

The affiliation between Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons was formalized 50 years ago and in 1928 gave birth to the complex of buildings known as the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. This institution has benefited the entire world through contributions to better health.

Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University and Augustus C. Long, president of the Presbyterian Hospital in the city of New York, announced that \$35 million of the campaign goal will be used for new construction, already underway, to include the \$13 million William Black Medical Research Building.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, is general chairman of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center Development Committee. General Clay, chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co. and vice president of Presbyterian Hospital's board of trustees has guided the fund close to the halfway mark. He has interrupted this stewardship to serve the President of the United States as his personal representative in Berlin with the rank of ambassador.

In discussing Columbia-Presbyterian's combination of patient care, medical education, and research during the last 30 years, General Clay said:

I believe that it is not an unrelated coincidence that these same past 30 years have seen more forward surge in medical science than in all the previous years of human history. This is by no means a claim that all such progress occurred in the center, but

simply that the impetus in research, teaching, and treatment which found expression in the center idea has had extremely wide and useful results.

More than 3 million patients of all races, creeds, and circumstances have been treated at the medical center since it was opened in 1928.

The high quality of medical education and research at the Medical Center has drawn a steady stream of visiting scholars from all points of the globe, many of whom are leaders in medicine in their own institutions both in this country and abroad.

A most important accomplishment of the center has been the training of thousands of doctors, nurses, and other members of the health professions. Approximately 4,000 medical students, 5,000 interns, and residents, and hundreds of research scientists have gone out from the medical center during the last three decades.

This country leads the world in both the qualitative and quantitative scope of its medical education. Yet, it suffers from a shortage of doctors that threatens to grow more serious in the face of a burgeoning population and increased commitments for world leadership in all fields.

This merely adds to the urgency of supporting the expansion of our great teaching institutions like the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

In this era of growing requests by Government and private philanthropic organizations for research projects into

various aspects of diseases the enormous demands for maintaining and extending research activities require more and better facilities—facilities unthought of when the Columbia-Presbyterian buildings were on the planning boards in the 1920's.

The trustees of Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University deserve the grateful commendation of Americans everywhere for their determination to extend the contribution of Columbia-Presbyterian toward better health by a major expansion of facilities for patient care, research and medical education.

I cannot too strongly urge Americans to support our free institutions like Columbia-Presbyterian in their dedication to nurturing a better way of life for all men.

Presbyterian Hospital, like all voluntary hospitals, is critically dependent upon funds from philanthropic giving, fund-raising campaigns, bequests and endowments to enable it to serve the community.

Yet this institution stands ready to serve regardless of the patient's ability to pay. Medical care is provided in the wards and outpatient departments, without charge, by attending staff doctors. Community volunteers serve, without pay, in virtually all parts of the hospital.

A gift to the medical center's development program is an investment in the health of our Nation. Furthermore, it is a promise to the free world that we shall not shirk our responsibilities for the well-being of peoples everywhere.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Matthew 20: 27: *Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.*
Eternal and ever-blessed God, we acknowledge humbly and gratefully that by Thy kind and beneficent providence we have hitherto been sustained and strengthened.

Grant that now, as we go forward into the days of a new year and a new session of Congress, with all of its perplexing problems, we may be sensitive and devoutly obedient to the leading of Thy divine spirit.

May our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative assembly embody and express that noble kind of statesmanship which strives to preserve and perpetuate those lofty ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained.

God forbid that we should ever misdirect our aspirations and dissipate our energies by allowing them to become centered upon personal gain rather than upon Thy glory and the welfare of humanity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 402. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 402 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President

taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber: the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representa-

tives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have a great pleasure, the highest privilege, and the distinct honor, and to me, particularly on this occasion, always, but particularly on this occasion, of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Vice President, my old colleague from Massachusetts and your new Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK [applause], Members of the 87th Congress, ladies and gentlemen, this week we begin anew our joint and separate efforts to build the American future. But, sadly, we build without a man who linked a long past with the present and looked strongly to the future. Mr. SAM RAYBURN is gone. Neither this House nor the Nation is the same without him.

Members of the Congress, the Constitution makes us not rivals for power but partners for progress. We are all trustees for the American people, custodians of the American heritage. It is my task to report the state of the Union—to improve it is the task of us all.

In the past year, I have traveled not only across our own land but to other lands—to the north and the south, and across the seas. And I have found—as I am sure you have, in your travels—that people everywhere, in spite of occasional disappointments, look to us—not to our wealth or power, but to the splendor of our ideals. For our Nation is commissioned by history to be either an observer of freedom's failure or the cause of its success. Our overriding obligation in the months ahead is to fulfill the world's hopes by fulfilling our own faith.

I. STRENGTHENING THE ECONOMY

That task must begin at home. For if we cannot fulfill our own ideals here, we cannot expect others to accept them. And when the youngest child alive today has grown to the cares of manhood, our position in the world will be determined first of all by what provisions we make today—for his education, his health, and his opportunities for a good home—and a good job—and a good life.

At home, we began the year in the valley of recession—we completed it on the high road of recovery and growth. [Applause.] With the help of new congressionally approved or administratively increased stimulants to our economy, the number of major surplus labor areas has declined from 101 to 60; non-agricultural employment has increased by more than a million jobs; and the

average factory workweek has risen to well over 40 hours. At year's end the economy which Mr. Khrushchev once called a stumbling horse was racing to new records in consumer spending, labor income, and industrial production. [Applause.]

We are gratified—but we are not satisfied. Too many unemployed are still looking for the blessings of prosperity. As those who leave our schools and farms demand new jobs, automation takes old jobs away. To expand our growth and job opportunities, I urge on the Congress three measures:

(1) First, the Manpower Training and Development Act, to stop the waste of able-bodied men and women who want to work, but whose only skill has been replaced by a machine, or moved with a mill, or shut down with a mine;

(2) Second, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, to help train and place not only the 1 million young Americans who are both out of school and out of work, but the 26 million young Americans entering the labor market in this decade; and

(3) Third, the 8-percent tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment, which, combined with planned revisions of depreciation allowances, will spur our modernization, our growth, and our ability to compete abroad.

Moreover—pleasant as it may be to bask in the warmth of recovery—let us not forget that we have suffered three recessions in the last 7 years. The time to repair the roof is when the sun is shining—by filling three basic gaps in our antirecession protection. We need:

(1) First, Presidential standby authority, subject to congressional veto, to adjust personal income tax rates downward within a specified range and time, to slow down an economic decline before it has dragged us all down.

(2) Second, Presidential standby authority, upon a given rise in the rate of unemployment, to accelerate Federal and federally aided capital improvement programs; and

(3) Third, a permanent strengthening of our unemployment compensation system—to maintain for our fellow citizens searching for a job and cannot find it, their purchasing power and their living standards without constant resort—as we have seen in recent years by Congress and the administrations—to temporary supplements.

If we enact this six-part program, we can show the whole world that a free economy need not be an unstable economy—that a free system need not leave men unemployed—and that a free society is not only the most productive but the most stable form of organization yet fashioned by man. [Applause.]

II. FIGHTING INFLATION

But recession is only one enemy of a free economy—inflation is another. Last year, 1961, despite rising production and demand, consumer prices held almost steady—and wholesale prices declined. This is the best record of overall price stability of any comparable period of recovery since the end of World War II.

Inflation too often follows in the shadow of growth—while price stability is

made easy by stagnation or controls. But we mean to maintain both stability and growth in a climate of freedom.

Our first line of defense against inflation is the good sense and public spirit of business and labor—keeping their total increases in wages and profits in step with productivity. There is no single statistical test to guide each company and each union. But I strongly urge them—for their country's interest, and for their own—to apply the test of the public interest to these transactions.

Within this same framework of growth and wage-price stability:

This administration has helped keep our economy competitive by widening the access of small business to credit and Government contracts, and by stepping up the drive against monopoly, price fixing, and racketeering.

We will submit a Federal pay reform bill aimed at giving our classified, postal, and other employees new pay scales more comparable to those of private industry.

We are holding the fiscal 1962 budget deficit far below the level incurred after the last recession in 1958; and, finally, I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget. [Applause.]

This is a joint responsibility, requiring congressional cooperation on appropriations, and on three sources of income in particular:

(1) First, an increase in postal rates, to end the postal deficit;

(2) Second, passage of the tax reforms previously urged, to remove unwarranted tax preferences, and to apply to dividends and to interest the same withholding requirements we have long applied to wages; and

(3) Third, extension of the present excise and corporation tax rates, except for those changes—which will be recommended in a message—affecting transportation.

III. GETTING AMERICA MOVING

But a stronger Nation and economy require more than a balanced budget. They require progress in those programs that spur our growth and fortify our strength.

CITIES

A strong America depends on its cities—America's glory, and sometimes America's shame. To substitute sunlight for congestion and progress for decay, we have stepped up existing urban renewal and housing programs, and launched new ones—redoubled the attack on water pollution—speeded aid to airports, hospitals, highways, and our declining mass transit systems—and secured new weapons to combat organized crime, racketeering, and youth delinquency, assisted by the coordinated and hard-hitting efforts of our investigative services: The FBI, Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Narcotics, and many others. We shall need further anti-crime, mass transit, and transportation legislation—and new tools to fight air pollution. And with all this effort underway, both equity and commonsense require that our Nation's urban areas—containing three-fourths of our population—sit as equals at the Cabinet table. I urge a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. [Applause.]

AGRICULTURE AND RESOURCES

A strong America also depends on its farms and natural resources. American farmers took heart in 1961—from a billion-dollar rise in farm income—and from a hopeful start on reducing the farm surpluses. But we are still operating under a patchwork accumulation of old laws, which cost us \$1 billion a year in CCC carrying charges alone, yet fail to halt rural poverty or boost farm earnings.

Our task is to master and turn to fully fruitful ends the magnificent productivity of our farms and farmers. The revolution on our own countryside stands in the sharpest contrast to the repeated farm failures of the Communist nations, and is a source of pride to us all. Since 1950 our agricultural output per man-hour has actually doubled. Without new, realistic measures, it will someday swamp our farmers and our taxpayers in a national scandal or a farm depression.

I will, therefore, submit to the Congress a new comprehensive farm program—tailored to fit the use of our land and the supplies of each crop to the long-range needs of the sixties—and designed to prevent chaos in the sixties with a program of commonsense.

We also need for the sixties—if we are to bequeath our full national estate to our heirs—a new long-range conservation and recreation program—expansion of our superb national parks and forests—preservation of our authentic wilderness areas—new starts on water and power projects as our population steadily increases—and expanded REA generation and transmission loans.

CIVIL RIGHTS

But America stands for progress in human rights as well as economic affairs, and a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color. This administration has shown as never before how much could be done through the full use of Executive powers—through the enforcement of laws already passed by the Congress—through persuasion, negotiation, and litigation, to secure the constitutional rights of all: the right to vote, the right to travel without hindrance across State lines, and the right to free public education.

I issued last March a comprehensive order to guarantee the right to equal employment opportunity in all Federal agencies and contractors. The Vice President's committee thus created has done much, including the voluntary plans for progress which, in all sections of the country, are achieving a quiet but striking success in opening up to all races new professional, supervisory, and other job opportunities. [Applause.]

But there is much more to be done—by the Executive, by the courts, and by the Congress. Among the bills now pending before you, on which the executive departments will comment in detail, are appropriate methods of strengthening these basic rights which have our full support. The right to vote, for example, should no longer be denied through such arbitrary devices on a local level, sometimes abused, such as literacy tests and poll taxes. As we approach the 100th

anniversary next January, of the Emancipation Proclamation, let the acts of every branch of the Government—and every citizen—portray that “righteousness does exalt a nation.”

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Finally, a strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens—the welfare of the needy, the health care of the elderly, the education of the young. For we are not developing the Nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends. All our material riches will avail us little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people.

Last year, we improved the diet of needy people—provided more hot lunches and fresh milk to schoolchildren—built more college dormitories—and, for the elderly, expanded private housing, nursing homes, health services, and social security. But we have just begun.

To help those least fortunate of all, I am recommending a new public welfare program, stressing services instead of support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency.

To relieve the critical shortage of doctors and dentists—and this is a matter which concerns us all—and expand research, I urge action to aid medical and dental colleges and scholarships and to establish new National Institutes of Health.

To take advantage of modern vaccination achievements, I am proposing a mass immunization program, aimed at the virtual elimination of such ancient enemies of our children as polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. [Applause.]

To protect our consumers from the careless and the unscrupulous, I shall recommend improvements in the food and drug laws—strengthening inspection and standards, halting unsafe and worthless products, preventing misleading labels, and cracking down on the illicit sale of habit-forming drugs.

But in matters of health, no piece of unfinished business is more important or more urgent than the enactment under the social security system of health insurance for the aged. [Applause.]

For our older citizens have longer and more frequent illnesses, higher hospital and medical bills, and too little income to pay them. Private health insurance helps some—for its cost is high and its coverage limited. Public welfare cannot help those too proud to seek relief but hard pressed to pay their own bills. Nor can their children or grandchildren always sacrifice their own health budgets to meet this constant drain.

Social security has long helped to meet the hardships of retirement, death, and disability. I now urge that its coverage be extended without further delay to provide health insurance for the elderly. [Applause.]

EDUCATION

Equally important to our strength is the quality of our education. Eight million adult Americans are classified as functionally illiterate. This is a disturbing figure reflected in selective serv-

ice rejection rates, welfare rolls, and crime rates. And I shall recommend plans for a massive attack to end this adult illiteracy.

I shall also recommend bills to improve educational quality, to stimulate the arts, and, at the college level, to provide Federal loans for the construction of academic facilities and federally financed scholarships.

If this Nation is to grow in wisdom and strength, then every able high school graduate should have the opportunity to develop his talents. Yet nearly half lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college. Enrollments are going to double in our colleges in the short space of 10 years. The annual cost per student is skyrocketing to astronomical levels—now averaging \$1,650 a year, although almost half of our families earn less than \$5,000. They cannot afford such costs—but this Nation cannot afford to maintain its military power and neglect its brainpower. [Applause.]

But excellence in education must begin at the elementary level. I sent to the Congress last year a proposal for Federal aid to public school construction and teachers' salaries. I believe that bill, which passed the Senate and received House committee approval, offered the minimum amount required by our needs and—in terms of across-the-board aid—the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. I, therefore, see no reason to weaken or withdraw that bill; and I urge its passage at this session.

“Civilization,” said H. G. Wells, “is a race between education and catastrophe.” It is up to you in this Congress to determine the winner of that race.

These are not unrelated measures addressed to specific gaps or grievances in our national life. They are the pattern of our intentions and the foundation of our hopes.

“I believe in democracy,” said Woodrow Wilson, “because it releases the energy of every human being.” The dynamic of democracy is the power and the purpose of the individual; and the policy of this administration is to give to the individual the opportunity to realize his own highest possibilities.

Our program is to open to all the opportunity for steady and productive employment, to remove from all the handicap of arbitrary or irrational exclusion, to offer to all the facilities for education, and health, and welfare, to make society the servant of the individual and the individual the source of progress, and thus to realize for all the full promise of American life. [Applause.]

IV. OUR GOALS ABROAD

All of these efforts at home give meaning to our efforts abroad. Since the close of the Second World War, a global civil war has divided and tormented mankind. But it is not our military might, or our higher standard of living, that has most distinguished us from our adversaries. It is our belief that the state is the servant of the citizen and not his master. [Applause.]

This basic clash of ideas and wills is but one of the forces reshaping our globe—swept as it is by the tides of hope

and fear, by crises in the headlines today that become mere footnotes tomorrow. Both the successes and the setbacks of the past year remain on our agenda of unfinished business. For every apparent blessing contains the seeds of danger—every area of trouble gives out a ray of hope—and the one unchangeable certainty is that nothing is certain or unchangeable.

Yet our basic goal remains the same: a peaceful world community of free and independent states—free to choose their own future and their own system, so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others. [Applause.]

Some may choose forms and ways that we would not choose for ourselves—but it is not for us that they are choosing. We can welcome diversity—the Communist cannot. For we offer a world of choice—they offer the world of coercion. And the way of the past shows clearly enough that freedom, not coercion, is the wave of the future. At times our goal has been obscured by crisis or endangered by conflict—but it draws sustenance from five basic sources of strength: The moral and physical strength of the United States; the united strength of the Atlantic Community; the regional strength of our hemispheric relations; the creative strength of our efforts in the new and developing nations; and the peacekeeping strength of the United Nations.

V. OUR MILITARY STRENGTH

Our moral and physical strength begins at home as already discussed. But it includes our military strength as well. So long as fanaticism and fear brood over the affairs of men, we must arm to deter others from aggression.

