she explains, adding:

"The only way to explain the deficits of the 1950's is that we didn't grow enough to create the taxes on pay and profits to cover the spending demanded to fight the cold war and provide services deemed essential or desirable for the people."

We disagree with Sylvia's contention that this is the only way to explain the deficits of the 1950's. There is another, and more realistic, way.

The Federal Government simply indulged in deficit financing, overspent its income, and went into debt. As a national institution, we lived beyond our means because of the strange and mixed-up thinking of those who believe big government and big spending are the answers to our problems. That happened in good years, too, when the Nation should have been hacking away at the burdensome national debt instead of adding to it.

Our defense obligations must be met, of course, and maintaining security is expensive business. The spenders are erring in promoting at the same time costly home-front programs that might be nice to have but which, in plain, unvarnished English, we can't afford.

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Senate will shortly be the foreign aid bill. I know of no other legislation over which so many American people are so disturbed as this. There is no question that most of our people recognize the desirability of a reasonable amount of foreign aid if it is judiciously spent. However, with the priority that has been given by this administration to domestic spending legislation, and with the \$3 billion deficit for the fiscal year just ended and the \$5 billion deficit—at least—forecast for the current fiscal year, most of which can be attributed to increased spending for domestic programs, our taxpayers back home are deeply concerned over the sincerity behind various statements regarding the need for all of the spending proposed by the foreign aid bill. If, indeed, all of this is so terribly necessary, they wonder why the administration did not see fit to cut down the amount of the domestic spending that has been requested.

Of equal concern is the common knowledge that much of the foreign-aid money we have taken from our taxpayers has not been judiciously spent. From 1955 to 1960, the Soviet bloc gave to non-Communist countries foreign aid amounting to \$3.5 billion; at the same time, the United States aid in grants and loans to the same countries amounted to \$5.7 billion. Still the Communists have been more effective. As was pointed out in an excellent editorial published in the June 26 edition of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, our whole concept of foreign aid is apparently based on some false assumptions or lack some ingredient to make it workable. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Also, Mr. President, in the June 10 issue of the Des Moines Register appears

a knowledgeable article by Mr. Arthur Krock, setting forth additional reasons why there are suspicion and restiveness over the administration's foreign aid bill. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

Finally, Mr. President, numerous taxpayers over the Nation are asking pointedly, "How much foreign aid can we afford?" This is raised as a result of the administration's request to boost the request of the Eisenhower administration by at least another half a billion dollars. Perhaps the answer is that we cannot afford any foreign aid whatsoever that is not judiciously spent; and we can only afford an amount which, even if judiciously spent, will not weaken our national character by demoralizing our people, through inflationary effects of such spending. I ask unanimous consent that a good editorial on this phase of the foreign aid question, appearing in the June 18 issue of the Sioux City Journal, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, June 26, 1961]

UNITED STATES MUST REEXAMINE FOREIGN-AID CONCEPT

It is time that we Americans gained a more realistic understanding of problems inherent in the accepted concept that foreign aid, by reducing poverty, will prevent the spread of communism.

That idea, based on vague American idealism, has now run up against some painful facts.

With the impact of Western technology, the standard of living in some backward areas of the world has actually declined. Modern medical methods of controlling epidemics, reducing infant deaths, and treating chronic diseases have caused a population explosion which places a greater strain than before on the food supply. More people are hungry today than ever before in world history. Foreign aid in many lands is useless without some means of controlling the population, by artificial means or otherwise.

Even in underdeveloped nations with adequate land for expansion, as in Latin America, the gap between living standards there and in the advanced Western nations is actually broadening rather than contracting. As a result, people who obtain a smattering of education are increasingly dissatisfied with their rate of advance and are willing to accept the Communist promises that the job can be done faster under a Marxist dictatorship.

Furthermore, foreign aid cannot possibly increase the standard of living fast enough in these areas to overcome this dissatisfaction. The case is summarized neatly by Prof. H. Wentworth Eldredge, chairman of the Dartmouth College sociology department, in the May issue of *NATO Letter*:

"A present annual per capita income of \$200 (not unusual among backward economies) will reach at the highly optimistic yearly growth of 5 percent within a decade the hardly impressive total of \$325 per capita. Meanwhile, the \$1,400 annual per capita income of the United States will have increased to \$2,280. In short, the level-of-living gap will have increased from \$1,200 to \$1,965.

"But this is a fictitious calculation; no underdeveloped economy is very likely to grow at a net per capita rate of 5 percent annually because the population explosion (induced by Western public health techniques

controlling the death rate) is likely to reduce the net per capita rate to 2.5 percent or lower.

"Naturally, we too in the West will be very fortunate indeed to hold a 5 percent or close to 5 percent net per capita output growth yearly over a period of time, but the chances are better. To summarize the conclusions of G. L. Bach ("Economics: An Introduction to Analysis and Policy"): If we make the assumption that Latin America could attain a 2.5 percent net annual per capita product growth, it would take 40 years to attain one-third of the present U.S. per capita income. And if the U.S. income grows at the low rate of 2 percent per annum it would require over 250 years before Latin American income reached one-third of the then current U.S. income level."

If foreign aid cannot possibly accomplish results to meet the rising expectations of the people in underdeveloped lands, why, then, should the Communists make headway with fewer resources and a less effective economic system? From 1955 to 1960, the Soviet bloc gave foreign aid to non-Communist countries amounting to \$3,510 million. United States aid in grants and loans to the same countries during the same period amounted to \$5,739 million. Our total foreign aid bill during the period was a staggering \$23,998 million. Yet the Communists are gaining everywhere while the West is losing.

We are not proposing the abolition of foreign aid. But apparently our whole concept of foreign aid is based on some false assumptions or lacks some ingredient to make it workable. Perhaps we should spend more energy and expense in exploiting unrest in Communist areas like Red China rather than trying to fight a purely defensive battle.

[From the Des Moines Register, June 10, 1961]

KROCK AGAINST PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN-AID PROPOSAL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The administration's foreign aid program has come before Congress for approval in the most defensive position these proposals have ever occupied. The position is that of a large borrower who, despite unsatisfactory tangible earnings, wants not only to renew his loan at the bank, but make it annually self-renewing for 5 years. To get even the substantial assent of Congress, the administration will have to persuade it to do the following:

Delegate to the Executive for 4 years, with an involvement of about \$2 billion a year, its power of the purse—the greatest and most effective of the powers specifically and exclusively vested in Congress by the Constitution.

By this action put itself in the position where it can neither reduce nor withhold this \$8 billion without (1) incurring the charge of breaking contract, (2) obliging the executive to leave unfinished in the lurch foreign aid projects undertaken on long-term commitments, and (3) being held responsible for the international ill will this inevitably will incur.

Increase the already large amount of Treasury back-door borrowing by granting this authority to a Government agency whose previous record has bred deep distrust in Congress of its competence and the soundness of the policy it administers.

By this increase of funds which can be spent by Government agencies without applying for them to Congress year by year, further undermine the sound fiscal system which requires annual appropriations to be made with knowledge of anticipated revenue.

Do all this on the assurance of the administration that, given a long-term fund commitment, it can and will correct the administrative and personnel-created weaknesses

of the foreign aid programs under the three preceding Presidents, during which the influence of international communism has steadily expanded in the world.

Even if President Kennedy and his aides can accomplish these extraordinary persuasions, the requested foreign aid fund of \$4.8 billion for fiscal 1962, a rise of \$800 million from President Eisenhower's request for fiscal 1961, will have to surmount more obstacles if Congress is substantially to approve it.

These obstacles, which can be identified by the questions committee members are asking of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon and other administration advocates, have been created by the following conditions:

The great unpopularity with the voters in many congressional constituencies of the foreign aid program, making its champion a hazard to reelection.

The apparently widespread conviction in the country that, without new and more painful price inflation, the economy cannot furnish \$7.8 billion more for foreign aid, and also finance the increased domestic spending for welfare measures urged by the President, plus the proposed vast outflow of other billions for space exploration and military defense.

Growing support among the people for those Members of Congress and publicists who are demanding that the President choose a precise list of priorities, leaving the remainder, including a man moon landing at a cost of \$20 billion to \$40 billion for later and more gradual attainment.

The answers made by Cabinet witnesses thus far to the questions these attitudes inspired do not seem to have been very persuasive.

The additional evidence of Soviet implacability supplied by the Vienna conversation between the President and Premier Khrushchev, in combination with the continued obstructions to a Laos settlement raised by Communist troops, and to a nuclear weapons treaty by Kremlin delegates at Geneva, weight the scales against rather than for the new foreign aid program.

The apparent strength of the congressional resistance suggests that the President's chances of overcoming it depend on the skills, political and otherwise, with which he uses his tools of persuasion, since the tools themselves are merely reconditioned old ones.

The kit includes a new and consolidated agency, reoriented on the principle of Truman's point 4.

[From the Sioux City Sunday Journal, June 18, 1961]

HOW MUCH FOREIGN AID CAN WE AFFORD?

There apparently is in progress a systematic program by top Kennedy administration officials to boost U.S. foreign aid spending. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, David E. Bell, said the other day for example that the United States can afford to double its aid to underdeveloped countries. "Plainly we could raise the amount of resources we are devoting to foreign aid, even to double its present level, without serious strain on the budget or the economy, if this were considered necessary in the national interest," Mr. Bell declared in a California speech.

Meanwhile, across the continent, another Kennedy administration official, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Abraham Ribicoff, was making a speech in Boston in which he said that as other nations helped the United States in its formative years, so too the time has come for us to help others.