In the past 12 months our military posture has steadily improved. We increased the previous defense budget by 15 percent—not in the expectation of war but for the preservation of peace. We more than doubled our acquisition rate of Polaris submarines—we doubled the production capacity for Minuteman missiles—and increased by 50 percent the number of manned bombers standing ready on 15-minute alert. This year the combined force levels planned under our new defense budget—including nearly 300 additional Polaris and Minuteman missiles—have been precisely calculated to insure the continuing strength of our nuclear deterrent.

But our strength may be tested at many levels. We intend to have at all times the capacity to resist nonnuclear or limited attacks—as a complement to our nuclear capacity, not as a substitute. We have rejected any all-or-nothing posture which would leave no choice but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. [Applause.]

Thus we have doubled the number of ready combat divisions in the Army's strategic reserve—increased our troops in Europe—built up the Marines—added a new sealift and airlift capacity—modernized our weapons and ammunition—expanded our antiguerrilla forces—and increased the active fleet by more than 70 vessels and our tactical air forces by nearly a dozen wings.

CVIII—5

Because we needed to reach this higher long-term level of readiness more quickly, 155,000 members of the Reserve and National Guard were activated under the act of this Congress. Some disruptions and distress were inevitable. But the overwhelming majority bear their burdens—and their Nation's burdens—with admirable and traditional devotion. [Applause.]

In the coming year, our reserve programs will be revised—two Army divisions will, I hope, replace those Guard divisions on duty—and substantial other increases will boost our Air Force fighter units, the procurement of equipment, and our continental defense and warning efforts. The Nation's first serious civil defense shelter program is underway, identifying, marking, and stocking 50 million spaces; and I urge your approval of Federal incentives for the construction of public fallout shelters in schools and hospitals and similar centers.

VI. THE UNITED NATIONS

But arms alone are not enough to keep the peace—it must be kept by men. Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. For the troubles of a world organization merely reflect the troubles of the world itself. And if the organization is weakened, these troubles can only increase. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority. But as an institution, it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America. [Applause.]

In 1961, the peacekeeping strength of the United Nations was reinforced. And those who preferred or predicted its demise, envisioning a troika in the seat of Hammarskjöld—or Red China inside the Assembly—have seen instead a new vigor, under a new Secretary General and a fully independent Secretariat. In making plans for a new forum and principles on disarmament—for peacekeeping in outer space—for a decade of development effort—the U.N. fulfilled its charter's lofty aims. [Applause.]

Eighteen months ago the tangled, turbulent Congo presented the U.N. with its gravest challenge. The prospect was one of chaos—or certain big-power confrontation, with all its hazards and all of its risks, to us and to others. Today the hopes have improved for peaceful conciliation within a united Congo. This is the objective of our policy in this important area.

No policeman is universally popular—particularly when he uses his stick to restore law and order on his beat. Those members who are willing to contribute their votes and their views—but very little else—have created a serious deficit by refusing to pay their share of special U.N. assessments. Yet they do pay their annual assessments to retain their votes—and a new U.N. bond issue, financing special operations for the next 18 months, is to be repaid with interest from these regular assessments. This is

clearly in our interest. It will not only keep the U.N. solvent, but require all voting members to pay their fair share of its activities. Our share of special operations has long been much higher than our share of the annual assessment—and the bond issue will in effect reduce our disproportionate obligation, and for these reasons, I am urging Congress to approve our participation. [Applause.]

With the approval of this Congress, we have undertaken in the past year a great new effort in outer space. Our aim is not simply to be the first on the moon, any more than Charles Lindbergh's real aim was to be the first to Paris. His aim was to develop the techniques of our own country and other countries in the field of air and the atmosphere, and our objective in making this effort, which we hope will place one of our citizens on the moon, is to develop in a new frontier of science, commerce, and cooperation, the position of the United States and the free world. [Applause.]

This Nation belongs among the first to explore it, and among the first, if not the first, we shall be. [Applause.] We are offering our know-how and our cooperation to the U.N. Our satellites will soon be providing other nations with improved weather observations. And I shall soon send to the Congress a measure to govern the financing and operation of an international communications satellite system, in a manner consistent with the public interest and our foreign policy.

But peace in space will help us naught once peace on earth is gone. World order will be secured only when the whole world has laid down these weapons which seem to offer present security but threaten the future survival of the human race. That armistice day seems very far away. The vast resources of this planet are being devoted more and more to the means of destroying, instead of enriching, human life.

But the world was not meant to be a prison in which man awaits his execution. Nor has mankind survived the tests and trials of thousands of years to surrender everything—including its existence—now. This Nation has the will and the faith to make a supreme effort to break the logjam on disarmament and nuclear tests—and we will persist until we prevail, until the rule of law has replaced the ever dangerous use of force. [Applause.]

VII. LATIN AMERICA

I turn now to a prospect of great promise: our hemispheric relations. The Alliance for Progress is being rapidly transformed from proposal to program. Last month in Latin America I saw for myself the quickening of hope, the revival of confidence, and the new trust in our country—among workers and farmers as well as diplomats. We have pledged our help in speeding their economic, educational, and social progress. The Latin American Republics have in turn pledged a new and strenuous effort of self-help and self-reform.

To support this historic undertaking, I am proposing—under the authority contained in the bills of the last session of the Congress—a special long-term

Alliance for Progress fund of \$3 billion. Combined with our Food for Peace, Export-Import Bank, and other resources, this will provide more than \$1 billion a year in new support for the Alliance. In addition, we have increased twelvefold our Spanish and Portuguese-language broadcasting in Latin America, and improved hemispheric trade and defense. And while the blight of communism has been increasingly exposed and isolated in the Americas, liberty has scored a gain. The people of the Dominican Republic, with our firm encouragement and help, and those of our sister Republics of this hemisphere, are safely passing the treacherous course from dictatorship through disorder towards democracy. [Applause.]

VIII. THE NEW AND DEVELOPING NATIONS

Our efforts to help other new or developing nations, and to strengthen their stand for freedom, have also made progress. A newly unified Agency for International Development is reorienting our foreign assistance to emphasize long-term development loans instead of grants, more economic aid instead of military, individual plans to meet the individual needs of the nations, and new standards on what they must do to marshal their own resources.

A newly conceived Peace Corps is winning friends and helping people in 14 countries—supplying trained and dedicated young men and women, to give these new nations a hand in building a society, and a glimpse of the best that is in our country. If there be a problem here, it is that we cannot supply the spontaneous and mounting demand.

A newly expanded food for peace program is feeding the hungry of many lands with the abundance of our productive farms—providing lunches for children in school, wages for economic development, relief for the victims of flood and famine, and a better diet for millions whose daily bread is their chief concern.

These programs help people; and, by helping people, they help freedom. The views of their governments may sometimes be very different from ours—but events in Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe teach us never to write off any nation as lost to the Communists. That is the lesson of our time. We support the independence of those newer or weaker states whose history, geography, economy, or lack of power impels them to remain outside “entangling alliances”—as we did for more than a century. For the independence of nations is a bar to the Communists’ “grand design”—it is the basis of our own. [Applause.]

In the past year, for example, we have urged a neutral and independent Laos—regained there a common policy with our major allies—and insisted that a cease fire precede negotiations. While a workable formula for supervising its independence is still to be achieved, both the spread of war—which might have involved this country also—and a Communist occupation have thus far been prevented.

A satisfactory settlement in Laos would also help to achieve and safeguard the peace in Vietnam—where the foe is increasing his tactics of terror—where our own efforts have been stepped up—and where the local government has initiated new programs and reforms to broaden the base of resistance. The systematic aggression now bleeding that country is not a “war of liberation”—for Vietnam is already free. It is a war of attempted subjugation—and it will be resisted.

IX. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Finally, the united strength of the Atlantic Community has flourished in the last year under severe tests. NATO has increased both the number and the readiness of its air, ground, and naval units—both its nuclear and nonnuclear capabilities. Even greater efforts by all its members are still required. Nevertheless our unity of purpose and will has been, I believe, immeasurably strengthened.

The threat to the brave city of Berlin remains. In these last 6 months the allies have made it unmistakably clear that our presence in Berlin, our free access thereto, and the freedom of 2 million West Berliners would not be surrendered either to force or through appeasement—that to maintain those rights and obligations, we are prepared to talk, when appropriate, and to fight, if necessary. [Applause.] Every member of NATO stands with us in a common commitment to preserve this symbol of freeman’s will to remain free.

I cannot now predict the course of future negotiations over Berlin. I can only say that we are sparing no honorable effort to find a peaceful and mutually acceptable resolution of this problem. I believe such a resolution can be found, and with it an improvement in our relations with the Soviet Union, if only the leaders in the Kremlin will recognize the basic rights and interests involved, and the interest of all mankind in peace.

But the Atlantic Community is no longer concerned with purely military aims. As its common undertakings grow at an ever-increasing pace, we are, and increasingly will be, partners in aid, trade, defense, diplomacy, and monetary affairs.

The emergence of the new Europe is being matched by the emergence of new ties across the Atlantic. It is a matter of undramatic daily cooperation in hundreds of workaday tasks: of currencies kept in effective relation, of development loans meshed together, of standardized weapons, and concerted diplomatic positions. The Atlantic Community grows, not like a volcanic mountain, by one mighty explosion, but like a coral reef, from the accumulating activity of all.

Thus, we in the free world are moving steadily toward unity and cooperation, in the teeth of that old Bolshevik prophecy, and at the very time when extraordinary rumbles of discord can be heard across the Iron Curtain. It is not free societies which bear within them the seeds of inevitable disunity. [Applause.]

X. OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

On one special problem, of great concern to our friends, and to us, I am proud to give the Congress an encouraging report. Our efforts to safeguard the dollar are progressing. In the 11 months preceding last February 1, we suffered a net loss of nearly \$2 billion in gold. In the 11 months that followed, the loss was just over half a billion dollars. And our deficit in our basic transactions with the rest of the world—trade, defense, foreign aid, and capital, excluding volatile short-term flows—has been reduced from \$2 billion for 1960 to about one-third that amount for 1961. Speculative fever against the dollar is ending—and confidence in the dollar has been restored.

We did not—and could not—achieve these gains through import restrictions, troop withdrawals, exchange controls, dollar devaluation, or choking off domestic recovery. We acted not in panic but in perspective. But the problem is not yet solved. Persistently large deficits would endanger our economic growth and our military and defense commitments abroad. Our goal must be a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments. With the cooperation of the Congress, business, labor and our major allies, that goal can be reached. [Applause.]

We shall continue to attract foreign tourists and investments to our shores, to seek increased military purchases here by our allies, to maximize foreign aid procurement from American firms, to urge increased aid from other fortunate nations to the less fortunate, to seek tax laws which do not favor investment in other industrialized nations or tax havens, and to urge coordination of allied fiscal and monetary policies so as to discourage large and disturbing capital movements.

TRADE

Above all, if we are to pay for our commitments abroad, we must expand our exports. Our businessmen must be export conscious and export competitive. Our tax policies must spur modernization of our plants—our wage and price gains must be consistent with productivity to hold the line on prices—our export credit and promotion campaigns for American industries must continue to expand.

But the greatest challenge of all is posed by the growth of the European Common Market. Assuming the accession of the United Kingdom, there will arise across the Atlantic a trading partner behind a single external tariff similar to ours with an economy which nearly equals our own. Will we in this country adapt our thinking to these new prospects and patterns—or will we wait until events have passed us by?

This is the year to decide. The Reciprocal Trade Act is expiring. We need a new law—a wholly new approach—a bold new instrument of American trade policy. Our decision could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war, and the economic growth of our Nation for a generation to come.

If we move decisively, our factories and farms can increase their sales to their richest, fastest growing market.

Our exports will increase. Our balance-of-payments position will improve. And we will have forged across the Atlantic a trading partnership with vast resources for freedom.

If, on the other hand, we hang back in deference to local economic pressures, we will find ourselves cut off from our major allies. Industries—and I believe this is most vital—industries will move their plants and jobs and capital inside the walls of the Common Market, and jobs, therefore, will be lost here in the United States, if they cannot otherwise compete for its consumers.

Our farm surpluses will pile up, and our balance of trade, as you all know, to Europe, Common Market, in farm products, is nearly 3 or 4 to 1 in our favor, amounting to one of the best earners of dollars in our balance-of-payments structure, and without entrance to this market, without the ability to enter it, our farm surpluses will pile up in the Middle West, tobacco in the South, and other commodities, which have gone through Western Europe for 15 years.

Our balance-of-payments position will worsen. Our consumers will lack a wider choice of goods at lower prices. And millions of American workers—whose jobs depend on the sale or the transportation or the distribution of exports or imports, or whose jobs will be endangered by the movement of our capital to Europe, or whose jobs can be maintained only in an expanding economy—these millions of workers in your home States and mine will see their real interests sacrificed.

Members of the Congress: The United States did not rise to greatness by waiting for others to lead. This Nation is the world's foremost manufacturer, farmer, banker, consumer, and exporter. The Common Market is moving ahead at an economic growth rate twice ours. The Communist economic offensive is underway. The opportunity is ours—the initiative is up to us—and I believe that 1962 is the time.

To seize that initiative, I shall shortly send to the Congress a new 5-year trade expansion action, far reaching in scope but designed with great care to make certain that its benefits to our people far outweigh any risks. The bill will permit the gradual elimination of tariffs here in the United States and in the Common Market on those items in which we together supply 80 percent of the world's trade—mostly items in which our own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that we sell abroad, in these items, substantially more than we import. This step will make it possible for our major industries to compete with their counterparts in Western Europe for access to European consumers.

On the other hand, the bill will permit a gradual reduction of duties up to 50 percent—permit bargaining by major categories—and provide for appropriate and tested forms of assistance to firms and employees adjusting to import competition. We are not neglecting the safeguards provided by peril points, an escape clause, or the national security amendment. Nor are we abandoning

our non-European friends or our traditional most-favored-nation principle. On the contrary, the bill will provide new encouragement for their sale of tropical agricultural products, so important to our friends in Latin America, who have long depended upon the European Common Market who now find themselves faced with new challenges which we must join with them in overcoming.

Concessions, in this bargaining, must of course be reciprocal, not unilateral. The Common Market will not fulfill its own high promise unless its outside tariff walls are low. The dangers of restriction or timidity in our own policy have counterparts for our friends in Europe. For together we face a common challenge: to enlarge the prosperity of freemen everywhere—and to build in partnership a new trading community in which all free nations may gain from the productive energy of free competitive effort.

These various elements in our foreign policy lead, as I have said, to a single goal—the goal of a peaceful world of free and independent states. This is our guide for the present and our vision for the future—a free community of nations, independent but interdependent, uniting north and south, east and west, in one great family of man, outgrowing and transcending the hates and fears that rend our age.

We will not reach that goal today, or tomorrow. We may not reach it in our own lifetime. But the quest is the greatest adventure of our century. We sometimes chafe at the burden of our obligations, the complexity of our decisions, the agony of our choices. But there is no comfort or security for us in evasion, no solution in abdication, no relief in irresponsibility.

A year ago, in assuming the tasks of the Presidency, I said that few generations, in all history, had been granted the role of being the great defender of freedom in its hour of maximum danger. This is our good fortune; and I welcome it now as I did a year ago. [Applause.] For it is the fate of this generation—of you in the Congress and of me as President—to live with a struggle we did not start, in a world we did not make. But the pressures of life are not always distributed by choice. And while no nation has ever faced such a challenge, no nation has ever been so ready to seize the burden and glory of freedom. And in this high endeavor may God watch over the United States of America.

At 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the President accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their chamber.

REFERRAL OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 8890. I am making this request in order that the portion of the report which shows the changes in existing law will conform to the present "Rameyer Rule"—rule XIII, clause 3—which has been amended by the House since the original report on this bill was filed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without making the matter a precedent, that all Members today may extend their remarks in the Record and include pertinent, extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not expected that today there may be extensions in the body of the Record? Permission has been granted for extensions in the

RECORD, but is permission granted to extend in the body of the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Yes; by unanimous consent.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for the acquisition of a parcel of real property located at 641 Delaware Avenue, in Buffalo, N.Y., by the U.S. Government. This is known as the Ansley Wilcox House which became famous in 1901 when, in the library of this home, Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States following the assassination of President William McKinley.

It is one of only four sites, outside of Washington, D.C., where the presidential oath has been administered. At the time Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in as President, the house was the residence of Ansley Wilcox, who was a civic leader of great prominence. It was built in the 1830's as the major's house of the old Poinsett Barracks, and is typical of post-colonial architecture.

The American Institute of Architects has recommended its preservation. National, State, and local organizations, supporting the movement for preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House, are: Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, National Trust for Historic Preservation, American Institute of Architects, New York State Historical Association, American Association for State and Local History, Frederick M. Houghton Chapter of the New York State Archaeological Association, Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs, Sons of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Daughters of the American Revolution, Society of Colonial Wars, Mayflower Society, Daughters of American Colonists, Society of New England Women, Society of Colonial Dames.

It is estimated that the cost of acquiring this historical site would be approximately \$400,000. Renovation would cost approximately \$50,000. Adequate parking space is available on the grounds.

In view of the historical significance of the Ansley Wilcox House, I strongly urge the Congress to take speedy action on this proposal while it is still available for preservation as a national shrine.

WHEAT ACREAGE

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced bill H.R. 9501.

This legislation is urgently needed in areas such as I represent where considerable wheat acreage will be removed from production. In brief, the bill would permit farmers to plant barley on the land taken out of wheat production, and make barley interchangeable with other feed grains.

Barley is one of the few crops which can be planted on the idled acres, most of which under the farming practices used in western Kansas have been in summer fallow. Yet, under the law farmers cannot plant barley on the land unless they have a barley acreage allotment.

Unless this summer fallow land is covered, preferably by a growing crop, it will be threatened by serious wind erosion. This land could be severely damaged.

To solve the problem, I have proposed that farmers be permitted to plant barley, whether they have an allotment or not, provided they take the same number of acres out of grain sorghum or feed grain production. This will maintain total acres in feed grains at the level provided under the feed grain program. It will permit farmers to follow sound conservation practices without any interruption to any program.

This particular provision was included in the omnibus farm bill passed by the House last year. Unfortunately, it was not included in the Senate bill, nor was it included in the conference report. Corrective measures cannot be taken by administrative action. Legislation is the only possible way of correcting what could be a very bad situation.

I hope the bill will receive early attention by the House Agriculture Committee. I do not believe it will be controversial.

For the information of Members interested in this problem, I am including the text of the bill in my remarks at this point:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end of paragraph (1): "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a producer shall be deemed to have participated in the feed grain program for corn, grain sorghum, and barley, if the sum of the acreages of corn, grain sorghum, and barley, excepting malting barley, on the farm in 1962 does not exceed 80 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to these three crops, excepting malting barley, in the crop years 1959 and 1960."

THE MIGRANT FARM LABOR STORY—I AND II

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring once again to the attention of my colleagues in this House the plight of some 200,000 working Amer-

icans and their families who are now living in the kind of squalor and poverty that made men shudder more than 100 years ago.

I refer to the migrant farmworkers of this country, who have until only recently been generally ignored by the public, the press, and, I feel, the Congress of the United States.

Many thousands of these workers are living today in the conditions which I have described, able to find work on only about 130 days of each year, often earning only around 50 cents per hour and too often forced to take their undernourished children into the fields so that the family can survive.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to see action taken this year by this body on the five bills which were passed in the other body during the first session as a first step in assisting this neglected segment of our population. The bills were forcefully managed in the other body by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS. I have introduced the same five bills in the House—H.R. 8879, H.R. 8880, H.R. 8881, H.R. 8882 and H.R. 8883.

Four of these bills deal with the present shocking situation. The fifth would establish a 15-member National Advisory Council on Migrant Labor representing farmers, migratory workers, health and welfare groups, and State officials.

The four action and regulatory bills speak for themselves:

The first bill generally prohibits employing children under 18. There is now no limit on the age or hours of children working in agriculture outside of school hours. Even 6- and 7-year-old youngsters work in the fields from dawn to darkness.

The second bill provides educational opportunities for the 150,000 children who follow the crops and average 2 or 3 years behind in their schooling. The bill would set up a 5-year program of Federal assistance to States and localities, including grants for summer schools.

The third bill provides a system of registering the often unscrupulous 8,000 crew leaders who recruit, transport, feed and house workers and contract out their labor.

The fourth action bill authorizes grants to public and nonprofit private agencies to establish health clinics. Migrants and their families now are less healthy than the general population. For instance, the infant mortality rate is twice that of the rest of the population, and few children are immunized against disease.

It seems hardly believable that the richest nation on earth would permit such conditions to exist for so long. In the nuclear age, when we are on our way to the moon, it is even less understandable that Congress can even hesitate before passing the migrant labor bills.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to include pertinent matter in the RECORD I include the first and second in a series of articles which were published last fall on this subject by the New York World-Telegram & Sun. The first of these articles was written by Robert H. Prall. The

second, and all of the other nine articles in the series were written by World-Telegram Staff Reporter Dale Wright, who lived with the migrant farmworkers off and on for a period of about 6 months. I hope to receive permission to insert in the RECORD, from time to time, the remaining articles of this series, which I commend highly to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York World-Telegram & Sun, Oct. 9, 1961]

W.-T. & S. TO BARE EXPLOITATION OF MIGRANT FARM LABORERS—REPORTER LIVED AS A WORKER IN FILTHY CAMPS

(By Robert H. Prall)

Four migrant farmworkers died yesterday when flames swept the hazardous, overcrowded wooden building in which they lived, near the potato fields of Cutchogue, Long Island.

Assistant Suffolk County District Attorney Theodore Jaffe, shocked by the "deplorable conditions" he found at the labor camp, is making a full investigation.

"Six people were living in space not adequate for a single person," he declared. "As one police officer said, it's legalized slavery."

REPORTER LIVED ROLE

The World-Telegram knows all about the squalor, the filth, and the dangers of life in a migrant labor camp. On and off for the past 6 months one of its staff writers has been working along the seaboard as a migrant laborer.

Staff Writer Dale Wright, using an assumed name, took on the job of a migrant field hand and lived with the overworked, underpaid, exploited laborers who harvest America's crops.

Starting in Florida, he worked his way north through the Carolinas to New Jersey and eventually to Long Island's lush potato fields. He lived in sordid shacks similar to—and even worse than—the quarters where the four migrants died yesterday in Cutchogue.

CHEATED, OVERCHARGED

He saw how migrant workers are cheated on their hours and their pay, overcharged on the items they buy, shunted from farm to farm in rattle-trap buses and trucks. He got to know the "labor contractor" who rounds up the migrant crews with promises of "good pay" and then exploits them at every turn. He learned how hundreds of migrants, at the end of a trail of broken promises, wind up on relief rolls at public expense.

He found youngsters 6 and 7 years old laboring in the fields alongside their parents. He talked with the gnarled, crippled older workers living out a hopeless existence.

Dale Wright's series of articles on America's "forgotten man," the migrant farm laborer, will start tomorrow in the World-Telegram. It is a shocking revelation that could be written only by a man who lived the part.

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE—I SAW HUMAN SHAME AS A MIGRANT WORKER

(Four migrant farmworkers died Sunday as fire swept their squalid living quarters in a Suffolk County labor camp, described by investigating authorities as shocking deplorable. The tragedy substantiates an on-the-spot survey by this paper. As long ago as last April the World-Telegram assigned Staff Writer Dale Wright to work as a migrant laborer to determine if protective laws are safeguarding the interests of America's "forgotten men." His articles revealing the abuses heaped on the overworked, underpaid, exploited migrant farm worker begin today.)

(By Dale Wright)

Despite certain limited improvements—on paper—in the laws protecting the migrant farm worker, he continues to be America's forgotten man—forced to work long, tortured hours, at substandard wages, cheated and exploited at every turn and compelled to live in filth and squalor and danger.

I know this because for 6 months, on and off from April to October, I worked as a migrant laborer along the Atlantic Seaboard from Florida to New York. I saw it with my eyes, I felt it in my blistered hands, I smelled it with my nose, and I rebelled at it in my conscience.

I labored with, slept with, ate with, and more than once suffered with the members of this vast army of men and women and children—most of them Negroes like myself—who stop and lift and grub from nature's earth a great part of the Nation's feed crop.

THINGS REPORTER FOUND

These are some of the things I found:

Many migrant workers are forced to work as many as 14 hours a day at a backbreaking task, the rewards of which are, in most cases, a string of broken promises.

They are grossly underpaid and, many times, not paid at all by conniving labor contractors who have them at their mercy.

They are cheated and exploited all along the line by profiteers in the roles of growers, shippers, packers, labor contractors, crew bosses, landlords and merchants.

Thousands of them live in shabby, unkempt hovels and shacks, usually hidden behind a clump of trees out of public view, without sanitary or plumbing facilities.

And, despite laws enacted to protect them, their children, starting at age 6, are worked long hours under a searing sun for less than the prevailing—or promised—pay.

HAZARDOUS VEHICLES

Under conditions inferior to those afforded cattle and freight, migrant laborers are transported from one work area to another in dilapidated, hazardous vehicles.

And at the end of the line, when all the crops are worked out, hundreds of the migrant workers wind up on relief at public expense in the Northern seaboard States.

The man who sits next to me in this newspaper office, Allan Keller, has done much to improve the lot of the migrant laborer. Mainly through his efforts and the campaigns by this newspaper over a period of years, a New York State legislative committee was named to look into the migrant labor problem and recommend changes in the laws.

Belatedly, teeth were put into regulations to provide better treatment for the migrant. The State Department of Health was empowered to license labor camps and require that minimum sanitary and health standards be maintained. Other States took steps—also on paper, to help and protect the forgotten man of America.

HAVEN'T HELPED MUCH

The changes in the laws haven't helped much. The miserable migrants, virtually without hope for a brighter tomorrow, are still hidden behind those clumps of trees.

At this moment, the migrant labor problem is being investigated anew by a subcommittee of the House Labor and Education Committee with a view toward drafting new remedial legislation.

It's another step in the long investigation of the stoop laborer, who has been studied, surveyed, microscoped, and diagnosed over the years as perhaps the sickest segment of the Nation's economy.

But I saw little improvement in the condition of the patient. The working and housing conditions were bad enough but it was the way he's cheated that outraged me.

He's overcharged for his squalid shack, his food, his clothing, his bottle of wine

at the end of a hard week of work. And he's gouged on just about every other item he purchases.

MEAGER BREAKFAST

I found workers in central New Jersey who were charged 75 cents for a breakfast of one chicken wing, a spoonful of watery rice and a slice of bread. An extra slice cost them 10 cents more.

In the Long Island potato belt, where the four migrant workers perished in flames Sunday, I found a large crew of men and women being charged by a labor contractor with \$1 weekly dues to a union which didn't exist. They also were being charged another \$1.40 for social security, far out of proportion to the paltry pay they had received.

In many cases, I discovered, workers forced to pay for social security had no SS numbers at all, the payments obviously going wholly to profiteers operating at their labor camp.

In Hastings, Fla., the heart of the State's potato belt, I bunked for 2 days in a near-collapsed, insect-infested shanty for which I was compelled to pay \$1.50 a night. Next door in an even more dilapidated hovel lived a married couple whose 2-month-old baby had been born there. They paid \$10 a week.

WAILING INFANT

The infant wailed endlessly from dawn to darkness in its makeshift crib, a cardboard cabbage carton, as flies and potato bugs crawled in and out of its mouth and nostrils. A ragged burlap potato sack served as the baby's blanket.

But Florida has no corner on squalor. Near Hightstown, N.J., less than 20 miles from Trenton, the State capitol, I found seven men and women tomato pickers—none of them related—living in filth in a 10-foot square tarpaper shack for which they were charged \$10 a week for rent.

Everywhere I traveled I found the itinerant laborer getting a wretched deal. And being inarticulate and always on the move, he is least able among America's workmen to have his cries heard.

WORLD WAR I PENSIONS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the following editorial which appeared in the National Tribune on January 4, 1962:

WORLD WAR I PENSIONS

The 2d session of the 87th Congress convenes next Wednesday. Coming before the legislators will be a number of important but highly controversial issues. These include foreign aid, tariff revision, medical care for the aged, plugging tax loopholes, and the necessary endorsement of the Congress to build up our defense forces. Practically all of these except the last will face determined opposition from particular groups in the Congress.

It is our fervent hope that another most important piece of legislation will be reported for consideration by both the House and the Senate. We refer particularly to H.R. 3745, or some kindred bill which would grant some form of liberalized pension for the men who fought the First World War.

Many Members of Congress have been most frank in admitting that if this legislation can be reported to the House of Representatives it will be passed with few dissenting votes. It is also believed that there

are a sufficient number of Senators who feel that something should be done to aid the older veterans of World War I to insure passage in that body.

The measure which has been adopted as the official pension bill of the Veterans of World War I, Inc., is H.R. 3745, and there have been more than a score of similar bills introduced in the House of Representatives. This measure calls for a 30 percent increase in pension benefits which are applicable under part III of Veterans Regulations. Specifically, the rates at the present time are \$78.75 for a veteran at age 65 or who has been on the rolls for 10 or more years, and \$66.15 for those under age 65, and who are permanently and totally disabled and meet certain income limitations.

Under the provisions of the Pension Act of 1959 which became effective July 1, 1960, there are some changes in the above rates with a higher amount payable to the veteran whose income is in the very lowest bracket and to those who have a large number of dependents.

It will be recalled that hearings were held on H.R. 3745 and other World War I pension bills last summer. At that time over 50 Congressmen either appeared in person or submitted statements to the Veterans' Affairs Committee setting forth in no uncertain terms their support for the legislation under discussion.

Chairman OLIN TEAGUE of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has indicated that he will call his committee into session at some later date to take some action upon a non-service-connected pension measure. The chairman has stated that he would like to ascertain first the findings of committee investigators who have been canvassing a cross section of World War I veterans in order to ascertain just why they have not in large numbers elected to change over to the Pension Act of 1959 so that they could in some cases be entitled to greater benefits, ranging from 8 to 10 percent. It is known that Representative TEAGUE is concerned over the fact that comparatively few World War I veterans and their dependents have chosen to transfer to this latest piece of legislation affecting them.

All of the major veterans' organizations feel that there is a definite and distinct need to liberalize the Pension Act of 1959 and undoubtedly they will press for some remedial legislation early in the session.

The men who fought in World War I now average over 67 years of age. Thousands and thousands of them are dependent upon the most meager income. Unfortunately, a large majority of them have never had the opportunity to earn sufficient social security entitlement that would provide for them a most substantial form of income. These persons are in desperate need and if relief is to be given them in the form of pension legislation it must come quickly.

The present death rate of these veterans is over 130,000 per year and as time passes this rate will accelerate most rapidly.

It is our sincere wish and prayer that this session of Congress will take cognizance of the desperate position in which these men and their dependents now find themselves and take speedy action to provide them with some tangible pension benefits in recognition of their services to this Nation over 43 years ago.

LIMITED FEDERAL AID TO CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS IS CONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a thorough study of court decisions, and of 41 programs approved by Congress, reveals that Federal aid limited to the secular or neutral aspects of education in church-related schools is clearly constitutional.

The U.S. Catholic bishops' legal advisers, in their 82-page brief have done much to clear the air of misconception regarding the right of church-related and private schools to share in Federal aid to education.

The study addressed itself to this specific question: "May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the Nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational?" The answer, supported by U.S. Supreme Court decisions and by Federal legislation is: "Yes."

Church-related schools perform a public function by providing essential citizen education and that this public function is, by its nature, eligible for support.

So long as the Government contribution is directed toward those kinds of expenses which are substantially the same in public and nonpublic schools, Government will not be involved in the purposeful support of religion.

For the reassurance of those who want to be certain that such limited aid is constitutional, I recommend the reading of: "NCWC Legal Department Issues Study Of School Aid Precedents" which appeared in the December 16, 1961, issue of the Pilot, published under the auspices of the Catholic archdiocese of Boston. Under unanimous consent, I include this contribution to American understanding and cooperation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NCWC LEGAL DEPARTMENT ISSUES STUDY OF SCHOOL AID PRECEDENTS

WASHINGTON, December 14.—The U.S. Catholic bishops' legal advisers have concluded that Federal aid limited to the secular or neutral aspects of education in church-related schools would be clearly constitutional.

The Legal Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference says in an 82-page study that such aid has precedents in at least 41 programs approved by Congress.

It states that the U.S. Supreme Court has held in three decisions that government can aid the nonreligious aspects of a public service performed by a church-related institution.

The study says government support can be limited to the secular aspect by being directed toward neutral items of expense, those kinds of expenses "which are substantially the same in public and non-public schools."

Support, it declares, can be given in numerous ways, but the study specifically mentions matching grants or long-term loans to institutions, grants of tuition or scholarships to students, and tax benefits.

NOT A PETITION

Massive Federal aid to public education alone, it says would produce a "critical

weakening" of church-related education and result in a dangerous government monopoly in education.

William R. Considine, head of the NCWC Legal Department, announced the study at a press conference here (December 14).