Well, it seems to us that in the years since World War II the United States has been anything but parsimonious in dealing out economic and military aid to foreign

governments. The total amount we have spread around the world in the past 15 years or so is heading toward the \$100 billion mark. Even figured by liberal definitions, this is a princely sum.

The United States always has been ready to offer a helping hand to needy countries, and—within the bounds of reason—rightly so. Generosity is an American trait and a good one. But mixed in with the customary generosity of this Nation has been a new note—big giveaways of our wealth via the scattergun method. We've aided oversea nations with a vast shower of American dollars, but today we are having trouble in more countries around the world than ever before.

What have we gained by our multibillion-dollar foreign aid programs in the past 15 years? That is a question virtually defying an answer. Those who advocate big spending abroad say that if we had not given so much money to foreign countries, things would be even worse than they are today. But here again there is no way of measuring the accuracy of such a position.

Mr. Ribicoff's statement that now the time has come for us to help others, sounds almost as though the United States has been sitting idly by without offering oversea aid. But it is evident he has a yen for bigger spending.

In some instances, we are providing foreign countries with more money each year than they take in from local revenue. But still we find anti-U.S. sentiment spread widely around the world.

The record does not provide a very good case for boosting foreign aid giveaways. Indeed, to the contrary, it signals a crying need for application of the brakes and a re-examination of what type of aid would serve the cause of freedom better.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION HEARINGS ON TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a day or two ago I mentioned on the floor of this body a specific threat against performers in the television industry for testifying against the industry at the Federal Communications Commission hearings in New York. The point of reference of my remarks happened to be an article by Lawrence Laurent, published in the Washington Post. Since then, I have obtained a copy of the broadcast announcement itself in which the threat was contained.

Because of the importance of this implied inducement to members of the industry not to testify against things which in their judgment may have gone wrong, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the actual copy of the material itself, from Broadcasting magazine.

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

How To INFLUENCE PEOPLE

Some witnesses in current FCC hearings on TV practices may have lots of cajoling to do when they try to resume doing business with individuals and organizations against whom they have testified. Even such reluctant witness as Bill Goodson (Goodson-Todman) finally testified that talent agencies like MCA demand right to sell program rights in return for supplying talent. Similarly Producer David Susskind, having blasted practically every broadcasting institution in sight, may find it difficult to find friendly port in which to do business.

Footnote to Susskind's testimony: Truman TV series rights were being peddled to

TV syndicators about 1 year ago. One syndicator says he turned it down then because (1) it would need network slot and because the former President is so apt to become embroiled in controversy, firm was sure no network would take show, and (2) if syndicated to stations, advertiser limitations would make series nearly unsalable. Producer Susskind testified he couldn't find TV network customer for his projected 26 hour-long TV episodes based on Truman.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I further remind both the Senate and the communications industry of this country that this body will, I am sure, take a very dim view of any efforts on the part of individuals or organizations in the communications business that may in any way—whether it be veiled or flagrantly open—threaten the security, the economic livelihood, or the job opportunities of individuals who so dare to testify during the deliberations now being conducted. The implications of such a threat are very dangerous. They do not do credit to the industry itself. I hope that members of the industry will speak out now against any such indulgence, and in no way themselves will condone the spread of threats, even beneath the surface or by indirection. I can assure all who are interested that as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Communications Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, I and all my colleagues will watch very carefully the conduct of the industry in connection with this matter.

Mr. President, at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 10, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 7, 1961:

U.S. MARSHALS

James V. Ryan, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice William A. O'Brien.

Doyle W. Foreman, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years, vice James Y. Victor.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Lucia M. Cormier, of Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

Russell F. Niquette, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305:

To be colonels

Adair, George T.	XXXXXX
Adams, Ernest C.	XXXXXX
Allen, John U.	XXXXXX
Alphin, Horace E.	XXXXXX
Anson, Paul A.	XXXXXX
Arfman, John F.	XXXXXX
Arn, Lauren A.	XXXXXX
Arvin, Paul D.	XXXXXX
Ash, Hughes L.	XXXXXX
Bagnulo, Aldo H.	XXXXXX
Bailey, William W.	XXXXXX
Baker, Denzil L.	XXXXXX
Bartling, Carl W.	XXXXXX
Baughn, Wilmot T.	XXXXXX
Bednarek, Frank	XXXXXX
Besson, Robert	XXXXXX
Bisbing, John	XXXXXX
Blake, Ellis D.	XXXXXX
Bledsoe, Carl E.	XXXXXX
Booth, Lance E.	XXXXXX
Bowman, Homer H.	XXXXXX
Briggs, Edwin J.	XXXXXX
Bronn, Carl H.	XXXXXX
Brooks, William P., Jr.	XXXXXX
Brown, Charles P., Jr.	XXXXXX
Brown, Greg J.	XXXXXX
Brown, Harold McD.	XXXXXX
Brown, Laurence C.	XXXXXX
Brownson, Harold N.	XXXXXX
Burba, Edwin H.	XXXXXX
Bush, Benjamin R.	XXXXXX
Butler, Earle B.	XXXXXX
Campbell, Fred P.	XXXXXX
Chabot, Joseph L.	XXXXXX
Chappuis, Steve A.	XXXXXX
Check, Gilbert J.	XXXXXX
Clark, Milton H.	XXXXXX
Clarke, Frederick J.	XXXXXX
Clayman, Donald C.	XXXXXX
Clema, Joe A.	XXXXXX
Comm, Edward D.	XXXXXX
Cone, John M.	XXXXXX
Conner, Karl	XXXXXX
Connor, Albert O.	XXXXXX
Connor, John P.	XXXXXX
Cox, Lavonne E.	XXXXXX
Crosby, Henry A.	XXXXXX
Cuphaver, Carl A.	XXXXXX
Curtis, Coy L.	XXXXXX
Dalrymple, John C.	XXXXXX
Dalia, George C.	XXXXXX
Davidson, Cecil H.	XXXXXX
Davison, Horace G.	XXXXXX
Deason, Charles A.	XXXXXX
Dickie, Ralph LeR.	XXXXXX
Diercks, Frederick O.	XXXXXX
Dodds, William A.	XXXXXX
Duncan, James W.	XXXXXX
Dyer, Harold F.	XXXXXX
Easton, William G.	XXXXXX
Edwards, Earl L.	XXXXXX
Egan, John B.	XXXXXX
Eister, William D.	XXXXXX
Eklund, Karl F.	XXXXXX
Enemark, William A.	XXXXXX
Espelund, Selmer J.	XXXXXX
Etzler, Charles R.	XXXXXX
Eubank, Perry H.	XXXXXX
Feidt, Gerald E.	XXXXXX
Fish, Hamilton W.	XXXXXX
Fraser, Alexander G., Jr.	XXXXXX
Gallagher, William J.	XXXXXX
Gassett, Silas	XXXXXX
Gavalas, Leonidas G.	XXXXXX
Gaynor, James K.	XXXXXX
Geddes, John A.	XXXXXX
Gerot, Joseph O.	XXXXXX
Gershenow, Louis	XXXXXX
Gildart, Robert C.	XXXXXX
Gonseth, Jules E., Jr.	XXXXXX
Graham, Ephraim F., Jr.	XXXXXX
Graham, Jackson	XXXXXX
Graham, Riley A.	XXXXXX
Grant, Carl E.	XXXXXX

Green, Martin L., XXXXX.
 Griffin, Linwood, Jr., XXXXX.
 Griffith, Wilbur M., XXXXX.
 Griswold, George M., XXXXX.
 Grote, Robert W., XXXXX.
 Groves, Joseph R., XXXXX.
 Haberman, Howard F., XXXXX.
 Haefele, Joseph L., XXXXX.
 Hall, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Hammond, David G., XXXXX.
 Hanburger, Christian, XXXXX.
 Hardaway, Eads G., XXXXX.
 Haycock, William M., XXXXX.
 Heimstead, Merten K., XXXXX.
 Hines, Charles B., XXXXX.
 Hines, John B. R., XXXXX.
 Hodges, Joseph H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Hoffman, Aldon M., XXXXX.
 Holt, Olin P., XXXXX.
 Hoska, Lukas E., Jr., XXXX.
 Hudiburg, Howard B., XXXXX.
 Hyzer, Peter C., XXXXX.
 Ingmire, Edgar J., XXXXX.
 Ishoy, Victor A., XXXXX.
 Jacobs, Lawrence P., XXXXX.
 Janes, Ernest L., XXXXX.
 Jenks, Harold F., XXXX.
 Johns, Glover S., Jr., XXXXX.
 Johnson, Chester L., XXXXX.
 Johnson, James R., XXXX.
 Johnston, Marvin V., XXXXX.
 Jones, William P., Jr., XXXX.
 Joslin, Will D., XXXXX.
 Kemp, James B., XXXXX.
 Kenderdine, John M., XXXXX.
 Kernan, Melvin M., XXXX.
 Kimbrell, Gordon T., XXXXX.
 Koletty, John W., XXXX.
 Kopcsak, Peter J., XXXXX.
 Lamar, Joseph B., XXXXX.
 Lang, Edmund H., XXXXX.
 Lash, Eugene L., XXXX.
 Lawrie, Joe S., XXXXX.
 Lawson, Walter R., XXXXX.
 Lee, Edwin C., XXXXX.
 Lemmon, Kelley B., Jr., XXXXX.
 Lutes, Leroy, Jr., XXXXX.
 Luther, Henry, XXXXX.
 Lutz, Carl G., XXXXX.
 MacGrain, Donald, XXXXX.
 Mangold, Harold B., XXXXX.
 Marr, Harold E., Jr., XXXX.
 Martin, Winfield L., XXXXX.
 Martineau, Frederick J., XXXX.
 Matchette, Claude H., XXXX.
 McCrea, William S., XXXXX.
 McCrone, Willard P., XXXXX.
 McDaniel, Seaton F., XXXXX.
 McDonnell, William J., Jr., XXXXX.
 McGee, George A., Jr., XXXXX.
 McGillin, Howard O., XXXXX.
 McGrath, Thomas W., XXXXX.
 McLaughlin, Charles V., XXXXX.
 McMains, D. M., XXXXX.
 Metz, Thomas McG., XXXXX.
 Meyer, Charles R., XXXXX.
 Miller, Henry L., XXXXX.
 Miller, Mabry G., XXXX.
 Minor, Floyd E., XXXX.
 Mitchim, Charles F., XXXX.
 Montgomery, Austin J., XXXX.
 Montgomery, John H., Jr., XXXX.
 Morrison, John A., XXXXX.
 Murphy, Ernest V. D., Jr., XXXXX.
 Nagle, Frederick W., XXXXX.
 Neier, Thomas D., XXXXX.
 Nelson, Clarence F., XXXXX.
 Nelson, John G., XXXXX.
 Nelson, Wilmer N. J., XXXXX.
 Newton, Carroll T., XXXXX.
 Oberbeck, Arthur W., XXXXX.
 Oden, Della McC., XXXXX.
 O'Malley, Charles S., Jr., XXXXX.
 Ord, John A., XXXXX.
 Orth, Eugene C., Jr., XXXXX.
 Palmer, Robert S., XXXXX.
 Parker, David B., XXXX.
 Parker, John C., XXXX.
 Parsons, William J., XXXXX.
 Peale, James N., Jr., XXXXX.
 Pearsall, James F., Jr., XXXX.