He said the study is intended as a comprehensive constitutional statement and not as a petition for specific aid. "It is our hope that it will serve to clarify constitutional issues and to cause a more widespread recognition of the massive contribution of church-related and other private schools to the common welfare," he said.

The precise question taken up by the study is this:

May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational?

Answering in the affirmative, the study points to the public service contributions by church-related schools, to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, to Federal legislation and to the peril it sees in aiding public schools only.

It holds that church-related schools perform a public function by providing essential citizen education and that this public function is, by its nature, eligible for support.

PARENTAL RIGHTS

Asking how support for the secular aspect can be distinguished from support for the religious aspect of education in church-related schools, it says this can be done by an allocation of costs based on the principles of accounting, "as informed by the basic legal and educational principles applicable in this area."

To limit support, the study continues, it must be directed toward the neutral items of expense. "A corollary of this principle is that Government should not bear the complete cost of constructing and operating nonpublic schools," it says.

"So long as the Government contribution is directed toward the neutral expenditures, Government will not be involved in the purposeful support of religion," it adds.

The study also says that parent and child have a constitutional right, supported by U.S. Supreme Court decisions, to choose a church-related educational institution.

And, it states that Government has been denied power by the courts to impose upon the people a single educational system in which all must take part.

The study notes that 5.5 million students, around 13 percent of the national total, are in Catholic grade and high schools. It estimates that Catholic schools in 1960 saved taxpayers \$1,800 million in education costs.

Social, as well as economic, benefits come from Catholic schools, it continues. "Typically, the Catholic schools are a meeting place for children of different economic and ethnic backgrounds * * *. They have historically proven an invaluable training ground to prepare citizens for full participation in a pluralistic society."

COURT DECISIONS

Turning to a detailed review of constitutional issues, the study says that opponents of the aid to church-related education generally rely on the first amendment's phrase that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

But, the study says, history teaches that the so-called no-establishment clause was meant to keep Government from transgressing upon religious liberty and was not intended to prevent relationships—even certain cooperative relationships—between church and state.

There are three decisions of the Supreme Court, it reports, which bear directly upon

the inclusion of church-related institutions in governmental programs to carry out public welfare objectives.

"Not only do none of these decisions hold such aid-providing unconstitutional, they flatly affirm its constitutionality," says the study.

The first case, an 1899 one known as *Bradfield v. Roberts*, involved payment by the Congress to a Catholic hospital for treatment and cure of poor patients.

The Court held that the payment did not constitute an appropriation to a religious society in violation of the "no establishment" clause.

In the second case, the 1930 decision in *Cochran v. Board of Education*, the Court held that it was constitutional to use State funds to provide secular textbooks for all school students because this served a public purpose.

In the third, which is the famed case of *Everson v. Board of Education*, decided in 1947, the Court upheld a New Jersey statute which provided that, as part of a general transportation program for all students, reimbursement to parents might be made out of public funds for the transportation of their children to Catholic schools on buses regularly used in the public transportation system.

"The underlying principle of the case," says the study in reference to the *Everson* ruling, "is that government aid may be rendered to a citizen in furtherance of his obtaining basic citizen education, whether he obtains it in a public or a private, nonprofit school."

COURT COMMENT

Two other decisions are also cited. They are *McCullum v. Board of Education* and *Zorach v. Clauson*.

Both, says the study, concern released time religious education and not Federal aid, but they do contain Court comment on the controversial "no establishment" clause.

The 1947 *McCullum* decision, it notes, brought the phrase "wall of separation of church and state" into prominence, but the 1951 *Zorach* case made it clear that the phrase was not to be taken "in any absolute sense."

Two additional decisions "involving the all-important rights of free choice in selecting educational institutions" are cited. They are the 1923 ruling in *Meyer v. Nebraska* and the 1925 decision in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*.

In the *Meyer* case, the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of a Lutheran parochial schoolteacher charged with violating a State law making it a crime to teach in any elementary school any language other than English.

The court said the law violated the rights of the teacher, the parent and the child. "The court thus struck at a doctrine which is everywhere identified with totalitarian regimes and which is unhappily on the ascendant in the United States: the view that all educational rights are the possession of the State," the NCWC Legal Department study says.

In the *Pierce* case, the court expanded its rejection of statism in education, the department comments, and overthrew an Oregon law requiring parents to send their children only to public schools. Catholics, Protestants and Jews had risen in opposition to the law.

The high court held that the law denied parental and child rights freely to choose education in nonpublic, including church-related, schools.

LEGISLATION

In regard to legislative precedent, the NCWC study says: "No stronger answer is to be found to the argument that no aid may be afforded education in church-related

schools than the fact that the Congress has in numerous ways over the years deliberately provided such aid."

It notes that 41 such programs of aid have been reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. One program has resulted in 488 grants of land and buildings to religious-affiliated schools of 35 denominations, it reports.

The study then concentrates on possible loss to the Nation and to supporters of private schools by massive Federal aid programs limited to public schools.

Predicting the weakening of all church-related schools, and the closing of many, it adds that this would mean that parents would no longer as a practical matter possess their freedom to choose a school other than public.

"Moreover, a practical governmental monopoly on education would result," the study charges. "This would not only dangerously transform our free, pluralistic society, but would also pose the most serious problems respecting freedom of belief."

Freedom of belief is threatened, it says, because "values are inculcated in all schools, not only in those in whose curricula specific ethical or social concepts are advocated, but also in schools whose curricula distinctly omit such concepts."

The person whose conscience dictated choice of a church-related school would be coerced to participate in schooling whose orientation would be counter to his belief, the study says.

There are some questions the study expressly excluded from its scope. They are: the basic constitutionality of Federal aid to education; the constitutionality of Federal aid to education exclusively in public schools; and the constitutionality of Federal aid to religious instruction.

The study did not attempt to explore whether there exists a need for large-scale Federal aid to education.

Considine said that the analysis of the constitutional issues was prepared by William B. Ball, of Harrisburg, Pa., in cooperation with staff members of the NCWC Legal Department.

Ball is executive director and general counsel of the Pennsylvania Catholic Welfare Committee and a former professor of constitutional law at Villanova University, Philadelphia.

Other major contributors, Considine said, were George E. Reed, associate director of the NCWC Legal Department, and Father Charles M. Whelan, S.J., of the Georgetown University Law Center here.

Criticism and advice on the study, he added, came from numerous authorities, and professors of constitutional law, including Wilber G. Katz of the University of Chicago Law School; Paul G. Kauper, of the University of Michigan Law School; Dean Paul R. Dean and Chester J. Anteau of Georgetown University Law Center; and Arthur E. Sutherland and Mark DeWolfe Howe, of the Harvard Law School.

Although all of these authorities have on recent occasions taken the position that certain types of inclusion of church-related schools in Federal aid to education would be constitutional, none has specifically endorsed the position set forth in the study, Considine said.

Attached to the department's major study was an analysis of the memorandum submitted to Congress on March 28, 1961, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which discussed the first amendment and Federal aid to education.

The HEW study is accused of relying on sweeping generalizations in some of the majority and many of the dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court, instead of upon the exact rulings.

The Government memorandum held that across-the-board grants and loans to church-related elementary and secondary schools are unconstitutional, as are tuition payments for all pupils in these schools.

However, it held that loans for special purposes not closely related to religious instruction are probably constitutional and that inclusion of church-related colleges and universities in any Federal-aid program is constitutional.

The text of the legal department study is currently being distributed on a limited basis, Considine said. A more fully annotated edition will be published, together with the HEW memorandum, in the winter, 1961, edition of the Georgetown Law Journal.

RAY OF PEACE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the Women's National Press Club held its annual reception and dinner at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on Wednesday evening, January 10, 1962, the night of the opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The dinner is held annually by the Women's National Press Club for Members of Congress on the first night of the session. This year Walter Lippmann, the famed commentator, made an excellent address on the "Frustration of Our Time."

As I have read two excellent newspaper articles concerning this address, I am making part of my remarks the address contained in the Washington Post's issue of Thursday, January 11, 1962. I am also making part of my remarks an article concerning the dinner in the Washington Star's issue of January 11, 1962.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1962] LIPPMANN ON THE FRUSTRATION OF OUR TIME—BETWEEN WAR THAT CAN'T BE FOUGHT AND PEACE THAT CAN'T BE ACHIEVED—OUR SPLENDID TASK: UNITING OF WEST IN A PROGRESSIVE ECONOMIC FORCE

(The following address was delivered last night by Walter Lippmann, distinguished author and columnist, before the Women's National Press Club)

It is an honor, which I greatly appreciate, to be asked to speak on this occasion. It is also a personal kindness. For Congress is about to convene, and that means that there will be many speeches in the months to come. Experience has taught me that it is always a good idea to be able to speak early in the program. By the time Congress has adjourned next summer, adjourned in order to go out and make more speeches in the constituencies, your bright and eager faces may not be so bright and eager at the prospect of hearing yet another speech. I am happy to catch you while you are still in such robust good health.

When I sat down to prepare this talk, I considered and rejected the idea of delivering a kind of preliminary message on the state of the Union. I remembered that this will soon be done with much more authority by the husband of a former newspaper-woman. So I decided to talk to you tonight

about the state of our minds, the state of our nerves, and perhaps even about the state of our souls.

I am moved to do this by a letter I received just before Christmas. It was from a friend of mine who was a great hero in the First World War. He has been an extraordinarily successful man since then, and his letter began in this cheerful fashion. "My dear Walter: Another year of frustration, confusion, and compromise is about over."

I know that my friend is not alone in feeling this way and that during the coming session of Congress there will be many who will say what he says and feel as he does. At different times I suppose all of us share his feelings. There is indeed much frustration, much confusion, and—because we live on earth and not in Heaven—there is, of course, much compromise.

FRUSTRATIONS NOTHING NEW

I could have written back to my friend, reminding him that in every year of which there is any historical record, there has been much frustration and confusion and compromise. Anyone who thinks he can get away from frustration, confusion, and compromise in politics and diplomacy should make arrangements to get himself reborn into a different world than this one. Or if that is beyond his powers, he should move to some country where there are no newspapers to read.

However, it is certainly true that in our own time we are experiencing a very special frustration and confusion. There is, I believe, a reason for this. Certainly, if we knew the cause, we might feel better, even if we cannot do quickly something drastic to end the difficulty.

The age we are living in is radically new in human experience. During the past 15 years or so there has occurred a profound revolution in human affairs, and we are the first generation that has lived under these revolutionary new conditions. There has taken place a radical development in the art of war, and this is causing a revolutionary change in the foreign relations of all nations of the world. The radical development is, of course, the production of nuclear weapons.

As a scientific phenomenon the nuclear age began with the explosion at Los Alamos in 1945. But in world relations the nuclear age really began about 10 years later. For during the 1940's the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But by the middle fifties and in the years following, the Soviet Union has created an armory of nuclear weapons and has built rockets which have made it, for all practical purposes of diplomacy, a nuclear power equal with the United States.

The essential fact about the appearance of two opposed great powers armed with nuclear weapons is that war, which is an ancient habit of mankind, has become mutually destructive. Nuclear war is a way of mutual suicide. The modern weapons are not merely much bigger and more dangerous than any which existed before. They have introduced into the art of warfare a wholly new kind of violence.

Always in the past, war and the threat of war, whether it was aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments. They were usable instruments in the sense that nations could go to war for their national purposes. They could threaten war for diplomatic reasons. Nations could transform themselves from petty states to great powers by means of war. They could enlarge their territory, acquire profitable colonies, change the religion of a vanquished population, all by means of war. War was the instrument with which the social, political and legal systems of large areas were changed. Thus, in the old days before the nuclear age began, war was a usable—however horrible and expensive—instrument

of national purpose. The reason for that was that the old wars could be won.

In the prenuclear age, right down through the Second World War, the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. We did that with Germany and with Japan. The damage they had suffered, although it was great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany and Japan and the Soviet Union.

But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean 100 million dead, after the devastation of the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere and the contamination of the earth, the water and the air, there would be no such recovery as we have seen after the two World Wars of this century.

The damage done would be mutual. There would be no victor. As far in the future as we can see, the ruin would be irreparable. The United States has the nuclear power to reduce Soviet society to a smoldering ruin, leaving the wretched survivors shocked and starving and diseased. In an interchange of nuclear weapons, it is estimated coolly by experts who have studied it, the Soviet Union would kill between 30 and 70 million Americans.

A war of that kind would not be followed by reconstruction, it would not be followed by a Marshall plan, and by all the constructive things that were done after World War II. A nuclear war would be followed by a savage struggle for existence, as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would have to be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship, trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be. After he and Prime Minister Churchill had studied some of the results of the nuclear tests, President Eisenhower made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

AN IMPOSSIBLE INSTRUMENT

When President Eisenhower made that statement no one of us, I think, understood its full significance and consequences. We are now beginning to understand them, and here I venture to say is the root of the frustration and the confusion which torment us. For while nuclear weapons have made war, the old arbiter of human affairs, an impossible action for a rational statesman to contemplate, we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war.

It is enormously difficult to make peace. It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war about the fundamental issues.

That is where our contemporary frustration and confusion originate.

We are confronted with an extraordinarily tantalizing and nerve-racking dilemma.

For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be settled by a treaty that can be negotiated. There, I repeat, is the root of the frustration which our people feel. Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages. But the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts of the past; namely, organized war, has become an impossible instrument to use.

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy are the only two American Presidents who ever lived in a world like this one. It is a great puzzle to know how to defend the Nation's rights, and how to promote its interests in the nuclear age. There are no

clear guidelines of action because there are no precedents for the situation in which we find ourselves. And as statesmen grope their way from one improvisation and accommodation to another, there are masses of people who are frightened, irritated, impatient, frustrated, and in search of quick and easy solutions.

The nuclear age is only a few years old. But we have already learned one or two things about how to conduct policy in this age. It was once said of a British admiral in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the British Fleet and with it the whole war in an afternoon. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are in a similar position today. In a few days or so Mr. Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the promise of a Communist economy. He can lose all the work of all his 5-year plans, his 7-year plans, and his 20-year plans. In that same time, Mr. Kennedy can lose the Constitution of the United States, the free enterprise system and the American way of life and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I don't think I am exaggerating. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred in recorded history. We cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter, which has been going on since they met at Vienna last June, unless we remind ourselves again and again of what war has become in the nuclear age.

The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about. They do not know what has happened in the past 20 years. They belong to the past, and they have not been able to realize what the present is.

In this present, only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however lunatic it might be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond the tolerable limits, it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as is the megaton bomb, and it is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy. It is the central fact in the whole diplomatic problem of dealing with the cold war. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable. It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it.

Those who do not understand the nature of war in the nuclear age, those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement. It is not any of these things. It is not softness. It is sanity.

But it leaves us with a task: because we cannot make war, because we cannot achieve peace, we must find some other way of meeting the great issues which confront us. For life will go on, and if the answers of the past do not work, other answers must exist and must be found.

The answer lies, I believe, in the nature of the struggle between our Western society and the Communist society.

It is often said that the struggle which divides the world is for the minds and the souls of men. That is true. As long as there exists a balance of power and of terror, neither side can impose its doctrine and its

ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men, moreover, is not, I believe, going to be decided by propaganda. We are not going to convert our adversaries, and they are not going to convert us.

The struggle, furthermore, is not going to be ended in any foreseeable time. At bottom it is a competition between two societies and it resembles more than any other thing in our historical experience the long centuries of conflict between Christendom and Islam. The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes.

The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain, is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilization lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic Community. Will this community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do. I speak with some hope and confidence tonight. For I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society.

MAGNETIC ATTRACTION

I dare to believe that this powerful Western economic community will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union, and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent magnetic attraction upon Eastern Europe. This will happen if we approach it in the right way. Jean Monnet, who is the original founder of this movement, has put it the right way. "We cannot build our future," he has said, "if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other peoples, indeed for the Russians themselves."

At the same time the wealth and confidence of the new community will enable the Western society to assist and draw to it the societies of the southern hemisphere, where social and economic change is proceeding rapidly.

You will have seen that I do not agree with those who think that in order to defend ourselves and to survive we must put a stop to the progressive movement which has gone on throughout this century. This movement began in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its purpose was to reform and advance our own social order, and at the same time to recognize that we must live in the world beyond our frontiers. We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become stagnant, neurotic, frightened and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Is all this conservative? Is all this liberal? Is it all progressive? It is, I say, all of these. There is no irreconcilable contradiction among these noble words. Do not Repub-

licans believe in democracy, and do not Democrats believe in a republic? Such labels may describe political parties in England; they do not describe political attitudes in the United States.

Every truly civilized and enlightened American is conservative and liberal and progressive. A civilized American is conservative in that his deepest loyalty is to the Western heritage of ideas which originated on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Because of that loyalty he is the indefatigable defender of our own constitutional doctrine, which is that all power, that all government, that all officials, that all parties and all majorities are under the law—and that none of them is sovereign and omnipotent.

The civilized American is a liberal because the writing and the administration of the laws should be done with enlightenment and compassion, with tolerance and charity, and with affection.

And the civilized man is progressive because the times change and the social order evolves and new things are invented and changes occur. This conservative who is a liberal is a progressive because he must work and live, he must govern and debate in the world as it is in his own time, and as it is going to become.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 11, 1962]

LIPPMANN NOTES RAY OF PEACE

(By Frances Lide)

Columnist Walter Lippmann warned last night that nuclear war is an ever-present possibility even though "only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button" to start such a war.

"However lunatic it might be to commit suicide," he declared, "a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings."

"This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century," he told a capacity audience attending the Women's National Press Club's annual dinner honoring Members of Congress.

"It is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy."

"There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable."

"It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it."

The speaker noted that "those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement."

SANITY, INSTEAD

"But it is not softness," he asserted—"it is sanity."

"The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about," he said. "They belong to the past and they have not been able to realize what the present is."

Mr. Lippmann spoke before a VIP-studded gathering at the Mayflower Hotel which included Vice President JOHNSON, and a large contingent from the Cabinet and diplomatic circle as well as leaders of the Senate and House.

Noting that "the age we are living in is radically new in human experience," he declared that, to his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be when he made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

"The root of the frustration and confusion which torment us," he suggested is that "we

do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war."

"It is enormously difficult to make peace," he continued. "It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war."

"For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved."

"Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages."

TO AVERT WAR

"If nuclear war is to be averted in the struggle between the Western and Communist worlds," he declared, "the competition between the two societies will turn on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes."

"For Western civilization," he continued, "the future will depend on whether the nations of the Atlantic Community are able to work together to become a great and secure center of power and of wealth—of light and of leading."

Declaring that he spoke with "some hope and confidence," he added: "I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society."

Bonnie Angelo, president of the WNPC, presented guests at the head table, while the galaxy of VIP's in the audience were introduced by Helen Hill Miller and Nancy Hanschmann.

The newly elected House Speaker, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, attended the reception before the dinner and congressional leaders who took a bow from the head table included Representative CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, new majority leader of the House; Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, new Democratic whip, and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, new chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Newcomers to Congress who were honored included Senator MAURICE MURPHY, Republican of New Hampshire, and Representatives JOE WAGGONER of Louisiana, LUCIEN NEDZI of Michigan and HENRY GONZALEZ of Texas, all Democrats.

Mrs. Henry M. Jackson, bride of the Senator from Washington, also received a special introduction.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to accord the benefits of capital gains tax treatment to authors in the event of transfers of all rights to the artistic works that such authors have created. My bill will include transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions.

I have introduced this bill in the hopes that it will become part of a series of the legislative steps that must be taken to stimulate the growth and development of the arts in the United States. In the first session I introduced additional bills to repeal the crippling 10 percent admissions tax on live dramatic and musical performances and to create a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. These bills, in my judgment, constitute must legislation if we are to take affirmative action to safeguard and strengthen the living theater and the dramatic and musical arts in general which are among our foremost national assets.

The underlying question in any arts legislation is to what extent should the Government be concerned with the cultural well being of its citizens?

The place of the dramatic and musical arts in the United States has been that of a poor relation. The theater, music, and opera are finding it necessary to struggle harder each day in order to survive the tentacles of economic adversity. There is little or no opportunity for growth and the best that can be hoped for under present conditions is to maintain the status quo.

Under present law tax treatment for authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions is discriminatory. It is my conviction that an author should be accorded the benefits of capital gains tax treatment for his creations in the event he sells all his rights. This is a benefit given to the owner of a patent and if you examine the legislative history of the Internal Revenue Code you will discover no basis for favor of one group over the other. There are special provisions for the patent holder geared to induce and stimulate inventive activity. I believe that we should have comparable devices to stimulate literary, musical, and artistic compositions. Such legislation would serve an equally significant purpose with respect to the arts.

The strengthening of our cultural institutions will be of unquestionable assistance to all of us. What we need in the arts is expansion and experimentation. The poor relationship Government has had with the arts has merely compounded the downhill trend.

Enhancement of the arts must be cautious, yet vigorous. The environmental conditions surrounding the arts must be improved so that the arts can grow. My bill is another step toward that goal.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. LESINSKI for 2 hours on Tuesday, January 16, 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1526. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1527. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1528. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 16th Annual Report of the Federal Aviation Agency operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. Supplemental report. H.R. 8890. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to extend their expired provisions for an additional year and to authorize payments under Public Law 815 for school construction in school districts with severe classroom shortages, to extend for 1 year the student loan program of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1063, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9615. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 9616. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 9617. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9618. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9619. A bill to establish and prescribe the functions of a Department of Consumers, and to require the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, and to create a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9620. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Com-

munist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9621. A bill to provide (1) that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and (2) for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9622. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 9623. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish, construct, equip, operate, and maintain a fish hatchery in Clay County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 9624. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala., and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 9625. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit wheat grown in connection with vocational education in agriculture programs to be marketed without payment of penalty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9626. A bill to revise the definition of "retirement-straight line property"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9627. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 9628. A bill to amend section 312(4) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for a review of certain reports of the Chief of Engineers with a view to determining whether certain improvements of the Tangipahoa River are warranted; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 506. Resolution to designate, name, and identify the House Office Buildings as the Joseph Gurney Cannon, the James Knox Polk, and the Sam Rayburn Buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9629. A bill for the relief of Earl W. Self; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret E. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9631. A bill for the relief of Azizeh Abdallah Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9632. A bill for the relief of Richard Shao-lln Lee and his wife, Grace Fu-hwa

Tang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9633. A bill for the relief of Augustyna Trzuskot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9634. A bill for the relief of Ursula Barbara Kolodziej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9635. A bill for the relief of Faithy Isobel Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9636. A bill for the relief of Tom Hem (also known as Tom Him); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9637. A bill for the relief of Rito De Haro Saucedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1962

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

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

Eternal Spirit, in this hallowed moment we humbly bow with the solemn realization that no changes in sessions or in debates and decisions can alter the fact of facts that until we find Thee and art found of Thee, we begin at no beginning and come to no ending.

As this day in a scene upon which the eyes of the world, some hopeful, some hostile, are riveted with intensity of interest, the chosen leader of the Republic pictures to the assembled representatives of the people the state of the Union, help the legislators and the millions who will listen on the speaking air to examine each his own dedication or lack of it—to the strength of that Union in these days of its greatest test and peril.

Give us to know that each of us individually is a part of America, and that to the extent that in all our relationships we practice our democratic faith, we are a vital factor in the state of the Union. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, attended the session of the Senate today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 10, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; and that JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker, and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 402) that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Mr. ROOSEVELT, of California, to fill the vacancy thereon.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. John J. Riley, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Louis C. Rabaut, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the committee appointed on yesterday to wait upon the President and to inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, has performed its duty. The President has advised us that he desires to deliver a message on the state of the Union today, Thursday, January 11, at 12:30 p.m., before a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION TO RECEIVE COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 402) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two

Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the Members of the Senate will leave in a body at 12:10 for the Hall of the House of Representatives.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Public Law 719, approved September 7, 1960, the Chair appoints Mr. Edward Fenner, of Illinois, a member of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, vice Mr. William F. Knowland, of California, resigned.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 2 Leg.]

Aiken	Fong	Moss
Allott	Fulbright	Mundt
Anderson	Gore	Murphy
Bartlett	Gruening	Muskie
Beall	Hartke	Neuberger
Bennett	Hayden	Pastore
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pell
Boggs	Hickey	Prouty
Burdick	Hill	Proxmire
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Rubertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Saltstall
Cannon	Javits	Scott
Capehart	Johnston	Smathers
Carlson	Jordan	Smith, Mass.
Carroll	Keating	Smith, Maine
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Stennis
Church	Kuchel	Symington
Clark	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Cotton	Mansfield	Tower
Curtis	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	McClellan	Williams, N. J.
Dodd	McGee	Williams, Del.
Douglas	McNamara	Yarborough
Dworshak	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Miller	Young, Ohio
Engle	Monroney	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 402, I now move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of attending the joint session to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States.

(For the address delivered by the President, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m., when it was called to order by the Vice President.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 205)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate on October 16, 1961, transmitting the 42d report on lend-lease operations, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Forty-second Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations for the calendar year 1960.

Information on the status of the various lend-lease accounts of our allies of World War II is contained in the report. As explained in previous reports there were two main types of lend-lease procedures under which other countries undertook to reimburse the United States: (1) Settlement agreements whereby the financial undertakings of the other governments were funded on credit terms and (2) Arrangements described generally as "cash reimbursement accounts" under which the recipients were to pay the United States in cash at the time the lend-lease goods were provided.

In summary, lend-lease settlement agreements thus far concluded with various governments provide for the eventual payment to the United States of \$1,577,570,755.50, plus interest. According to data supplied by the Treasury Department as of December 31, 1960, total collections and credits on these accounts amounted to \$751,142,976.96. Payments during 1960 totaled \$49,401,368.02. Additionally, on the "cash reimbursement accounts" foreign governments had, as of December 31, 1960, paid

\$1,301,529,123.32 of the \$1,326,934,982.11 owed to the United States. A total of \$109,310.00 was received during 1960.

Under the lend-lease program, the United States also loaned 409,782,670.64 fine troy ounces of silver to various countries. As of December 31, 1960, 366,066,067.73 fine troy ounces had been returned. Shipments of silver not assayed by the close of 1960 are not included in this figure.

This report gives an account of the negotiations with the Soviet Government on a settlement for some of the lend-lease aid received from the United States prior to V-J Day. As mentioned in the previous report, the discussions, which began on January 11, 1960, were discontinued on January 27, 1960, because there appeared to be no common ground for continuing. There have been no further developments on this matter.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate certain communications and reports of various agencies of the Government received since the adjournment of the first session, which, without objection, will be appropriately referred.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Administration, covering the period January 1, 1961, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORTS ON NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION ON CERTAIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., dated October 4, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 1(d) of the act of July 21, 1961, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Two letters from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., both dated October 11, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Three letters from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., dated October 17, October 20, and November 28, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., dated November 2, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 4 of the act of June 1, 1960, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AT GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, GREENBELT, MD.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction at the Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., a magnetic fields component test facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF GENERAL SALES MANAGER, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager, Commodity Credit Corporation, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which that Corporation owns or is directed to support, for the month of May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

Two letters from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on agreements concluded during the months of September and November 1961, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during October 1961, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 67)

A letter from the President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Five letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated October 20, October 20, October 27, December 13, and December 22, 1961, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated September 27, 1961, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to

the Department of the Interior for "Management and Protection," National Park Service, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated October 25 and October 26, 1961, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligations of appropriations within that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, an overobligation of an appropriation within that Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on 16 overobligations of appropriations within that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on real and personal property, as of June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LOAN OF SHIPS TO PORTUGAL AND SPAIN

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the loan of ships to Portugal and Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON CONTRACTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, for the period January 1-June 30, 1961, listing contracts, in the amount of \$10,000 or more, for experimental, developmental, or research work (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS FOR STOCKPILE PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions for stockpile purposes by the Office of Civil Defense, covering the quarter ended September 30, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay, for the period July 1-December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NATIONALS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the disposition of certain nationals of the United States in foreign countries who are alleged and determined to be of unsound mind, and dangerous to persons or property, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for \$50,000 or more, which were awarded during the period January 1, 1961, through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO OFFENDERS OF UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1331, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO RETIREMENT DATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1331 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for a different retirement date thereunder for entitlement to retired pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN THE EXECUTIVE ELEMENT OF AIR FORCE AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of September 30, 1961, there was an aggregate of 2,292 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Air Force military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the period January 1, 1961, through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF U.S. COAST GUARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, for the information of the Senate, on flight pay of the U.S. Coast Guard, covering the period July 1 to December 31, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the

President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN MATERIALS IN THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Four letters from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., dated October 11, October 23, October 26, and November 28, 1961, respectively, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of notices to be published in the Federal Register of the proposed disposition of certain materials now held in the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., dated November 22, 1961, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of the proposed disposition of certain ferromanganese fines now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON IDENTICAL BIDDING

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the reporting of collusive or identical bids received by Government agencies, as of August 9, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration on liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which were transferred to the Small Business Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, for the quarter ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the liquidating of the assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to that Administration, during the quarter ended September 30, 1961; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the third quarter of 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON AWARDS OF CONTRACTS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Three letters from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, reporting, pursuant to law on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms for the months of July, August, and September, 1961; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July-October 1961 (with an

accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, dated June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Two letters from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bank as of the close of business December 31, 1960, and June 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of Commerce conducted no commissary activities outside the continental United States during the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, for the period June 30 through September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, as Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Four letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission for the months of August, September, October, and November 1961 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PERMITS AND LICENSES FOR HYDRO-ELECTRIC PROJECTS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the following publications of that Commission: "Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Natural Gas Companies, Class C"; "Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Natural Gas Companies, Class D"; "Hydroelectric Power Resources in the United States, Developed and Undeveloped, 1960"; "Typical Electric Bills, 1961"; "State Commission Jurisdiction and Regulation of Electric and Gas Utilities, 1960"; and "Map, Major Natural Gas Pipelines, June 30, 1961" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Agency on the administration of the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON INSTITUTIONS OR ORGANIZATIONS WHOSE PROPERTIES WERE EXEMPTED BY SPECIAL ACTS OF CONGRESS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted by special acts of Congress prior to the passage of the act of December 24, 1942, showing the purposes for which such properties were used during the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS ON INSTITUTIONS, ORGANIZATIONS, CORPORATIONS, AND ASSOCIATIONS OWNING PROPERTY EXEMPT UNDER PUBLIC LAW 846—77TH CONGRESS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on institutions, organizations, corporations, and associations owning property exempt under Public Law 846—77th Congress, covering the calendar year 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF CERTAIN NAMES BY COLLECTING AGENCIES AND PRIVATE DETECTIVE AGENCIES

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 6 OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia

Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicles title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925, AS AMENDED

A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION ON LAND ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing lands acquired by that Commission during fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering the fiscal year July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency,

covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

A letter from the President, NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, Paris, France, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of the reports and recommendations adopted by that Conference at its seventh annual session, held in Paris from November 13 to 18, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property of the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Agriculture on activities under title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF RECEIPT AND DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of foreign excess personal and real property, for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF F-101 AIRPLANE WINGS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an examination of the pricing of F-101 airplane wings under a fixed-price incentive subcontract negotiated by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo., with the Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., under Department of the Air Force Prime Contract AF 33(600)-23393, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICES NEGOTIATED FOR CERTAIN ELECTRON TUBES UNDER DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the prices negotiated for certain electron tubes under Department of the Navy contracts with the Raytheon Co., Waltham, Mass., dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN ESTIMATED COSTS FOR SUBCONTRACTED ASSEMBLIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the estimated

costs for subcontracted assemblies included in the incentive target price negotiated for B-52G airplanes, under Department of the Air Force Contract AF 33(600)-34670, with the Boeing Co., Wichita Division, Wichita, Kans. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for the year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the financial statements of the Columbia River power system and related activities, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the abaca fiber program administered by the General Services Administration, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Southeastern Power System and related activities, Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, and the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Sav-

ings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SHORT-FORM REPORT ON AUDIT OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a short-form report on audit of the Panama Canal Company, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON REVIEWS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected activities relating to the lease and disposal of lands and mineral resources, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of requisitioning actions by the Ordnance Supply Management Agency of the U.S. Army, Europe (Rear) Communications Zone, Orleans, France, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of materiel standardization activities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense, Philadelphia, Pa., dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the Federal contributions program, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the management of spare parts for Army equipment provided to Far East countries under the military assistance program, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of supply management of ordnance equipment and spare parts, in the Department of the Navy, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of practices followed in the storage and warehousing of aircraft parts and equipment, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., dated November 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected activities in the management of food supply, by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency, Department of Defense, dated November 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Army signal supply operations, U.S. Army, Europe (Rear) Communications Zone, Orleans, France, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of overseas commercial air shipments of military cargo for the military assistance program and Air Force units, by the Department of the Air Force, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected activities of Facilities and Materiel Depot, Aeronautical Center, Oklahoma City, Okla., of the Federal Aviation Agency, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the use of local currencies in Spain for contracting and administrative purposes, by the U.S. Government, dated September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the use of cumulative sinking fund for the retirement of public debt obligations, Treasury Department, as of April 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the housing allowances paid to U.S. military personnel occupying rental guarantee housing projects in France, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the use of commercial air carriers for overseas travel and shipment of unaccompanied baggage of Department of Defense personnel, dated January 9, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON INCLUSION OF EXCESSIVE PREMIUM PAY COSTS AND COMPUTATIONAL ERRORS IN PRICE NEGOTIATED FOR A CERTAIN CONTRACT