Peot, Joseph J., XXXXX.
 Pervier, George W., XXXXX.
 Peters, Robert E., XXXXX.
 Pierce, Donald R., XXXXX.
 Polk, John F., XXXXX.
 Popowski, Michael, Jr., XXXXX.
 Postlethwait, Edward M., XXXXX.
 Prahl, Robert L., XXXXX.
 Prather, Lawrence H., XXXXX.
 Priest, Ferry B., XXXXX.
 Quandt, Douglass P., XXXXX.
 Rader, William F., XXXXX.
 Reeves, Kelsie L., XXXXX.
 Redling, William N., XXXXX.
 Reeves, James H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Reid, Clarence E., XXXXX.
 Rice, Kenneth E., XXXXX.
 Richards, Daniel A., XXXXX.
 Richards, Frederick W., XXXXX.
 Rogers, Walter D., XXXXX.
 Roth, Louis E., XXXXX.
 Rowan, Robert L., XXXXX.
 Rowland, Henry C., Jr., XXXXX.
 Sacerdote, Sydney E., XXXXX.
 Sandlin, Joseph C., XXXX.
 Sanford, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXX.
 Saylor, John H., XXXXX.
 Schermerhorn, John G., XXXXX.
 Scherrer, Edward C. D., XXXXX.
 Schroeder, Norman M., XXXXX.
 Scordas, Paul H., XXXXX.
 Scott, Franklin E., XXXXX.
 Seedlock, Robert F., XXXXX.
 Shepherd, Daniel F., XXXXX.
 Shepherd, Gerald D., XXXXX.
 Sheppard, Harvey E., XXXXX.
 Shive, Donald W., XXXXX.
 Short, Earl R., XXXXX.
 Shull, Lewis F., XXXXX.
 Simpson, Thomas B., XXXXX.
 Skeldon, James H., XXXXX.
 Sloan, George B., XXXXX.
 Smart, Donald V., XXXXX.
 Smedile, Joseph A., XXXXX.
 Smigelow, Howard G., XXXX.
 Smiley, Stanley W., XXXXX.
 Smith, Ralph H., XXXXX.
 Solf, Waldemar A., XXXXX.
 Sollohub, Julian V., XXXXX.
 Spangler, Henry M., XXXXX.
 Stann, Eugene J., XXXXX.
 Strandberg, William B., XXXXX.
 Stromberg, Woodrow W., XXXXX.
 Surles, Alexander D., Jr., XXXXX.
 Swarm, William R., XXXXX.
 Sweger, Dyson C., XXXXX.
 Talbott, Charlie Y., Sr., XXXX.
 Tanner, James D., XXXXX.
 Taylor, Benjamin F., XXXX.
 Taylor, Kenneth G., XXXX.
 Teeter, Edgar M., XXXXX.
 Terry, Augustus T., Jr., XXXXX.
 Thompson, Donald F., XXXXX.
 Tiede, Roland V., XXXXX.
 Tolson, John J., 3d, XXXXX.
 Townsend, Elias C., XXXXX.
 Ulrich, John A., XXXXX.
 Underwood, George V., Jr., XXXXX.
 Unger, Ferdinand T., XXXXX.
 Van Allen, William G., XXXX.
 Van Atta, Ward H., XXXXX.
 Van Volkenburgh, Robert H., Jr., XXXXX.
 Walker, George H., XXXXX.
 Washington, Donald, XXXXX.
 Weissman, Edwin W., XXXXX.
 White, Barney D., XXXXX.
 Whitesell, Carlin H., XXXXX.
 Whitmore, Stanley E., XXXX.
 Wilhoyt, Ellis E., Jr., XXXXX.
 Zehner, Elery M., XXXXX.
 Zierdt, John G., XXXXX.

To be colonels, Chaplain

Ames, Kenneth L., XXXXX.
 Anderson, Wilber K., XXXXX.
 Knight, Lonnie W., XXXXX.
 Moore, Harmon D., XXXXX.
 Phillips, Mitchell W., XXXXX.
 Rhea, John I., XXXXX.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United

States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be lieutenant colonel

Hughes, Fredrick K., XXXXX.

To be major

Graham, Elmer H., XXXXX.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Gandy, Kent E., XXXXX.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Abbuhl, Willmott, XXXXX.

Abernathy, Eugene B., XXXXX.

Adams, William D., XXXXX.

Akin, Robert B., XXXXX.

Alexander, William F., XXXXX.

Allanson, Will B., XXXXX.

Allen, Teddy G., XXXXX.

Allison, Roy L., XXXXX.

Allred, Raymond S., Jr., XXXXX.

Amend, William B., XXXXX.

Apruzzese, Vincent A., XXXXX.

Arndt, Terrance L., XXXXX.

Axline, Daniel D., XXXXX.

Back, Eric L., XXXXX.

Balaguer, Melchor C., XXXXX.

Baldwin, Roy G., XXXXX.

Barkett, John S., XXXXX.

Barnes, Jimmie E., XXXXX.

Barnwell, Isaiah E., Jr., XXXXX.

Basha, Robert T., XXXXX.

Basham, Harold R., XXXXX.

Baxter, Thomas R., XXXXX.

Beaumont, Marion E., XXXXX.

Beck, Buddy G., XXXXX.

Becker, Ronald C., XXXXX.

Behnke, James E., XXXXX.

Bellinsky, Howard M., XXXXX.

Bennett, Eugene W., XXXXX.

Bentz, Ronald J., XXXXX.

Bergevin, Duane E., XXXXX.

Beyer, Alfred H., XXXXX.

Beyer, Harry C., XXXXX.

Bishop, Robert L., XXXXX.

Biskup, Robert L., XXXX.

Blakey, Joe B., XXXXX.

Blanchard, Robert DeW., XXXXX.

Bliss, Richard A., XXXXX.

Blomstrom, Harold W., XXXXX.

Bonotto, John J., 3d, XXXXX.

Boothe, Robert S., XXXXX.

Borelli, Raymond F., XXXXX.

Boswell, Benjamin W., XXXXX.

Bowdan, Melvin R., Jr., XXXX.

Bowen, David, Jr., XXXXX.

Bowser, John A., XXXXX.

Boyd, Robert C., XXXX.

Boyd, Thomas G., XXXXX.

Boyett, George H., XXXXX.

Bradlin, James W., 4th, XXXXX.

Bradley, Holley D., XXXXX.

Brett, William J., XXXXX.

Brewer, Robert R., XXXXX.

Brewster, Nathan H., XXXX.

Brickner, Robert L., XXXX.

Broadhurst, Donald G., XXXXX.

Brooks, Joseph H., XXXXX.

Brown, Jerry R., XXXX.

Brown, Joseph E., XXXXX.

Brown, Spencer L., XXXXX.

Bruno-Berrettiaga, Fernando A., XXXXX.

Bruschette, Jerome A., XXXXX.

Buckman, LeRoy R., XXXXX.

Bunger, Reid H., XXXXX.

Bunty, James R., Jr., XXXXX.

Buono, Daniel P., XXXXX.

Burleson, Grady L., XXXXX.

Burns, Richard C., XXXXX.

Burns, Walter L., XXXXX.

Burrell, Raymond E., XXXXX.

Caldwell, James A., XXXXX.

Camarota, Jeremiah F., XXXXX.

Cannon, Edwin E., Jr., XXXX.

Cannon, Robert S., XXXXX.

Cantrell, Ralph D., XXXXX.

Carbone, Anthony J., XXXXX.

Casey, Joe W., XXXXXX.
 Caston, James C., XXXXXX.
 Cavoli, Ivo J., XXXXXX.
 Ceverha, George W., XXXXXX.
 Chandler, Edward V., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Chee, Alfred C. K., XXXXXX.
 Chesterfield, Joseph V., XXXXXX.
 Christie, Jerrold L., XXXXXX.
 Clark, Herbert T., XXXXXX.
 Clark, Richard A., XXXXXX.
 Clement, John P., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Clough, William S., XXXXXX.
 Cohen, Michael I., XXXXXX.
 Cole, John W., XXXXXX.
 Cole, Leslie W., XXXXXX.
 Coleman, Ronald R., XXXXXX.
 Connolly, John D., XXXXXX.
 Cook, James W., XXXXXX.
 Cook, Kenneth J., XXXXXX.
 Cook, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Cooper, George H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Cooper, William H., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Corkery, Paul J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Cornell, Marcus C., XXXXXX.
 Cotton, Thomas W., XXXXXX.
 Cowart, David W., XXXXXX.
 Cox, Kenneth E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Craig, Joe F., XXXXXX.
 Cross, George B., XXXXXX.
 Crowley, Ronald C., XXXXXX.
 Cubert, Burleigh M., XXXXXX.
 Curran, Francis P., XXXXXX.
 Currin, David M., XXXXXX.
 Daley, Richard M., XXXXXX.
 Davis, George C., XXXXXX.
 Davis, James L., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Philip A., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Roy J. XXXXXX.
 Dearth, Edgar G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dedyo, Harry P., XXXXXX.
 Dembinski, Mark L., XXXXXX.
 DeMetropovich, Frederick F., XXXXXX.
 De Nio, Jean H., XXXXXX.
 De Rocher, Robert F., XXXXXX.
 Di Giacinto, Joseph V., XXXXXX.
 Dillon, John P., XXXXXX.
 Dishner, Wilbert J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Doherty, William J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dombrosky, Francis B., XXXXXX.
 Donahue, Andrew J., XXXXXX.
 Doyle, Stuart G., XXXXXX.
 Draper, Stanford C., XXXXXX.
 Drennon, Clarence B., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Edmond, Holman, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Edwards, Fain E., XXXXXX.
 Egan, James E., XXXXXX.
 Eldredge, Richard B., XXXXXX.
 Eldredge, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Elliott, Charles R., XXXXXX.
 Ellis, Orous L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Engh, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Eppler, Daniel R., XXXXXX.
 Evans, Albert B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Evans, Jacky R., XXXXXX.
 Fagan, Allan P., XXXXXX.
 Farill, Trent G., XXXXXX.
 Farnsworth, Fred L., XXXXXX.
 Farrar, Raymond E., XXXXXX.
 Farris, Jack B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Feloney, John A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Fenton, Charles R., XXXXXX.
 Fields, Harvey R., XXXXXX.
 Filer, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Filson, Ronnie L., XXXXXX.
 Fish, Richard O., XXXXXX.
 Fisher, Don R., XXXXXX.
 Fletcher, James E., XXXXXX.
 Fletcher, Richard F., XXXXXX.
 Flowers, Robert G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Floyd, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Fowler, Darrell L., XXXXXX.
 Freeman, Thomas E., XXXXXX.
 Fulfer, Jesse K., XXXXXX.
 Galbreath, Carlton A., XXXXXX.
 Gallagher, Michael W., XXXXXX.
 Gard, William B., XXXXXX.
 Genovese, Peter E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Gess, William D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Gilliam, Glen L., XXXXXX.
 Ginem, Thomas D., XXXXXX.

Glover, Ronald F., XXXXXX.
 Goodman, Donald W., XXXXXX.
 Gordon, Raymond, XXXXXX.
 Goudie, Richard B., XXXXXX.
 Gowan, Arthur D., XXXXXX.
 Gowen, Ralph D., XXXXXX.
 Grade, Kenneth D., XXXXXX.
 Gravett, Ray A., XXXXXX.
 Greene, Ernest L., XXXXXX.
 Grieg, John M., XXXXXX.
 Griffith, Allen L., XXXXXX.
 Groves, James R., XXXXXX.
 Guillory, Kenneth R., XXXXXX.
 Guinn, Ollie R., XXXXXX.
 Hadjis, John, XXXXXX.
 Haenni, Antonio L., XXXXXX.
 Haines, Richard E., XXXXXX.
 Hamilton, Welton E., XXXXXX.
 Hardin, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Harmon, Charles P., XXXXXX.
 Haskell, Charles T., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Haskins, Franklin C., XXXXXX.
 Haugland, Maurice M., XXXXXX.
 Hauschild, John L., XXXXXX.
 Heald, Paul G., XXXXXX.
 Healey, Roger, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Heard, Reuben L., XXXXXX.
 Hempstead, Edward B., XXXXXX.
 Hendricks, Carl C., XXXXXX.
 Hennessey, Stephen P., XXXXXX.
 Hernandez, Jose A., XXXXXX.
 Herron, Roy H., XXXXXX.
 Hickey, William C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hicks, David L., XXXXXX.
 Hilton, Thomas G., XXXXXX.
 Hoffman, James E., XXXXXX.
 Hollingsworth, Victor L., XXXXXX.
 Holloway, Havis L., XXXXXX.
 Holmes, Ernest L., XXXXXX.
 Holst, Raymond H., XXXXXX.
 Homolka, Hubert H., XXXXXX.
 Honan, Joseph C., XXXXXX.
 Hopf, William H., XXXXXX.
 Hopkins, James A., XXXXXX.
 Hopkins, Stephen H., XXXXXX.
 Horn, Jesse Lee, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hornaday, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Hubler, George E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hughes, Joseph L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Hull, Arthur V., XXXXXX.
 Hulse, Kent O., XXXXXX.
 Humeston, Edwin A., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Humphrey, Johnny M., XXXXXX.
 Hunnicutt, Roy D., XXXXXX.
 Hutcheson, Samuel Z., XXXXXX.
 Hutzler, Ralph L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Iwal, Robert H., XXXXXX.
 Jacobs, Bruce V., XXXXXX.
 Jacobson, Walter R., XXXXXX.
 Jagoe, Marcellus H., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Jebava, Ronald J., XXXXXX.
 Jennings, Gerald R., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Alvin F., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Floyd C., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Gaylon LaW., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Gonzales B., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, James O., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, Michael D., XXXXXX.
 Johnson, William M., XXXXXX.
 Johnston, Lon D., XXXXXX.
 Jones, Dennis R., XXXXXX.
 Jones, Edwin Y., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Jones, Joseph E., XXXXXX.
 Jones, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Jones, Robert P., XXXXXX.
 Jordan, Daniel W., XXXXXX.
 Jutilla, Donald D., XXXXXX.
 Kaiser, Gary L., XXXXXX.
 Kaiser, Samuel E., XXXXXX.
 Kane, Paul N., XXXXXX.
 Kaney, Frank N., XXXXXX.
 Kasmark, James W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Kaye, Francis, XXXXXX.
 Keefer, Gary L., XXXXXX.
 Keighler, Howard V., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Kelly, Peter J., XXXXXX.
 Kennedy, James M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Kennedy, Paul J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Kerr, Paul J., XXXXXX.
 Kiely, James L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Killian, Howard J., Jr., XXXXXX.

King, Howard F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Kirshman, Ronald L., XXXXXX.
 Kiser, James E., XXXXXX.
 Klein, Alvin A., XXXXXX.
 Klein, Hugo L., XXXXXX.
 Klys, Adam J., XXXXXX.
 Kneiss, Richard F., XXXXXX.
 Komer, James E., XXXXXX.
 Kronkaitis, John, XXXXXX.
 Kutzner, Robert A., XXXXXX.
 Lacy, Paul J., XXXXXX.
 Lagutchik, Peter, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lasseter, Earle F., XXXXXX.
 Lavey, Michael A., XXXXXX.
 Lee, Gordon K., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lee, Lothrop, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lehmann, Clark T., XXXXXX.
 Leitzen, Thomas R., XXXXXX.
 Lennon, John C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lester, Donald P., XXXXXX.
 Liepins, George, XXXXXX.
 Lindsey, Charles R., XXXXXX.
 Linver, Sidney L., XXXXXX.
 Livingston, George D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lockwood, Edward D., XXXXXX.
 Long, Avery P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Long, Melvin D., XXXXXX.
 Longoria, Ezekiel, XXXXXX.
 Loos, Richard E., XXXXXX.
 Louney, Patrick D., XXXXXX.
 Lucke, David B., XXXXXX.
 Luksik, Franklin D., XXXXXX.
 MacKenzie, David F., XXXXXX.
 Maloney, Mark L., XXXXXX.
 Mann, Hal G., XXXXXX.
 Martinez-Boucher, Rafael E., XXXXXX.
 Massey, Ralph E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Masson, Ronald D., XXXXXX.
 Mastroserio, Joseph, XXXXXX.
 Matsen, Gerald G., XXXXXX.
 Mattes, Richard W., XXXXXX.
 Matthews, John P., XXXXXX.
 Matthews, Robert C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Maxson, Ronald G., XXXXXX.
 McAllister, Max F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 McCluskey, William J., XXXXXX.
 McDonald, Warren J., XXXXXX.
 McEuen, Roger S., XXXXXX.
 McFadden, Patrick J., XXXXXX.
 McGaw, Charles D., XXXXXX.
 McIntosh, Larry P., XXXXXX.
 McKee, Elmo J., XXXXXX.
 McKinnon, Graham, 3d, XXXXXX.
 McKinzie, George J., XXXXXX.
 McLeod, Roger L., XXXXXX.
 McNamara, Andrew T., 3d, XXXXXX.
 McShane, Donald L., XXXXXX.
 Merritt, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Metcalf, George P., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Michener, Edward H., XXXXXX.
 Mickelson, Roger W., XXXXXX.
 Miles, James L., XXXXXX.
 Miller, Gary A., XXXXXX.
 Miller, Raymond A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Miller, Retsae H., XXXXXX.
 Millham, Richard D., XXXXXX.
 Mitchell, Richard G., XXXXXX.
 Moffitt, Robert B., XXXXXX.
 Moll, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Moore, George A., XXXXXX.
 Moore, Lanny W., XXXXXX.
 Mowbray, Calvin W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Mozey, William B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Muchmore, Gilbert L., XXXXXX.
 Murray, Lark R., XXXXXX.
 Musil, Louis F., XXXXXX.
 Myers, William M., XXXXXX.
 Naughton, Hugh V., XXXXXX.
 Nelson, Raymond W., XXXXXX.
 Nelson, Roosevelt, XXXXXX.
 Nelson, Turner L., XXXXXX.
 Neumann, Thomas W., XXXXXX.
 Neuville, Donald L., XXXXXX.
 Nichols, James M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Nilsson, John A., XXXXXX.
 Nishimoto, Masami, XXXXXX.
 Norton, Graham J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Norvell, Frank C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Nulk, Robert A., XXXXXX.
 Obregon, Conrad J., XXXXXX.
 O'Brien, Morgan J., XXXXXX.