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the inclusion of excessive premium pay costs and computational errors in the price negotiated by the Department of the Navy for fixed-price contract NO's 3647, awarded to the New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., dated September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on administration of functions of that Administration under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR THAILAND—REPLY OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison Staff, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the reply of that agency to the report on an examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Thailand, during the fiscal years 1955 through 1960, transmitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of

the United States on August 21, 1961 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR IRAN—REPLY OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Director for Congressional Relations, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the reply of that agency to the report on an examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Iran during the fiscal years 1956 through 1960, transmitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States on June 27, 1961 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO NATIONAL FORESTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the National Forest, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA RELATING TO FACILITIES OF THE SAN LUIS UNIT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an agreement between the United States of America and the Department of Water Resources of the State of California for the construction and operation of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit, dated December 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DECEASED LOWER BRULE INDIAN ALLOTTEES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased lower Brule Indian allottees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA—OFFICIAL COMMENTS OF STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the official comments of the State of Texas on the Arbuckle project, Oklahoma (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, GARFIELD WATER DISTRICT, FRIANT-KERN DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by the Garfield Water District, Friant-Kern Canal Division of the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CANCELLATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS OF CERTAIN DEBTS OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders covering the adjustment or elimination of certain debts of individual Indians or tribes of Indians, covering the fiscal year 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEFERMENT OF PAYMENT DUE THE UNITED STATES FROM THE NEWTON WATER USERS ASSOCIATION, NEWTON PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, his determination relating to partial deferment of the December 31, 1961, construction payment due the United States from the Newton Water Users Association, Newton project, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 OF TAYLOR GRAZING ACT OF JUNE 28, 1934

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C., sec. 315g) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON STATUS OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPLICATION FOR LOAN UNDER THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, in the amount of \$811,000, for the Weber-Box Elder Conservation District at Ogden, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LEOPOLDO ROCHA CANAS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Leopoldo Rocha Canas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid by that Department under the Military Personnel Claims Act, during fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS UNDER TEXAS CITY DISASTER RELIEF ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims under the Texas City Disaster Relief

Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON PAYMENT OF TORT CLAIMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department during the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Army during fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Acting General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission, covering the period from July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Agency, during the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MINUTES OF NATIONAL REUNION OF NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the National Shipwright, Navy Club of the United States of America, Sanford, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, the minutes of the National Reunion (convention) of that club, held in Rockford, Ill., June 22-25, 1961; also minutes of the several national staff sessions held during the year of 1961, in Chicago, Ill. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Association as of March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART OF THE U.S.A., INC.

A letter from the National Adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Daytona Beach, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Corporation, dated July 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF LEGION OF VALOR

A letter from the Corporation Agent, Legion of Valor, U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial

statement of that corporation, covering the period August 16, 1960-July 31, 1961 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN DEFECTORS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain alien defectors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order entered in the case of Emilia Vallera, granting admission into the United States of said alien defector (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN B. HOGAN

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John B. Hogan (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAIM OF INDEPENDENT CAB CO. AND PULASKI CAB CO. v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the claim of Fred Foster and George Morris, d.b.a. *Independent Cab Co. and Pulaski Cab Co. v. The United States*, Congressional No. 8-60; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on receipts and expenditures, for the period July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT TO AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Library Services Act to American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

BONDING OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a re-

port on operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

VARIATION OF 40-HOUR WORKWEEK OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on certain positions in grades GS-17 and -18 of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON FILLING CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the filling of certain scientific positions in that Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS MEMORIAL BOARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman and Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON THE FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Voting Assistance Program, for the period September 1959 to September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ELEVENTH SESSION OF CONFERENCE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, informing the Senate that the 11th session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was scheduled to be held at Rome, Italy, from November 4 to 23, 1961; ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the State of New Hampshire; ordered to lie on the table:

"RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF U.S. SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

"Whereas U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, for the greater part of his lifetime, dedicated his services to the betterment of his fellow countrymen; and

"Whereas Senator BRIDGES faithfully and honorably served the State of New Hampshire as Governor, and fulfilled his duties in a most exemplary manner as U.S. Senator; and

"Whereas Senator BRIDGES has long been recognized as an outstanding champion of the individual rights and privileges of his fellow men and was internationally recognized as a statesman of the greatest stature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That His Excellency, Gov. Wesley Powell, and members of the executive council express their deep and profound sorrow on the death of one of the greatest patriots in the history of the State of New Hampshire; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the records, and a copy transmitted to his widow, Mrs. Doloris Bridges, his three sons, Styles, Jr., David, and John, his mother, Mrs. Alina Bridges, his sister, Miss Doris Bridges, and to the President of the U.S. Senate.

"WESLEY POWELL, Governor.

"PHILIP A. ROBERTSON.

"ANDREW JAMES.

"ROGER E. BRASSARD.

"HAROLD WEEKS.

"JAMES H. HAYES.

"Attest:

"ROBERT L. STARK,
"Secretary of State."

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

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the consideration of the constitutional amendment concerning equal legal rights for women

"Whereas the women of our Nation have enjoyed full civil rights since the adoption of the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas all citizens of our Nation should not only share equal civil rights but also equal legal rights; and

"Whereas there exist many statutes discriminating against women; and

"Whereas such legal differentiations, merely because of sex, lower the Nation's prestige and status in the world community; and

"Whereas both major political parties have announced support of equal legal rights in their respective platforms; and

"Whereas such a discriminating situation is outmoded; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 121st General Assembly of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact the required enabling legislation to present to the States for adoption the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex"; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the two U.S. Senators from Delaware; the Member of the House of Representatives from Delaware, and the Governor of the State of Delaware."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Kiwanis Club, of Coral Gables, Fla., favoring an investigation of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Oheb Shalom Sisterhood, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the ratification of the genocide convention; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of the Slovak Liberation Council, of New York, N.Y., to the General Assembly of the United Nations, relating to the adjudication of the independence to Slovakia, pursuant to its declaration of December 14, 1960, against colonialism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Pennsylvania for America, Philadelphia, Pa., at Wayne, Pa., opposing the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by Pennsylvania for America, of Philadelphia, Pa., at Wayne, Pa., supporting the objectives of the John Birch Society, and opposing the alleged trend to eliminate States rights, relating to aid to education in Prince Edward County, Va., and elsewhere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ralph Elon Turton, of Georgetown, Ky., relating to the repeal of clause 8, section 9, article I of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Francisco Cepero, of San-turce, P.R., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Joseph Ominsky, chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, transmitting a copy of the conference committee report on house resolution 62, passed by the 1961 Pennsylvania General Assembly, relating to equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by chapter 9 of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Cavite City, Philippine Islands, relative to the death of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn; ordered to lie on the table.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, and that remarks during that hour be limited to 3 minutes; also that allowance be made for the introduction of bills and other routine matters.

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

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask the Chair what the pending business is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending business is the bill, H.R. 8847, Calendar No. 1080, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reference is to the so-called Du Pont bill, which the Senate will take up on Monday next.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the distinguished minority leader, it is the intention of the leadership to adjourn today until Monday. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

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

FUNERAL EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEATH OF THE LATE SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate resolution. Hav-

ing obtained approval of both the majority and minority leaders, I shall, after the resolution is read, ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 232), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than \$1,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$90,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2645. A bill to authorize the construction of a multiple purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2646. A bill to amend the Act of June 29, 1961 (75 Stat. 129) in order to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2647. A bill for the relief of Yao Peng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2648. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zagorka Golubovic Dzinoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2649. A bill for the relief of Hamburg Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2650. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes; which by unanimous consent was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

S. 2651. A bill to fix the rate of compensation for certain scientific and engineering positions in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2652. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to authorize financial assistance for the construction of public facilities designed for use as fallout shelters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2653. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis (Peter) Kourkoulis; and

S. 2654. A bill for the relief of Athanasios (Arthur) Kourkoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2655. A bill for the relief of Roberto Hidalgo Villarín;

S. 2656. A bill for the relief of Dionisios A. Maroudas; and

S. 2657. A bill for the relief of Margarete Helm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2658. A bill for the relief of Chia-Yao Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2659. A bill to prohibit transportation into a State of certain prescribed drugs dispensed by an individual not licensed to practice pharmacy in such State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2660. A bill to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Clark Canyon Dam in the State of Montana as Hap Hawkins Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2661. A bill for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2662. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agri-

culture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 2663. A bill to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2664. A bill to provide a program of health care insurance for individuals aged 65 or over who are retired; to the Committee on Finance.

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

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. COTTON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 232) relating to the funeral expenses of Hon. Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, which was considered and agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 233); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) banking and currency generally;
- (2) financial aid to commerce and industry;
- (3) deposit insurance;
- (4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
- (5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;
- (6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
- (7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;
- (8) securities and exchange regulation;
- (9) credit problems of small business; and
- (10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$80,000, shall be paid from the contingent

fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. KERR, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 235); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL SERVICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEMS

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 236); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

- (1) the postal service, including but not limited to (a) postal rates, (b) modernization of facilities, (c) research and development programs, (d) public services, (e) operations, and (f) procedures; and
- (2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the shifting of positions from the merit system to a policymaking category, (c) the granting of civil service status to employees by Executive order or administrative action, (d) procedures for classifying positions and adjusting pay schedules, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the

Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$75,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV WITH REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(1) by striking out "nine" in subsection (g) (relating to the Committee on Government Operations) and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen";

(2) by striking out "seventeen" in subsection (m) (relating to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(3) by striking out "seventeen" in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen"; and

(4) by striking out all that follows paragraph 3. and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4. Except as otherwise provided in paragraph 5., each Senator shall serve on two and no more of the following standing committees: Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; Committee on Appropriations; Committee on Armed Services; Committee on Banking and Currency; Committee on Finance; Committee on Foreign Relations; Committee on Government Operations; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and Committee on Public Works. No Senator shall serve on more than one of the following standing committees: Committee on the District of Columbia; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and Committee on Rules and Administration. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be effective during any period when there are more than forty-seven Senators of the minority party.

"5. Any Senator serving on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences or the Committee on Government Operations on the effective date of this paragraph may continue to serve on such committee notwithstanding the fact that he is also serving on two other committees referred to in the first sentence of paragraph 4. During any period in which one or more Senators are serving on three of the committees referred to in the first sentence of paragraph 4, as herein authorized, an equal number of Senators who are serving on the Committee on Rules and Administration may serve on one other committee referred to in the second sentence of paragraph 4, but shall not serve on more than one of the committees referred to in the first sentence of paragraph 4."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING A REPORT BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 238); which

was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the time for filing a final report by the Special Committee on Aging, established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended to January 31, 1963.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of enabling the special committee to complete its work and prepare such final report, it is hereby authorized to exercise, until such date, all of the duties, functions, and powers conferred upon it by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the special committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$185,000 from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the special committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 239) expressing sorrow on the death of Hon. Louis C. Rabaut, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, which was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. THURMOND) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 240) expressing sorrow on the death of Hon. John J. Riley, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, which was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 241) expressing sorrow on the death of Hon. Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, which was considered and agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DAM AND RESERVOIR AT OAKLEY SITE ON SANGAMON RIVER, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River in the State of Illinois.

The proposed channel improvement project will provide for flood control, water supply, and recreational purposes by the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Sangamon River near Oakley and Decatur, Ill., with a capacity of 148,000 acre-feet, including 11,000 acre-feet for a permanent municipal and industrial water supply for central Illinois, recreation pool, 4,500 acre-feet for sedimentation, and related downstream channel improvements. The estimated cost of the project to the United States is \$23,056,000 for construction and \$135,000 for annual maintenance and operation; provided that prior to construction local interests agree to maintain all roads and bridges in the reservoir area and over the improved channel downstream from the dam, operate the existing non-Federal water supply dam and reservoir at Lake Decatur for flood control in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of the Army, and contribute in cash 15.1 percent of the first cost, presently estimated at \$4,115,000 and 22 percent of the annual opera-

tion and maintenance cost, presently estimated at \$38,000.

The benefit-cost ratio of the project is 1.2. It has the approval of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army.

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

The bill (S. 2645) to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River in the State of Illinois, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communication facilities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

This bill will, I believe, establish the necessary foundation for the expediting of a worldwide communications system through the cooperative efforts of both the Government and private enterprise. There is an urgent need for legislation in this area in view of the remarkable progress being made in the space satellite communications field.

This bill will give us a starting place for exploring the many unresolved problems in the administration and development of a communications phenomenon which has unlimited potential in providing an instrument for peace and understanding between the peoples of the world. The potential significance of a well-coordinated undertaking of this vast magnitude is unlimited and can well become a most powerful asset to this Nation in the decades ahead.

By enacting legislation in this field during 1962, Congress can set the stage for the first dramatic worldwide distribution of a consumer product directly resulting from the space research and development of U.S. scientists, engineers, and technicians.

In this regard I should like to say to the Senate that I have discussed the matter with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and I have advised him that if in the deliberations of the bill by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, of which the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee is a member, any matter comes up with respect to which the Commerce Committee has jurisdiction, an agreement will be worked out whereby either the bill will be later referred to the Commerce Committee for its consideration, or that a program of joint hearings by both committees will be worked out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The bill (S. 2650) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space

communications facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and, by unanimous consent, referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Trade Adjustment Act of 1962." I am pleased to announce that the following additional members of the Small Business Committee have joined with me as cosponsors of the proposed legislation: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS].

The Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 has been prepared and introduced to follow up a letter which I addressed to the President of the United States on last Tuesday, January 9. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to President Kennedy be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 9, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recognize the importance of expanded trade among the free nations of the world, and I understand your interest in supporting trade policies which would promote such trade. At the same time, I am deeply concerned, as I am sure you are, with the possible immediate impact of such expanded trade upon our domestic concerns. Indeed, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I feel a strong responsibility to do what I can to assure that meaningful adjustment relief will be provided those enterprises injured or threatened with injury.

Such relief must of necessity include, among other things, financial assistance. You will recall that such assistance has been recommended by various studies and was included in legislation introduced by you and others in Congress.

To be meaningful, this assistance must be available without undue and unnecessary restrictions. A substantial majority of entitled concerns will be small and independent businesses which are simply unable to negotiate with a number of different agencies for relief. To require them to do so will be to deny them the financial assistance to which they may be entitled. Accordingly, this program of assistance should be handled by a single agency of the Government presently equipped with personnel and experience to do the job.

The Small Business Administration is successfully administering several business loan programs of all types and sizes. No other agency of government has comparable experience.

Therefore, I would hope that under the program established, once it is determined that financial assistance is appropriate, the Small Business Administration be given full authority in the lending function, and its decision as to the soundness of the loan under the criteria established in the legislation be final. I would recommend that

the money to be used in such loans be appropriated to the SBA's revolving fund.

I believe that the success of this program as regarding financial assistance will be dependent upon such an arrangement. In addition, to do otherwise would not be consonant with the strong views of many in Congress, including myself, regarding the independence of the Small Business Administration.

I expect to introduce in the Senate a proposed Trade Adjustments Act within the next few days which will incorporate the suggestions I have made. I urge that this proposal be given the most careful consideration in connection with your legislative program.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the concept of a Federal program of assistance to business concerns, communities, and unemployed workers whose lives and activities have suffered as a result of the trade policy of the United States has been the subject of numerous bills introduced in each Congress since 1953. An excellent history of and commentary upon these bills will be found in the March 1961 issue of the Columbia Law Review. It is an article entitled "The Trade Adjustment Bills: Their Purpose and Efficacy," by Bruce E. Clubb and Otto R. Reischer—61 Columbia Law Review 490. More recently, one of the coauthors of that article, Dr. Reischer, a consulting economist who has taught economics at Rutgers University, the University of British Columbia, Michigan State University, and the University of Virginia, has prepared a study entitled "Trade Adjustment in Theory and Practice," which was published as a joint committee print of the Joint Economic Committee on November 21, 1961. As a member of that committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, which commissioned the Reischer report, I have followed Dr. Reischer's work with a great deal of interest.