O'Connor, Edward J., Jr., ██████████.
 O'Donovan, Thomas E., Jr., ██████████.
 Offield, Nathan A., ██████████.
 Olds, Warren T., Jr., ██████████.
 Olson, Stanley R., ██████████.
 Orndorff, David A., ██████████.
 O'Rourke, Thomas A., Jr., ██████████.
 Osborn, John J., ██████████.
 O'Sullivan, Christopher J., ██████████.
 Pace, Prewitt L., ██████████.
 Paddock, Alfred H., ██████████.
 Parchen, David H., ██████████.
 Parker, Raymond L., ██████████.
 Patterson, Twyman L., ██████████.
 Perkins, Jerry L., ██████████.
 Perry, Richard O., ██████████.
 Peterson, Rolland B., ██████████.
 Pfabe, Richard K., ██████████.
 Phillips, Don, ██████████.
 Plascik, Leon P., Jr., ██████████.
 Pierce, Dale W., ██████████.
 Plestch, Robert C., ██████████.
 Pike, Randall L., ██████████.
 Plasket, Richard L., ██████████.
 Poach, James R., 3d, ██████████.
 Pointer, Monroe, ██████████.
 Pollard, Gordon K., ██████████.
 Ponton-Nieves, Hector R., ██████████.
 Posey, Frank D., ██████████.
 Powell, Arvis L., ██████████.
 Power, Peter J., ██████████.
 Powers, Byron L., ██████████.
 Prahm, Byron F., ██████████.
 Prentice, Charles C., ██████████.
 Presnell, Darrell D., ██████████.
 Price, Herman L., ██████████.
 Putnam, Sidney F., ██████████.
 Ralston, Leonard H., ██████████.
 Randall, Thomas G., ██████████.
 Raupp, Edward R., ██████████.
 Redman, Peter, ██████████.
 Redmon, Burt P., ██████████.
 Rees, Warren K., ██████████.
 Reeves, Jon A., ██████████.
 Regut, Robert E., ██████████.
 Reinen, Robert H., ██████████.
 Reitz, Wilson, Jr., ██████████.
 Renfro, Ronald D., ██████████.
 Resley, Patrick E., ██████████.
 Richardson, Celeste T., ██████████.
 Rider, Charles R., ██████████.
 Rill, Joseph H., Jr., ██████████.
 Rizzo, Peter J., ██████████.
 Roach, Armand D., Jr., ██████████.
 Roberts, Milton R., ██████████.
 Robinson, Charles A., Jr., ██████████.
 Robinson, James C., Jr., ██████████.
 Roche, William H., ██████████.
 Rogers, James D., ██████████.
 Root, Duane B., ██████████.
 Roppo, Leo J., ██████████.
 Rose, Robert S., ██████████.
 Ross, Joseph L., ██████████.
 Rusch, Richard M., ██████████.
 Rushing, Theophilus H., Jr., ██████████.
 Russell, Frederick W., 2d, ██████████.
 Sambol, Donald G., ██████████.
 Sanders, Paul B., ██████████.
 Sanner, Herman R., ██████████.
 Sargent, Terrence D., ██████████.
 Saunders, James D., ██████████.
 Scanlon, John G., ██████████.
 Schad, Charles T., ██████████.
 Schaefer, Lawrence H., ██████████.
 Schleper, David P., ██████████.
 Schlossberg, Arnold, Jr., ██████████.
 Schooner, Murray J., ██████████.
 Schott, Joseph D., ██████████.
 Schrader, Johnie R., ██████████.
 Schriver, Robert F., ██████████.
 Schroeder, William M., ██████████.
 Schumacher, Robert H., ██████████.
 Scott, James MacK., ██████████.
 Sechtman, Paul L., ██████████.
 Serda, William C., Jr., ██████████.
 Shanahan, Edward J., Jr., ██████████.
 Shaw, Robert V., ██████████.
 Shelby, Donald McC., XXXX.
 Shell, James H., ██████████.
 Shelton, Hal T., ██████████.

Shepard, George T., ██████████.
 Shriver, Louis M., Jr., ██████████.
 Siemering, Edward W., ██████████.
 Sitten, John R., Jr., ██████████.
 Sivert, William D., ██████████.
 Slocum, Neil R., ██████████.
 Smart, Lee D., ██████████.
 Smith, Edward, ██████████.
 Smith, Edward C., Jr., ██████████.
 Smith, James A., ██████████.
 Smith, Lee C., Jr., ██████████.
 Smith, Richard N., ██████████.
 Smith, Stanley LeR., Jr., ██████████.
 Smith, Thomas S., Jr., ██████████.
 Smitherman, Joe V., ██████████.
 Snell, Robert A., ██████████.
 Snowden, John R., ██████████.
 Snyder, Thomas E., ██████████.
 Snyder, Walter H., ██████████.
 Solomon, William V., ██████████.
 Sorensen, William A., ██████████.
 Sowell, Mark S., ██████████.
 Spearman, David L., ██████████.
 Spears, Tom, ██████████.
 Spivey, Currie B., Jr., ██████████.
 Squire, John H., ██████████.
 Stairs, William D., ██████████.
 Stallings, Jimmie L., ██████████.
 Steakley, David L., ██████████.
 Stedman, Robert W., ██████████.
 Steele, Jerry T., ██████████.
 Steele, Merrill F., Jr., ██████████.
 Stewart, Robert G., ██████████.
 Strickland, Robert, ██████████.
 Strong, Edwin T., Jr., ██████████.
 Stryker, Dean K., ██████████.
 Surface, Vaughn E., ██████████.
 Sutton, Donald M., ██████████.
 Sutton, William M., ██████████.
 Talbot, Ralph, 4th, ██████████.
 Tamer, Robert S., ██████████.
 Tannenbaum, David L., ██████████.
 Taylor, Ronald D., ██████████.
 Taylor, William E., ██████████.
 Tebo, Robert J., ██████████.
 Temples, Coy H., ██████████.
 Templin, Timothy T., ██████████.
 Tennis, Gayland L., ██████████.
 Thibodeau, Charles A., Jr., ██████████.
 Thomas, Charles R., ██████████.
 Thomas, Kenneth E., ██████████.
 Thompson, Robert A., ██████████.
 Tilling, William T., Jr., ██████████.
 Tippin, Garold L., ██████████.
 Tipton, Cari W., ██████████.
 Torreto, Richard J., ██████████.
 Treacy, John T., ██████████.
 Tripp, Frederick G., ██████████.
 Tucker, Everett L., Jr., ██████████.
 Tucker, Woodson C., ██████████.
 Turenne, Paul N., ██████████.
 Uhrlrich, Theodore W., Jr., ██████████.
 Ulzheimer, Robert, ██████████.
 Umbaugh, Lloyd D., ██████████.
 Vallmont, Benjamin F., ██████████.
 Van Devender, Edward P., ██████████.
 Van Steenbergen, Albert R., ██████████.
 Vaughn, John P., ██████████.
 Volpe, Michael, ██████████.
 Waddell, Marion F., ██████████.
 Wagner, Edward H., ██████████.
 Walker, John R., ██████████.
 Wallace, Richard C., ██████████.
 Walsh, Richard J., ██████████.
 Walters, Charles C., ██████████.
 Walton, Ronald A., ██████████.
 Walton, Warren J., ██████████.
 Webb, Daniel J., ██████████.
 Webber, Paul B., ██████████.
 Weber, William J., ██████████.
 Weiss, George R., ██████████.
 Welsh, Richard W., ██████████.
 Westbrook, Tommy R., ██████████.
 Wheeler, Rock C., Jr., ██████████.
 White, Donald P., ██████████.
 White, Weldon E., ██████████.
 Whitehead, Dorsey M., ██████████.
 Whitmarsh, Donald B., ██████████.
 Wiles, Edward, Jr., ██████████.
 Wilhite, James A., ██████████.

Wilkinson, Cicero, ██████████.
 Wilkinson, Coleman D., ██████████.
 Williams, Durward R., ██████████.
 Williams, Robert S., Jr., ██████████.
 Willoughby, Kenneth L., ██████████.
 Wilson, Douglas B., Jr., ██████████.
 Wilson, James F., ██████████.
 Wise, Ronald T., ██████████.
 Withington, Robert J., ██████████.
 Witter, Lee F., ██████████.
 Wolfe, June E., Jr., ██████████.
 Wood, Robert D., ██████████.
 Woodall, Jack D., ██████████.
 Wylder, Robert J., ██████████.
 Yoder, Kenneth E., ██████████.
 Zeltman, Ronald W., ██████████.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps
 Phillips, Charlotte E., XXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bardill, Donald R., ██████████.
 Bevilacqua, Joseph J., ██████████.
 Carter, William A., ██████████.
 Dimmitt, William A., ██████████.
 Dryden, David D., ██████████.
 Dubiel, Joseph, Jr., ██████████.
 Duffy, Paul F., ██████████.
 Fechner, Ruben F., Jr., ██████████.
 Habeck, Edgar J., ██████████.
 Hayes, John D., ██████████.
 Heiser, Carl W., ██████████.
 Hubbell, Gilbert L., ██████████.
 Jenkins, William N., ██████████.
 Lawson, James L., ██████████.
 Leach, William O., ██████████.
 Locklear, James P., ██████████.
 Logan, Robert F., Jr., ██████████.
 McLeod, William R., ██████████.
 Miles, Peter D., ██████████.
 Miske, Thomas R., ██████████.
 Murphy, Robert J., ██████████.
 O'Donnell, Frank P., ██████████.
 Roberts, John E., ██████████.
 Rockwell, John H., ██████████.
 Russillo, Michael P., Jr., ██████████.
 Sites, William G., ██████████.
 Snyder, Harvey W., 2d, ██████████.
 Ulrich, Wayne E., ██████████.
 Wheeler, Gerald E., ██████████.
 Wilson, Jack R., 2d, ██████████.
 Wolters, Kenneth V., ██████████.
 Woods, William B., ██████████.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps
 Seufert, Helen J., XXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Derrick, Beverly A., XXXX.
 Pavlis, Patricia M., XXXX.
 Sampson, Carol M., XXXX.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Holley, James E., ██████████.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Miller, Henry T. (CE), ██████████.

To be first lieutenant

Reue, David N. (MSC), ██████████.

To be second lieutenant

Moore, Claude P. (MSC), ██████████.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Marshall, George W., ██████████.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

To be captains

Bastian, Richard K., ██████████
 Cole, Billie J., ██████████
 Dalone, Arthur A., ██████████
 Hoeft, Kermit C., ██████████
 Jones, William A., III, ██████████
 Maddox, Fletcher B., ██████████
 McQueen, James T., ██████████
 Rush, Robert P., ██████████
 Strange, Loren C., ██████████
 Tumlin, Grady H., Sr., ██████████

To be first lieutenants

Allen, Carl J., ██████████
 Blackham, Richard G., ██████████
 Cook, Walter C., ██████████
 Cunningham, Cleve, ██████████
 Daugherty, John M. Jr., ██████████
 Dickson, Rodney, ██████████
 Gagliardone, John L., ██████████
 Garrison, Edgar C., ██████████
 Giampaoli, Joseph T., ██████████
 Hornstein, Edmund H., ██████████
 Hudak, Robert J., ██████████
 Keefe, Victor F., ██████████
 Kelley, Carl C., ██████████
 Little, Ronald E., ██████████
 McNatt, Orville W., ██████████
 Rutter, Leo F., Jr., ██████████
 Santulli, John F., ██████████
 Thompson, Michael R., ██████████

To be second lieutenants

Anderson, David W., ██████████
 Bartay, Tandy E., ██████████
 Bartels, Steven E., ██████████
 Brooks, Richard L., Sr., ██████████
 Buford, Alfred E., ██████████
 Carter, Randall O., ██████████
 Gantt, Larry O., ██████████
 Hawkins, Lawrence R., ██████████
 Henry, Larry F., ██████████
 Jacko, Victor W., ██████████
 Jackson, George B., Jr., ██████████
 Kuhn, William K., Jr., ██████████
 Lantz, Norman F., ██████████
 Larson, Christian M., ██████████
 Lyles, Billy A., ██████████
 McCormick, William R., ██████████
 Mitchell, Thomas P., ██████████
 Smith, Richard A., ██████████
 Smith, Verneille T., ██████████
 Thompson, John T., Jr., ██████████
 Van Dine, Peter W. H., ██████████
 Wakelin, John D., ██████████
 West, William A., ██████████
 Wigner, Larry R., ██████████

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be majors, Medical Corps

Clearkin, Kevin P., ██████████
 Moore, Robert C., Jr., ██████████

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Ayers, Donna M., ██████████

To be captains, Dental Corps

Brown, Alden G., ██████████

Horton, John E., ██████████

Lederer, Robert M., ██████████

McCasland, John P., ██████████

Ott, Gerald R., ██████████

Purdy, Robert B.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Chipman, Martin, ██████████

Kleck, Henry G., ██████████

Knovick, George C., ██████████

Mattei-Rosich, Ivan R., ██████████

Miller, William C., Jr., ██████████

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Bizer, James E., ██████████

Yarbrough, Charles R., ██████████

To be first Lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Gately, Miriam A., ██████████

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Banton, Huston J., II, ██████████
 Fung, Edmond, ██████████
 Howerton, Robert B., Jr., ██████████

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Nelson, Robert N., ██████████

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Howe, Charles B., ██████████

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Boyd, Charles N., ██████████
 Goler, David, ██████████
 Lenio, Paul T., ██████████

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Grieser, Elaine M., ██████████
 Hart, Suzanne D., ██████████

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Berlin, Jack E., ██████████
 Garrett, Richard L., ██████████
 Hatfield, Earl P., ██████████
 Howell, Lawrence C., Sr., ██████████
 LaValley, John W., ██████████

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Estock, Barbara J., ██████████

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Carter, Jimmie B., Jr.
 Chin, Gordon O.
 Turpin, William P., IV

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3288:

Berry Terry G., Morris, James D.
 Bevis, Coleman O., Jr. O'Connor, Robert E.
 Bulley, Brian Paisley, James A.
 Burns, Jerald G. Parker, Frederick E.
 Cappadona, Louis A. III Pettine, Anthony V.
 Jr. Pettine, Anthony V.

Castillo, Rosendo J. III Reddington, Thomas
 Chrissinger, John E. E.
 Christopherson, David E.

Reilly, Robert J.
 Crosby, Philip A. Reppard, Richard A.
 Dacus, Kenneth J. Smith, Arthur L.
 Davis, Terrel E. Smith, Dennis B.
 Dunning, Stephen G. Smith, Tommy J.
 Ebbaugh, Christian M. Spencer, Farrell J., Jr.
 Eppley, Vernon L. Spitzer, Melvin R.
 Ferguson, Jack W. Stanberry, Robert M.
 Furgeson, Charles T. Symcox, Jerry J.
 Givens, Arthur A., Jr. Tait, Donald A.
 Hardy, David J., Jr. Thrift, Raymond H., Jr.
 Harn, Patrick J.
 Harper, Michael R. Tilton, William M.
 Haywood, Everett L. Tippin, Scott M.
 Hervey, Robert F. Turner, Robert D. S.
 Jaeger, John F. Vinci, Vincent D.
 Johnson, Alvin B., Jr. Watson, Walter E., III
 Keiser, Maurice R. Watt, Murray B.
 Major, Ernest H. Watzek, Albert L.
 Marsh, Caryl G. White, Charles A., Jr.
 McClure, Walter R. Wiseman, Donald E.
 McFarland, Jon W. Wylie, Robert M.
 McIntire, Paul J. Yaugo, Edward O.

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1961, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:

Myerchin, Thomas S.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of

cated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Kenneth H. Cooper, ██████████
 Albert R. Cristian, ██████████
 Robert T. Herrington, ██████████
 John R. Hoch, ██████████
 Donald N. Mantle, ██████████
 Andrew A. Nielsen, ██████████
 James H. Oliver, Jr., ██████████
 Lewis H. Richmond, ██████████
 Charles H. Sawyer, ██████████
 Charles R. Secrest, ██████████

To be captain, USAF (dental)

Earle S. Slaughenhoupt, Jr., ██████████

To be captain, USAF (nurse)

Mida M. Page, ██████████

To be first lieutenant, USAF (dental)

Donald W. Turner.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Phyllis J. Bolterman, ██████████
 Della J. Daniels, ██████████
 Alta B. Moore, ██████████
 Dorothy D. Pavlakovic, ██████████
 Charlotte Roberts, ██████████
 Della A. Shea, ██████████
 Josephine M. Tripp, ██████████
 Claire Walsh, ██████████

To be second lieutenant, USAF (nurse)

Norma D. Halley, ██████████

The following distinguished graduates for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Officer Training School Graduates

Ben D. Jenkins, ██████████
 William E. Owen, Jr., ██████████
 William H. Sowers, ██████████
 William S. Tuthill, ██████████

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduates

James E. Deal, ██████████

Aubrey L. Hall, ██████████

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

Lanny R. Andres, ██████████
 Joseph A. Breen, ██████████
 John M. Carroll, Jr., ██████████
 Philip L. Huntwork, ██████████
 Creston C. Hutchinson, Jr., ██████████
 Richard K. Koehne, ██████████
 Donald B. McGhee, ██████████
 Richard L. Millikan, ██████████
 Craig F. Morgan, ██████████
 Robert W. Moser, ██████████
 Charles A. Newton, ██████████
 Walter S. Radeker, III, ██████████
 Dieter W. Satz, ██████████
 Richard J. Szucs, ██████████
 Gerald A. Taylor, Jr., ██████████
 David A. Terry, ██████████
 Jack M. Thurman, ██████████

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as a distinguished military graduate, the following distinguished military student of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Donald W. Doerge, ██████████