The concept of a coordinated but multifaceted national program of trade adjustment received the unanimous endorsement of the Senate Small Business Committee—with one member not participating—as long ago as the summer of 1960. That endorsement will be found at page 12 of Senate Report No. 1903, 86th Congress, 2d session, issued on August 23, 1960, and entitled "Impact of Imports on Small Business." The language of the Small Business Committee's report is relevant and important, and I should like to read it into the RECORD at this point, as follows:

6. Special help for seriously injured domestic industries: American manufacturers feeling the intense competition of foreign imports have, since April 1, 1957, initiated with the U.S. Tariff Commission 28 applications for escape-clause relief, and only 2 of those applications have resulted in the relief sought. These results, some witnesses contended, have discouraged them from seeking relief by this means.

Your committee takes note of the fact that the Tariff Commission found "serious injury" in six cases, but that relief was accorded officially in only one-third of those cases. There is a moral obligation on the country as a whole to provide more tangible help where the serious injury has been found but where

the President has determined that higher tariffs or quotas are not in the interest of American foreign policy. No injured industry can be expected to bear willingly an economic burden that more properly belongs on the broader shoulders of the national economy.

Your committee suggests, as direct help to injured industries, such steps as the following:

(a) Readjustment aids: Specific Federal programs could be developed for case-by-case assistance to businesses and communities hard hit by imports. Such programs should help both entrepreneurs and employees to make necessary adjustments. Small businesses should receive market research and technical data collected and tailored for their particular individual problems. Displaced workers should receive help in retraining themselves for new or changed occupational opportunities. In some cases, relocation allowances might be made available, upon certification, by an appropriate authority, that certain unemployed workers are the victims of foreign trade competition and that their skills are needed in the section of the country to which they wish to move.

(b) Trade injury loans: Small businesses in industries found by the U.S. Tariff Commission to have been seriously injured by foreign imports should be entitled to preferential loan consideration by the Small Business Administration. The usual rate of interest on small business loans is 5½ percent; on disaster loans administered by the same agency, it is 3 percent. A new category of trade injury loans at 4 percent may be advisable.

(c) Tax concessions: Business enterprises found by an appropriate authority to have been compelled to make expenditures for new, diversified plant and equipment, as a direct consequence of U.S. trade policies, should be allowed to amortize the new plant and equipment at accelerated rates for Federal income tax purposes. Various specific proposals along these lines have been included in a number of bills introduced in this Congress * * *. These proposals deserve the careful consideration of the tax-writing committees of the Congress.

Your committee's suggestions are offered as samples of the kind of help which the Federal Government might offer to meet what appears to be a clear moral obligation to those industries which have been pronounced seriously injured but for whom tariff and quota help have been denied, for overriding foreign-policy reasons, at the White House.

The method of defining the industries entitled to help is clear and workable; further suggestions for deserved help are in order, and will be the subject of additional study by this committee.

Mr. President, in March 1961 the exhaustive and long-awaited report of the Senate Commerce Committee's 2-year special staff study of U.S. foreign trade was issued under the title "The United States and World Trade—Challenges and Opportunities." At page 157, the learned special staff made recommendations as to the essential points of a national trade adjustment program, which conformed substantially to the Small Business Committee's recommendations. A few paragraphs from the Commerce Committee staff report, preceding the recommendations just mentioned, are worthy of note here. I read from page 145 of the report:

THE NEED FOR ADJUSTMENT

To limit imports requires adjustments; not to limit imports also requires adjustments. The cost of the latter seems far less than

the cost of the former in terms of all the factors mentioned above plus the benefits that result from a more efficient use of resources.

Keeping our resources mobile is essential to economic progress. Economic adaptation is the essence of the steady shift from lower productivity to higher productivity use of land, labor, and capital. It is the lubricant for a closer meshing of the economic achievements of different countries, some developed, others less developed. Together with rising levels of international trade, it makes it possible for the American economy to benefit from the achievements of foreign industrialization, and for foreign countries to benefit from American achievements. It is the marrow of the process of international specialization.

Where the Government is called upon to help cope with market difficulties experienced by agriculture, manufacturing, and mining, the approach should be to facilitate the mobility of resources, not to retard it; to keep open the channels of change and private decision; and to lend a helping hand to those who find difficult the adaptation made necessary by a policy the Government had to follow in the national interest.

Mr. President, the key words of that quotation are the last words: "a policy—of more liberal trade—the Government had to follow in the national interest." I think that every well-informed American must now concede, as the President has eloquently indicated in the message we have just heard, that the Commerce Committee's special staff was correct in couching their finding in the language of compulsion, not the language of choice or option. What was said in 1961 is even more true today. The impact on world trade, and the consequences and conclusions for the United States, of the great new economic communities, customs unions and free trade areas of Europe, together with the rapid progress of former war-devastated countries and some of the underdeveloped countries, become ever more apparent and inescapable. The trade policies of 1930, 1934, and 1951 are no longer viable in the world of 1962. The tariff protections of former years are, whether we like it or not, going to come down, some very rapidly now, some more gradually—but down they will come. And, whatever the benefits for the Nation as a whole, the result for some industries, enterprises, and workers of the United States will be economic injury. In the words of the Senate Small Business Committee's report:

No injured industry can be expected to bear willingly an economic burden that more properly belongs on the broader shoulders of the national economy.

And, I might add, an injured industry should not have to bear that burden. To shift that burden, as best we possibly can, to the broader shoulders of the national economy, where it belongs, is the purpose of the trade adjustment bills, the latest of which I introduce today.

Mr. President, my bill has drawn heavily on the suggestions made by Mr. Clubb and Dr. Reischer, as well as upon the many bills introduced in prior sessions of Congress—particularly the bill introduced in 1957 by then

Senator Kennedy as S. 2907, 85th Congress, and a practically verbatim reintroduction of that bill in 1959 by the then Representative Chester Bowles, H.R. 9023, 86th Congress. I have also profited from and in part drawn upon the bill introduced last year by my esteemed colleague on the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator JAVITS, S. 851, 87th Congress. And, of course, no mention of trade adjustment would be complete without acknowledgment of the prolonged and pioneering efforts in the field by two other members of the Small Business Committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I gratefully acknowledge my debt to all of them. However, I must also note that my bill contains significant departures from prior bills, including one new program not previously proposed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement I have prepared, which describes the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962, section by section, with source notes and comments.

Mr. President, this kind of legislation will be badly needed in connection with the new trade program which Congress will undoubtedly enact. I believe the bill is in keeping with the recommendations contained in the President's state of the Union message today, and I am very glad to introduce it. Naturally, I should be pleased to have other Senators become associated besides those who have already supported the proposed legislation.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much pleased to be a cosponsor with the Senator from Alabama of this important proposed legislation. The Senator may recall that when President Kennedy was a Senator, he proposed a trade adjustment program which I was privileged to cosponsor with him.

I believe the program which the Senator from Alabama now suggests will be of great help, particularly to smaller independent businesses, and that the general outlines of the program will be helpful, not only to smaller businesses, but to any big business which may be affected as well. I assure the Senator from Alabama of my wholehearted active cooperation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section description will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2663) to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The section-by-section description presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SOURCE NOTES AND COMMENTS ON THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1962

(By Senator JOHN SPARKMAN)

Title: The title follows the title of S. 2907, 85th Congress, (hereinafter referred to as "the 1957 Kennedy bill"), except that the words "communities, industries" have been dropped. My bill is aimed at assisting individual business enterprises and individual members of the labor force who have been adversely affected by the trade policy of the United States. This approach follows the recommendations of the Reischer report. It is my hope and expectation that adequate provision for assistance to communities, directly and through industrial development corporations, has been made by the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87-27 (May 1, 1961, 75 Stat. 47).

Section 1 (short title): The short title of the bill is identical to that of the 1957 Kennedy bill, except that the year has been changed. The bill is called the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962.

Section 2 (purpose): The purpose of the bill, broadly stated, is to offset the impact on American businesses, especially smaller businesses, of an increasingly liberal national trade policy by a broad-gauge program of adjustment assistance. The statement of purpose in my bill represents a composite of section 2 of the 1957 Kennedy bill and section 2 of the 1961 Javits bill, S. 851, with, however, the references to "communities" and "industries" eliminated, to conform to the individual business and individual worker approach recommended by Reischer. Section 2(b) of my bill expresses a Congressional intent that the provisions of the bill be liberally construed and that close questions of eligibility be decided in favor of applicants.

Section 3: Reischer and Clubb have recommended that the U.S. Tariff Commission be the agency that would initially determine eligibility of businesses and workers for assistance under a Federal trade adjustment program. Section 3 of my bill accepts and implements this recommendation by creating a Trade Adjustment Division in the Tariff Commission. Section 201 of the Small Business Investment Act—Public Law 699, 85th Congress—served as a model for this section.

Section 4(a) (certificates of eligibility): This section assigns to the proposed new Trade Agreement Division of the Tariff Commission the responsibility for determining eligibility and issuing certificates of eligibility for assistance to import-affected businesses and workers. In the 1957 Kennedy bill and most other prior trade adjustment bills, this function was given to a new agency, a Trade Adjustment Board. My bill accepts the arguments of Clubb and Reischer that the Tariff Commission is well equipped by experience and present function to carry out this responsibility without a new addition to the Federal bureaucracy.

Section 4(b) (eligible persons): Generally speaking, business enterprises and workers who are adversely affected by the trade policy of the United States are eligible for assistance. My bill's definition of eligible business enterprises is derived from section 5(c)(1) of the 1957 Kennedy bill, while my definition of eligible individuals is drawn in part from section 5(b)(4) of the 1961 Javits bill and is in part original, again following the rationale of the Reischer report.

Section 4(c) (criteria for eligibility): This subsection, setting forth two prerequisites for eligibility of a business enterprise, follows section 5(c) of the 1957 Kennedy bill.

Section 5 (functioning of Trade Adjustment Division): The legislative language contained in section 5 of my bill is almost entirely original. The intent and purpose of the section, which has six subsections, is to enable the Tariff Commission, operating through the new Trade Adjustment Division the bill would create, to recommend trade adjustment assistance as an alternative to new or increased tariffs or other import restrictions, under each of the several statutory procedures it is now empowered to administer. Hence, the functions envisaged for the Commission are essentially the same as those envisaged for the Trade Adjustment Board in earlier bills; but my bill presents, for the first time, suggested statutory language to implement the Reischer recommendation that these functions be assigned to the Tariff Commission.

Section 5(a) would amend section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the Tariff Commission to investigate business efficiency, following the recommendation of the Reischer report (Joint Economic Committee), joint committee print, pages 36-37.

Section 5(b) would make a minor technical amendment in section 332(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, required by the amendment made by section 5(a) of my bill.

Section 5(c) would amend section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to give the Commission the alternative of recommending invocation of the Trade Adjustment Act provisions instead of increasing, or prohibiting a decrease in, tariffs, pursuant to that section of the 1930 act.

Section 5(d) would repeal section 336(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, which prohibits the shift of any article from the dutiable list to the free list.

Section 5(e) would amend section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (the peril-point provisions) to permit the Tariff Commission to recommend invocation of the Trade Adjustment Act as an alternative to a recommendation of an increase or of no decrease in existing customs treatment or import restrictions.

Section 5(f) would make a similar amendment in section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the escape clause provisions, insofar as they relate to the types of recommendation that may be made by the Tariff Commission.

Section 6 (Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment): Section 3 of the 1957 Kennedy bill provided a model for section 6(a) of my bill; however, my bill would create an Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment rather than a Trade Adjustment Board. The remaining three subsections establish the membership of the Committee, provide that it shall meet at least quarterly, and authorize it to call on all Federal departments, and, under my bill, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration would be designated as Chairman of the Committee and the Chairman of the Tariff Commission as Vice Chairman of the Committee. Other members would be the Under Secretaries of State, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. The President would be empowered to name representatives of other departments and agencies, from time to time, as he deemed appropriate.

Section 7(a) (Functions of Trade Adjustment Committee): The function of the Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment would be to determine the kinds and amounts of assistance needed by those classes of business enterprises and workers found by the Tariff Commission to be eligible for the benefits provided by the act. Here again I have been guided by the recommendations of the Reischer report, page 37, although the precise statutory language is original.

Section 7(b) would amend subsection (c) of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to

authorize the President to invoke the Trade Adjustment Act as an alternative to increased or continued rates of duty in proceedings under that section of the 1930 act. It will be noted that this section of my bill, which relates to the functions and powers of the President in section 336 proceedings, is the complement of section 5(c) of the bill, which makes a substantially similar amendment of the same section with respect to the functions of the Tariff Commission thereunder.

Sections 7(c) and 7(d) would make amendments to the peril-point and escape-clause provisions, respectively, of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, with respect to the powers and functions of the President thereunder, authorizing him, in either case, to invoke trade adjustment rather than continued or increased rates and types of protection. These sections complement the amendments made by sections 5(e) and 5(f) of my bill, with respect to the functions of the Tariff Commission in peril-point and escape-clause proceedings.

Section 7(e) establishes the manner by which the President shall invoke the Trade Adjustment Act: by giving notice to the Tariff Commission, the Trade Adjustments Committee, the House Ways and Means, and Senate Finance Committees.

Section 8 (Small Business Administration functions): At the heart of virtually every trade adjustment program proposed since 1953 have been the lending and technical assistance functions—but especially the lending program—of the Small Business Administration. The Reischer report recognizes the soundness of this approach (page 38) in these words:

"Under the proposed trade adjustment program devoted primarily to relieving the individual business enterprises of distress caused by increased imports, assistance granted would be chiefly in the form of loans, from the Small Business Administration."

Section 8(a) of my bill would have the business concern which the Tariff Commission has certified to be eligible for the benefits of the act apply to the Small Business Administration for technical advice and assistance.

Section 8(b) would empower the SBA to grant trade adjustment loans, by an amendment of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act. The language of the amendment of section 7(b) is derived, in substantial part, from section 8(a) of S. 851, the 1961 Javits bill. The trade adjustment loans would be limited to 25 years, including extensions and renewals, and would bear interest at 4 percent.

Section 8(c) would add a new subsection (e) to section 7 of the Small Business Act, authorizing SBA to make grants up to \$25,000 to eligible business enterprises for procuring technical assistance in the private business community, to make detailed plans for their adjustment to changed conditions and to new lines, when a need to do so has been occasioned by the trade policy of the United States. Such grants would be made only where the technical assistance programs of SBA itself, and other Government agencies, were inadequate to the task at hand, or where greater efficiency or lower cost to the Government could be obtained by this route. I am indebted to Clubb and Reischer (61 Columbia Law Review 500) for the original suggestion upon which this subsection is based.

Section 8(d) would permit SBA to make all of its programs authorized under this section available to all certified eligible businesses not dominant in their lines, whether or not they are technically small businesses. I have again followed the recommendations of Reischer in this regard.

Section 8(e) would amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act to increase the

authorized appropriation to the section 7(b) revolving loan fund by \$100 million, the entire amount of the increase to be earmarked for the new trade adjustment loan program.

Section 9 (unemployment assistance program) follows almost verbatim the language of section 8 of the 1957 Kennedy bill and the 1959 Bowles bill. These provisions are noted without criticism or suggestions in the Clubb and Reischer article previously mentioned, 61 Columbia Law Review 495-496. However, the Senate may wish to consider tying this program into the Area Re-development Act.

Section 10 (training and transportation) follows closely the language of section 9 of the 1957 Kennedy bill and other similar bills. I have noted with keen interest and considerable agreement the suggestion of Clubb and Reischer, 61 Columbia Law Review 496-497, for extensive revision of this portion of the Bowles (1957 Kennedy) bill, along the lines of the Korean GI bill, 38 U.S.C. 1501-1510; however, time has not permitted me to work up legislative language to implement the suggestion. I may wish to do so later, by an amendment of this bill. In the meantime, I commend the cited commentary to the legislative committee to which this bill is referred.

Section 11 (provisions for retirement of eligible workers under social security age 60) follows the 1957 Kennedy bill, section 10. The Senate may wish to lower the age still further, to 55 or even 50, as recommended by Reischer.

Section 12 (accelerated amortization) is patterned upon section 11 of the 1957 Kennedy bill.

Section 13 authorizes necessary appropriations.

PLANNING GRANTS

I should like to add just a word more about one adjustment program proposed by my bill that is not found in any of the earlier trade adjustment bills, to the best of my knowledge. That is the authorization of the SBA, contained in section 8(c) of my bill, to award grants of up to \$25,000 to certified eligible business establishments, for the purpose of engaging private management and industrial counsel in planning their adjustment to additional or different lines of production. In the extremely helpful Columbia Law Review article I have previously cited, Clubb and Reischer write as follows:

"Given a sufficiently large appropriation, the Department of Commerce might be able to organize a program of product and market analysis that could provide adequate informational adjustment assistance. There are at least two reasons why this should not be done, however. First, the Department would have to recruit and weld the necessary personnel into an effective organization. This would take time and money that need not be spent since there are already many experienced private firms that could undoubtedly do the job at least as well as the Department of Commerce. But a more important reason for having this job done by a private market and product analyzing firm is that the manufacturer would thus retain greater freedom of choice. It would therefore seem preferable were the trade adjustment bills to provide for grants to eligible firms for the purpose of retaining market and product analysis."