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of

rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be second lieutenants

Ackerlund, Walter E., XXXXXXXXX
Adam, Wallace B., XXXXXXXXX
Ahart, Edward L., XXXXXXXXX
Ahearn, Joseph A., XXXXXXXXX
Ahearne, John F., XXXXXXXXX
Akers, Brian L., XXXXXXXXX
Alexander, George, XXXXXXXXX
Allman, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX
Alman, Frederick R., XXXXXXXXX
Anderson, Joseph C., XXXXXXXXX
Anderson, Lavon N., XXXXXXXXX
Armbruster, John A., XXXXXXXXX
Armstrong, Arthur J., XXXXXXXXX
Atteberry, David L., XXXXXXXXX
Augspurger, Earl F., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Avery, Allan F., XXXXXXXXX
Barham, Billy G., XXXXXXXXX
Barland, Edwin S., XXXXXXXXX
Barlow, William K., XXXXXXXXX
Barnett, Larry L., XXXXXXXXX
Basso, Ronald J., XXXXXXXXX
Bartlett, Donald A., XXXXXXXXX
Beamer, James M., XXXXXXXXX
Beauchamp, Charles K., XXXXXXXXX
Beerman, Raymond O., XXXXXXXXX
Bell, David F., XXXXXXXXX
Benson, Robert P., XXXXXXXXX
Berg, Robert M., XXXXXXXXX
Bergholz, Richard J., XXXXXXXXX
Bergstad, Joe G., XXXXXXXXX
Bergstrom, Charles R., III, XXXXXXXXX
Berkley, Charles E., XXXXXXXXX
Bernd, Ronald E., XXXXXXXXX
Beschta, Jack W., XXXXXXXXX
Bessette, John F., XXXXXXXXX
Bliery, Alvin E., XXXXXXXXX
Boehm, Stanley P., XXXXXXXXX
Bonham, Arthur E., XXXXXXXXX
Boudreau, Jean A., XXXXXXXXX
Boudreaux, Clifford P., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Bourne, William R., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Boyden, James E., XXXXXXXXX
Boynton, Gerald D., XXXXXXXXX
Bradfield, Edward N., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Braman, Ellis J., XXXXXXXXX
Braniff, Ronald W., XXXXXXXXX
Brickson, Milton E., XXXXXXXXX
Bridges, Edward S., II, XXXXXXXXX
Briesch, Earl W., XXXXXXXXX
Brooks, Kent, XXXXXXXXX
Brown, Charles V., XXXXXXXXX
Brown, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
Braudli, Ulysses J., XXXXXXXXX
Brquetsch, Walter E., XXXXXXXXX
Buchanan, John W., XXXXXXXXX
Buckenmaier, Chester C., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Bunch, Frederick D., XXXXXXXXX
Burchard, Donald C., XXXXXXXXX
Burke, James P., XXXXXXXXX
Burnett, Troy D., XXXXXXXXX
Burns, Kenneth S., XXXXXXXXX
Burns, Vincent B., XXXXXXXXX
Bush, Roger G., XXXXXXXXX
Campbell, James F., XXXXXXXXX
Carnevale, Arthur, Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Carver, Robert M., XXXXXXXXX
Cassity, James S., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Castetter, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX
Caulfield, John J., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Chamberlin, Robert W., XXXXXXXXX
Chambers, James E., XXXXXXXXX
Church, James W. B., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Clancy, John T., XXXXXXXXX
Clarke, Walter F., XXXXXXXXX
Colton, George M., XXXXXXXXX
Coody, Marion C., XXXXXXXXX
Cooper, James H., XXXXXXXXX
Cornwell, Jefford R., XXXXXXXXX
Cotton, Leonard W., XXXXXXXXX
Cowan, Jimmy D., XXXXXXXXX
Cramer, James L., XXXXXXXXX
Crews, Charles P., XXXXXXXXX
Cronican, John G., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
Cronquist, Richard G., XXXXXXXXX
Cross, Robert A., XXXXXXXXX
Curren, John J., XXXXXXXXX
Dabasinkas, John R., XXXXXXXXX

Daleo, James M., ██████████
Dauber, Carl W., ██████████
Davenport, Ernest J., ██████████
Dawley, Donald L., ██████████
DeGreve, Stanley C., ██████████
DeJong, John E., ██████████
Dempster, Kennett D., ██████████
Dessert, Robert A., ██████████
Dianich, David F., ██████████
Dickinson, Dean C., ██████████
Dierker, Joseph B., ██████████
Dipilla, Reginangelo A., ██████████
Disalvo, Richard S., ██████████
Dixon, Glenn R., ██████████
Doherty, Edward P., ██████████
Dorsey, William H., ██████████
Dow, Donald W., Jr., ██████████
Duick, William, ██████████
Dunlap, Fredric C., ██████████
Dziacko, Stanley, Jr., ██████████
Earl, John A., ██████████
Eastep, Franklin E., ██████████
Eckert, Theodore J., ██████████
Eggen, Charles P., ██████████
Ehernberger, Lumir J., Jr., ██████████
Ellis, Christopher F., ██████████
Ellis, Kenneth N., Jr., ██████████
Ellis, William H., Jr., ██████████
Erhart, Ronald G., ██████████
Erickson, Bertil R., ██████████
Evans, Jay J., ██████████
Fahnestock, Dale L., ██████████
Felty, Darrell W., ██████████
Flitz, Regin F., ██████████
Finnegan, Patrick M., ██████████
Fitzsimons, R. Michael, ██████████
Flickinger, Harry H., ██████████
Fogle, James M., ██████████
Foley, William L., ██████████
Ford, Brian J., ██████████
Forsythe, Conrad O., ██████████
Fournier, Pierre D., ██████████
Frantz, John J., ██████████
Fredrickson, Gerald O., ██████████
Freeman, Thomas W., ██████████
Freer, Jerry H., ██████████
Frusti, Roy A. J., ██████████
Fyock, Milford D. V., ██████████
Gaddie, William R., ██████████
Galias, Donald T., ██████████
Gallinger, Robert J., ██████████
Galloway, James A., ██████████
Gantter, Wallace F., ██████████
Gardner, Norman E., ██████████
Garver, Charles W., Jr., ██████████
Gee, William L., ██████████
Geesey, Roger A., ██████████
Geisel, Martin A., ██████████
Generale, Mark A., ██████████
Gibson, Leroy A., ██████████
Giles, Thomas E., ██████████
Gilfillin, Eugene A. II, ██████████
Gill, Ben T., Jr., ██████████
Gillman, Wallace M., ██████████
Giuliani, Benjamin W., ██████████
Godsey, Neil W., ██████████
Goetz, Michael B., ██████████
Gompert, Leon T., ██████████
Gordon, Glynneth M., ██████████
Gray, Alvin L., Jr., ██████████
Green, Ronald R., ██████████
Greene, Rockwell N., ██████████
Greene, Samuel J., ██████████
Griffith, James R., ██████████
Hackert, Nels A., ██████████
Hager, John A., ██████████
Halac, Harry E., ██████████
Haldeman, Bruce, ██████████
Hamer, Howard A., ██████████
Hamilton, William C., ██████████
Hancock, Charles C., Jr., ██████████
Harmon, James B., ██████████
Harriman, Albert R., Jr., ██████████
Harris, Roy V., Jr., ██████████
Hartung, Ludwig F., Jr., ██████████
Haselbauer, Francis G., ██████████
Hatch, Bruce R., ██████████
Hatch, Gordon L., ██████████
Haver, Robert W., ██████████
Hayden, Warren R., ██████████
Hayes, Oscar E., ██████████
Hedden, Wesley D., ██████████
Henry, Charles J., ██████████
Herbert, David B., ██████████
Hermann, Gordon L., ██████████
Hershey, Terry L., ██████████
Hetrick, Raymond H., ██████████
Hewitt, Conrad W., ██████████
Hight, Gerald A., ██████████
Hillesland, Kent L., ██████████
Hjelm, Lawrence N., ██████████
Hoder, Joseph J., ██████████
Hogue, Baxter E., ██████████
Hollis, Lewis D., ██████████
Holmes, William C., ██████████
Horner, Charles A., ██████████
Huebner Defejervar, Charles A., ██████████
Hugelman, Rodney D., ██████████
Hughes, Thomas F., ██████████
Huguley, Ted E., ██████████
Hymas, Carl E., ██████████
Irwin, Joseph R., A ██████████
Jackson, Lee S., ██████████
James, John R., ██████████
Jamison, Theodore T., ██████████
Jansen, Theodore A., ██████████
Janssens, Leo G., ██████████
Jarvie, James G., Jr., ██████████
Johnson, Robert J., ██████████
Jolly, Bobby G., ██████████
Kaiser, Richard J., ██████████
Kane, Jackie J., ██████████
Kanillopoulos, John J., ██████████
Katsikas, Constantinos J., ██████████
Kern, Kenneth J., ██████████
Ketter, Donald J., ██████████
Kilroy, John D., ██████████
King, Martin B., ██████████
Kirsimagi, Tonu J., ██████████
Klar, Charles H. III, ██████████
Klingbeil, Ronald L., ██████████
Kowalczyk, Robert A., ██████████
Kucera, Howard L., ██████████
Kunkle, Alexander J., ██████████
Lanahan, Robert J., ██████████
Langie, John D., ██████████
Langlinais, Gedeon B., ██████████
Laws, Louis W., ██████████
Ledden, John M., ██████████
Lee, Robert S., ██████████
Legare, Vincent P., ██████████
Lehnhoff, Edward W., Jr., ██████████
Leighton, John H., Jr., ██████████
LePage, Frederick R., ██████████
Light, James E., ██████████
Liles, Charles O., ██████████
Lindsay, Nathan J., ██████████
Love, William A., ██████████
Lowry, Clifton L., ██████████
Ludwig, Karl T., ██████████
Lyons, Bernard G., ██████████
Mack, William F., ██████████
Mahaffey, Kenneth E., ██████████
Malone, Burnie H. III, ██████████
Manz, Joe E., Jr., ██████████
Martin, Norman C., ██████████
Maston, Eugene W., ██████████
Matheis, Vernon H., ██████████
Mathison, Richard A., ██████████
Mathys, Ronald E., ██████████
Maxwell, Robert S., ██████████
May, Robert S., ██████████
McBride, Jon R., ██████████
McCall, Philip J., ██████████
McDaniel, Denis S., ██████████
McDevitt, Neil T., ██████████
McHenry, Dale E., ██████████
McKinley, Robert D., ██████████
McKnight, George P., ██████████
McLaughlin, Richard E., ██████████
McMullan, Charles D., ██████████
Mecca, Maure L., ██████████
Medeiros, Manuel F., Jr., ██████████
Menuez, Jan L., ██████████
Merrill, Landell H., ██████████
Middlemist, Louis S., Jr., ██████████
Miller, John C., ██████████
Miller, Robert A., ██████████
Miller, Shirley A., ██████████
Miller, William J., Jr., ██████████
Minkin, Alan R., ██████████
Monberger, Richard A., ██████████

Moore, Gery E., XXXXXXXXX
 Moore, James O., XXXXXXXXX
 Moore, Tom C., XXXXXXXXX
 Moore, William J., XXXXXXXXX
 Moreman, Otis S., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Morenoff, Edward, XXXXXXXXX
 Morgan, William R., XXXXXXXXX
 Mugler, David J., XXXXXXXXX
 Mulrooney, William L., XXXXXXXXX
 Mulick, Richard F., XXXXXXXXX
 Murphy, Crawford O., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Murray, Guy E., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Nawrocki, Edmund A., XXXXXXXXX
 Nelson, Elmer E., XXXXXXXXX
 Nethercot, Hubert S., XXXXXXXXX
 Nevin, John M., XXXXXXXXX
 Nicholson, Robert S., XXXXXXXXX
 Niedens, Alverta D., XXXX
 Niven, William A., XXXXXXXXX
 Nordhauser, Fred, XXXXXXXXX
 O'Brien, John W., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Ojakangas, Dennis R., XXXXXXXXX
 Olivet, David J., XXXXXXXXX
 Olsen, Alan K., XXXXXXXXX
 Olson David A., XXXXXXXXX
 Parker, Billy R., XXXXXXXXX
 Pault, Linton A., XXXXXXXXX
 Peacock, James M., XXXXXXXXX
 Pepe, Paul A., XXXXXXXXX
 Perry, Glenwood H., XXXXXXXXX
 Petersen, Ernest V., XXXXXXXXX
 Peterson, Frederick H., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Phelps, James E., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Phillips, Frank T., XXXXXXXXX
 Pickens, William, III, XXXXXXXXX
 Pierce, James O., II, XXXXXXXXX
 Pike, Paul W., XXXXXXXXX
 Poor, Russell A., XXXXXXXXX
 Pope, James N., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Porco, John V., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Porter, Jimmie R., XXXXXXXXX
 Porter, John B., XXXXXXXXX
 Prater, Ronald F., XXXXXXXXX
 Pray, Wayne S., XXXXXXXXX
 Price, George, XXXXXXXXX
 Prostko, Vincent A., XXXXXXXXX
 Purins, Guntis, XXXXXXXXX
 Quayle, Ronald J., XXXXXXXXX
 Quinby, Charles F., XXXXXXXXX
 Rachofsky, David J., XXXXXXXXX
 Rasmussen, James L., XXXXXXXXX
 Reardon, James P., XXXXXXXXX
 Reckler, Arthur, XXXXXXXXX
 Reed, William C., XXXXXXXXX
 Reoh, George C., XXXXXXXXX
 Repole, Joseph, Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Reynolds, Louis H., II, XXXXXXXXX
 Rhodes, Guy W., XXXXXXXXX
 Riddle, Richard D., XXXXXXXXX
 Risan, Thomas J., XXXXXXXXX
 Rist, John D., XXXXXXXXX
 Roach, James H., XXXXXXXXX
 Robertson, Arthur D., XXXXXXXXX
 Robertson, Robert A., XXXXXXXXX
 Robison, Russell D., XXXXXXXXX
 Rogers, James C., XXX
 Roselund, Gordon E., XXXXXXXXX
 Rosenfeld, Stuart A., XXXXXXXXX
 Rosetti, William J., XXXXXXXXX
 Rostkowski, Alexander E., XXXXXXXXX
 Roy, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX
 Rutten, Thomas W., XXXXXXXXX
 Rutter, Joseph G., XXXXXXXXX
 Sabo, Ronald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Sackschewsky, Virgil E., XXXXXXXXX
 Sanders, Delbert A., XXXXXXXXX
 Schaefer, Robert F., XXXXXXXXX
 Schneider, Jerry R., XXXXXXXXX
 Schumacher, Frederick W., XXXXXXXXX
 Schuyler, Peter R., XXXXXXXXX
 Schwartz, Larry L., XXXXXXXXX
 Selzer, Larry A., XXXXXXXXX
 Semrad, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Shaper, James R., XXXXXXXXX
 Shapleigh, William M., XXXXXXXXX
 Sheldon, James H., XXXXXXXXX
 Shelley, Zack H., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Shepler, Ronald K., XXXXXXXXX
 Sherouse, Lewis E., XXXXXXXXX
 Sherwood, Marcia W., XXX
 Shindler, George R., XXXXXXXXX
 Sickeler, Richard O., XXXXXXXXX

Sims, William R., XXXXXXXXX
 Sitterly, Lewis F., XXXXXXXXX
 Skucas, Donatas, XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Conrad E., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Eric E., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Keith W., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Larry E., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Richard E., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Theodore W., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Walter E., XXXXXXXXX
 Snaring, Thor M., XXXXXXXXX
 Starnes, Arthur J., XXXXXXXXX
 Sterrett, Ronald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Stevens, Donald T., XXXXXXXXX
 Stone, John T., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Stroud, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Stutzman, Roger D., XXXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, David J., XXXXXXXXX
 Suranyi, Edward E., XXXXXXXXX
 Suter, Richard M., XXXXXXXXX
 Termeer, John J., XXXXXXXXX
 Tharp, Roland L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Thomas, William B., XXXXXXXXX
 Thomason, Henry A., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Thompson, David E., XXXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Paul V., XXXXXXXXX
 Toner, William L., XXXXXXXXX
 Trace, Thomas L., XXXXXXXXX
 Tuttle, Thomas O., XXXXXXXXX
 Tyler, Wayne L., XXXXXXXXX
 Ubelhor, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX
 VanKuren, James T., XXXXXXXXX
 Veach, James P., XXXXXXXXX
 Violett, Russell L., XXXXXXXXX
 Voss, John H., XXXXXXXXX
 Wade, James E., XXXXXXXXX
 Wagener, Dennis G., XXXXXXXXX
 Wainwright, Ronald G., XXXXXXXXX
 Wakeman, James F., XXXXXXXXX
 Walton, Morris D., XXXXXXXXX
 Warble, Keith V., XXXXXXXXX
 Watts, James D., XXXXXXXXX
 Wavell, John C., XXXXXXXXX
 Weber, Robert H., XXXXXXXXX
 Werle, Benjamin O., XXXXXXXXX
 West, John E., XXXXXXXXX
 White, Jerry D., XXXXXXXXX
 Wickman, John F., XXXXXXXXX
 Wigton, Richard S., XXXXXXXXX
 Willett, James G., XXXXXXXXX
 Wittenberg, William A., XXXXXXXXX
 Womack, Bond M., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Work, James B., XXXXXXXXX
 Wray, Robert F., XXXXXXXXX
 Wynne, John W., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Yager, Walter S., XXXXXXXXX
 York, Guy P., XXXXXXXXX
 Yorks, Robert A., XXXXXXXXX
 Young, Bruce E., XXXXXXXXX
 Young, Francis J., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Zahniser, Frank R., XXXXXXXXX
 Zeidler, Jerry L., XXXXXXXXX
 Zimmerman, Joseph R., XXXXXXXXX
 Zustovich, Alfred B., XXXXXXXXX

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 7, 1961:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Gerald Johnson, of California, to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 10, 1961

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

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

O God our Father, as servants of the national welfare, before, in the hearing

of all the world, we talk of the Nation's good, we would lift our needy hearts to the Nation's God. Thou hast ordained that in the leadership of public affairs the care of the many must rest upon the shoulders of the few. Enable, we pray Thee, those thus lifted to posts of great power to cultivate the spirit of fairness and charity that differing opinions may not bitterly divide, nor practices dishonor, nor conflicts make us unkind.

Be patient with our impatience. In times of tension make us more forbearing and considerate one with another, remembering that even in the glare of public gaze each fights a hard battle and walks a lonely way.

Enrich us with a passionate care for others' needs without which all we say, even though we speak with the tongues of men and angels, is as but sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.

Help us in all our ways to be masters of ourselves that we may be the servants of all. Thus may we faithfully serve our baffled day as we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee, our God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 7, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ANDERSEN of of Minnesota, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

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

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the transaction of routine