In two footnotes to this paragraph, the authors add:

"For a firm that has its own market and product research departments, a comparable grant could be made for the temporary support of that department.

"If such grants are to be made, of course, some sensible limitations must be put on the amount. Perhaps the best method would be to let the distributing agency determine the

amount necessary, which, in any event, could not exceed a particular figure, say \$25,000."

In addition to the fact that a business concern—faced with a need to make a major overhaul in its methods or major change in its line of production—may find it more convenient and expeditious to employ private management counsel for its planning than to seek the services of Government agencies, it is possible that such a method would also save the Government both cost and embarrassment. I can imagine, for example, that in some cases, it might be considerably more difficult for Government experts to recommend to a business firm a change to a new line of production, a recommendation in which existing producers in that line would have an obvious interest, than for a private management counseling firm to do so.

My bill would impose a \$25,000 ceiling on adjustment planning grants, as suggested by Clubb and Reischer. In addition, it would require, as conditions precedent to the award of a grant, that a determination be made by the Small Business Administration that the planning assistance required could not be obtained by a certified eligible firm from Government agencies, or could be provided at less cost to the Government by employing private industry; that a national as well as a private interest would be served by the planning grant; that the SBA would have some control over the qualifications and methods of contract planners to be employed; and that the final plan prepared under the grant would be filed with the SBA, which would have discretion to make it public, in whole or in part.

I can anticipate, even with these qualifications, some difficulties in the administration of this proposed program and I therefore maintain an open mind on the question whether it is desirable and practicable. Nevertheless, I feel that the novel suggestion by Mr. Clubb and Dr. Reischer deserves to be put forward in bill form, to provide a convenient focus for consideration and discussion by the Congress, the executive branch, and the business community.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a program of health care insurance for all persons aged 65 and over who are retired, through the social security mechanism but administered by the States. It provides preventive, diagnostic and short-term illness benefits; or long-term catastrophic illness benefits; or cash benefits to pay for private health care insurance.

Entitled the "Health Insurance for the Aged Act," the bill covers more than 12 million persons out of the 16.6 million Americans over 65 years of age, including the 2 to 4 million who are not eligible under social security.

The bill provides an optimum program of health care insurance and is consistent with the platform pledges of the Republican and Democratic Parties. It represents a compromise that I have worked out to accommodate those who advocate the social security approach and still retain the principles in the general revenue plan which my Republican colleagues and I put forward in the 86th Congress, and it therefore makes it possible for me to call for a genuine bipartisan effort now to enact a satisfactory health care program for the aging at this session.

I feel that I join millions of Americans in the determination that there should be a medical-care-for-the-aging bill in this session of the Congress. I have been deeply devoted to the general revenue medical care plan for the aged which, together with others of my Republican colleagues, I have sponsored continuously on this issue, but I am now convinced that it will not result in legislation soon. That legislation is urgently needed and, therefore, the time to work out an amalgam of both points of view is now. Hence, my offer of this compromise proposal as a formula for the solution of what has become the medical-care-for-the-aging deadlock.

I do not hold with those who feel that this body has only the one course of waiting for the other body on action on medical care for the aging. Certainly all respect must be shown to the constitutional prerogative in the initiation of tax legislation in the other body, but if after an appropriate interval it becomes clear that on this basis no result in legislation is likely in this session, then I believe that by appropriate amendment to a suitable bill this body ought to put the issue up to our coordinate body of the Congress as a duty to the country. This body has a duty to the country, too, to give its coordinate body an opportunity to enact legislation at this session by adding it as an amendment to another appropriate bill if necessary. I shall do everything I can to implement this course.

For more than a decade I have been vitally interested in health legislation which would provide not only a health care insurance program for the aging but also the medical research, personnel, and construction of facilities needed to keep pace with the mounting needs of our population. I have supported sound planning to increase the effectiveness of our health service system and to improve and expand our research.

The program would become part of the social security system, but actual administration would be handled by the States under agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or by the Secretary if he is unable to conclude an agreement with a State. This will make possible closer supervision in the maintenance of high medical standards and more efficient administration because of greater flexibility in the use of local facilities. It will also allow the States to improve service benefits under the same administration beyond the same basic Federal plan if they assume the costs of the added program.

The health benefits plan defines as eligible all persons 65 and over who are on social security, as well as those who are not on social security, as long as they meet the retirement qualification, and except for those receiving medical benefits under another Federal program. I would apply the definition of "retired" to all whose income for his last taxable year for purposes of Federal income tax did not exceed \$3,000 in the case of an individual or \$4,500 in the case of a couple who have filed a joint return; or who files a statement that for the taxable year in which he applies for health care insurance benefits his income will not

exceed the above-mentioned sums. This limitation would not apply to anyone who had attained age 72.

The bill offers eligibles a choice of one of three optional benefit programs. One provides preventive illness benefits that would include 21 days of hospital care; physician's services for 12 visits; 63 days of nursing home care less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days to 1 hospital day; the first \$100 of costs for diagnostic, laboratory and X-ray services; and 24 days of home health care services.

The second option, which is more liberal in its benefits than any other Government program, provides only long-term catastrophic or chronic illness benefits and would go into effect after the insured individual has incurred the first \$125 of medical expenses. It covers 80 percent of the following costs in a calendar year: 120 days of hospital with surgical services, including oral surgery, drugs and appliances, laboratory and X-ray services in hospital; 360 days of nursing home care after transfer from hospital; and full visiting nurse or other home health care services.

For those eligible individuals who have private health care plans and want to continue them, a third option provides cash payments to an insurance carrier of premiums on a guaranteed renewable health insurance policy of which the eligible individual is the beneficiary, amounting up to \$100 per calendar year. This amount is the per capita cost of the above two service plans.

A Federal medical insurance trust fund would be established to pay benefits for those receiving social security. For qualified older citizens not receiving social security benefits, participation would be financed out of general revenue by appropriations of the Federal Government paid into the Federal medical insurance trust fund. The total cost of providing medical benefits and administration under the bill is estimated to be \$1,230 million per year. To finance the benefits of social security eligibles, the payroll taxes paid by employers and employees would each be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent in 1963 with an additional increase of one-eighth of 1 percent each in 1972. Similar increases of three-eighths of 1 percent and three-sixteenths of 1 percent are made in taxes paid by the self-employed. These increases derive the equivalent of 0.70 percent of payroll on a level premium basis, or enough to make this program self-sustaining.

The rapid annual increase in the number of Americans who are 65 years of age and older is presenting us with a problem of major proportions. Progress in medical science has brought about an even more spectacular rise in longevity in the group of men and women who are over 75 and 85 years of age, and their health needs have become more and more of a public responsibility.

Today it is becoming increasingly clear that, with the mounting costs of medical care and the growing pressure on our medical facilities, most of our older citizens cannot afford to get the kind of health care they need without some form

of government help. The 1960 census showed that there were 16.6 million Americans 65 years of age and over. By 1970, if the present rate of increase continues, there will be over 20 million men and women in that age bracket. The number currently receiving social security retirement benefits is approaching 14 million.

The years of retirement should be healthy and creative years, but with costs for doctors, drugs, hospitalization, and other health care needs rising far beyond the ability to pay of almost two-thirds of the aging group at a time when their earning abilities have suffered a sharp decline, the magnitude and gravity of the problem call for prompt action.

Mr. President, when the Senate concluded its great debate on medical care for the aged in the 1960 session, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a leading proponent of such legislation on the other side of the aisle, and I both pledged to the Senate that we would try to find a way out of the deadlock. My compromise proposal today is my contribution toward that effort.

Mr. President, I urge Senators to study the bill most carefully. As I have said, it joins the social security approach with complete coverage and the option to continue private coverage.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comparison between

the bill I am introducing today and the Anderson-King bill, and also a general description of the bill I am introducing now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the comparison and general description will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2664) to provide a program of health care insurance for individuals aged 65 or over who are retired, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The comparison and description presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

Comparison of major health care insurance proposals for the aging, 1962

	Javits bill	Anderson bill (S. 909), King bill (H.R. 4222)
Coverage.....	All persons 65 and over who meet the retirement qualifications ¹ and who are not beneficiaries of medical care under old-age assistance or other Federal assistance medical programs.	OASDI eligibles age 65 and over; also railroad retirees. 13.75 OASDI beneficiaries and 500,000 railroad retirees.
How many benefit... Benefits.....	12,300,000 (as of 1963) estimated out of total age population of 16,000,000 (estimated)..... Eligible individuals may choose 1 of 3 optional programs: (1) preventive, diagnostic, and short-term illness benefits with specified services; (2) long-term illness benefits with specified services; (3) private insurance benefits under which the cost of a private insurance plan, up to a maximum of \$100 per year, is paid for. Benefits specified under the preventive short-term care plan: (1) 21 days of hospital care; (2) 63 days of nursing care less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (3) physicians' service for 12 days; (4) 1st \$100 of costs for ambulatory diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services; and (5) 24 days of visiting nurse or other home health care services. Benefits specified per year under the catastrophic long-term or chronic illness plan—80 percent of the following costs, after payment of the 1st \$125 of medical expenses: (1) 120 days of hospital care; (2) surgical service, drugs, and appliances, provided in a hospital; (3) 360 days of nursing home services less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (4) full home health care services. Private insurance benefits—payment to insurance carrier of premiums on a renewable private health insurance policy which an eligible individual is beneficiary, not to exceed \$100 per year.	14,240,000 (as of 1963). (1) Inpatient hospital care—90 days per benefit period subject to a deductible of \$10 per day for the 1st 9 days, but not less than \$20; plus, (2) skilled nursing home care after transfer from a hospital—120 days per benefit period plus an extra 2 days for each unused day of hospital care, total not to exceed 180 days; plus, (3) home health services—240 visits per calendar year; plus, (4) outpatient diagnostic services, subject to a deductible of \$20 per diagnostic study.
Administration.....	By States under agreement with Secretary of HEW, or by the Secretary if he is unable to conclude an agreement; States to be reimbursed; they can augment benefits under same administration if they assume added costs.	Secretary of HEW.
Financing.....	Benefits would be paid from a Federal medical insurance trust fund: (1) payroll taxes of employees and employers are increased $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent of 1st \$4,800 wages in 1963 each and $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent in 1972; for self-employed, $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 percent in 1963 and $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 percent in 1972. These increases derive the equivalent of 0.70 of payroll on a level premium (longrun) basis; (2) for other retirees, by appropriation from general revenue.	Increases OASDI taxable wage base from \$4,800 to \$5,000; provides for rate increase beginning in 1963 of $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent of wages; $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 percent of 1st \$5,000 for self-employed.
Total cost, 1st year.	\$1,230,000,000.....	\$1,000,000,000.

¹ An individual would be "retired" if: (i) his income did not exceed \$3,000, or \$4,500 in combined income with his spouse, in his last taxable year; or (ii) he files a sworn statement that for the taxable year in which he applies for health care insurance

benefits, his income will not exceed \$3,000, or \$4,500 for a married couple; or (iii) he had attained age 72.

SUMMARY OF HEALTH CARE INSURANCE FOR THE AGED ACT, SPONSORED BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

A health benefits plan for persons 65 years old or over through the social security mechanism (OASI) and administered by the States, providing preventive, diagnostic, and short-term illness benefits; or long-term catastrophic or chronic illness benefits; or cash benefits to purchase private health care insurance.

All persons 65 years of age and over who meet the retirement qualification are eligible including persons not eligible for OASI benefits, but excluding those receiving medical benefits under another Federal program.

FINANCING AND COST

The total cost of providing medical benefits is estimated to be about \$1.23 billion. Benefits for the OASI eligibles and ineligibles would be paid from a Federal medical insurance trust fund. Per capita cost of the benefits package is \$100 including administration.

To finance the benefits of OASI eligibles, the payroll taxes paid by employees and employers are each increased by one-fourth of 1 percent beginning in 1963, with an additional increase of one-eighth of 1 percent in 1972. Similar increases of three-eighths of 1 percent and three-sixteenths of 1 percent are made in taxes paid by the self-employed. These increases derive the

equivalent of 0.70 percent of payroll on a level premium basis.

Benefits for those not eligible for OASI benefits would also be paid out of the medical insurance trust fund, but the cost of such benefits would be financed out of general revenue.

COVERAGE

Out of an estimated 16 million persons 65 and over, 12.3 million would be eligible. Excluded are 2.2 million on old-age assistance; over 1 million have earnings over \$3,000; and more than one-half million are covered under other Federal programs.

SCOPE OF BENEFITS

Eligible individuals may choose one of three optional programs: (a) Preventive, diagnostic and short-term illness benefits with specified services; (b) long-term illness benefits with specified services; (c) private insurance benefits, under which the cost of a private insurance plan, up to a maximum of \$100 per year, is paid for.

Benefits specified under the preventive short-term care plan: (a) 21 days of hospital care; (b) 63 days of nursing home care less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (c) physicians services for 12 days; (d) first \$100 of costs for ambulatory diagnostic, laboratory and X-ray services; and (e) 24 days of visiting nurse or other home health care services.

Benefits specified per year under the catastrophic long-term or chronic illness

plan—80 percent of the following costs, after payment of the first \$125 of medical expenses: (a) 120 days of hospital care; (b) surgical service provided in hospital; (c) full nursing home services; (d) full visiting nurse or other home health care services.

Private insurance benefits—payment to the insurance carrier of premiums on a non-cancellable private health insurance policy of which an eligible individual is the beneficiary, not to exceed \$100 per year.

The program is to be administered by the States under agreement with the Secretary of HEW, or by the Secretary if he is unable to conclude an agreement. States are to be reimbursed by the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund, and are authorized to augment benefits under the same administration if they assume the costs of the added program.

An Advisory Council on Health Insurance shall be established in the Department of HEW to advise the Secretary on general policies and administration of the program.

EFFECTIVE DATE: JULY 1, 1963

An individual would be retired if: (i) his income did not exceed \$3,000 or \$4,500 in combined income with his spouse, in his last taxable year; or (ii) he files a sworn statement that for the taxable year in which he applies for health care insurance benefits, his income will not exceed \$3,000 or \$4,500 for a married couple; or (iii) he had attained age 72.

IMPROVED MASS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES IN CERTAIN METROPOLITAN AREAS—AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am today submitting a substitute measure amending my bill, S. 2390, to authorize a new program of Federal guarantees for qualified revenue bonds issued by local public transit agencies for the purpose of financing construction of new mass rapid transit systems.

We recognize that the economic health of our major metropolitan centers, the nerve centers of our Nation, is a matter of critical national concern and that such economic health is today threatened by inadequate mass transportation services. For that reason, we included in the omnibus housing bill passed last year a program of loans and grants to help stimulate development of modern and efficient mass transit systems.

In this new legislation introduced today, I suggest a new approach to this problem which would limit outright expenditures from the Federal Treasury and offer an alternative of Federal guarantees for locally issued bonds for those cities that can qualify.

This measure would create a \$1 million Federal transit revenue bond guarantee fund administered under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. At such time as payments on locally issued revenue bonds guaranteed by the HHFA Administrator might fall behind, this fund would provide necessary costs for meeting the Federal guarantee.

This legislation spells out explicit standards to be met by local public transit agencies seeking eligibility for such Federal guarantees.

These agencies must have approved engineering reports, independent engineering opinions when required, evidence of sufficient statutory authority, evidence of financial resources, and so forth. Revenue bonds shall bear interest at an average rate not to exceed 3¾ percent per annum and shall have maturity dates not in excess of 50 years.

An important additional qualification calls for local agencies to agree that facilities of mass transit systems, such as subway tunnels, will be made available to any appropriate Federal agency or agencies for military or civilian defense purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

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

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Address entitled "The Role of Government in Education," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH at the National Conference on Curriculum Experimentation, Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota, on September 28, 1961; and a letter written by five Minnesota educators.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Remarks by Senator RANDOLPH at the dedication of the National Computer Center of Internal Revenue Service at Martinsburg, W. Va.; remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the dedication of the Internal Revenue Service National Computer Center, Martinsburg, W. Va.; remarks by Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, at the dedication of the Internal Revenue Service National Computer Center, Martinsburg, W. Va.; and address by John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission regarding the role of the Federal Government in pioneering computer applications.

By Mr. WILEY:

Summary of proposals to meet the challenges of 1962 and promote peace and progress.

EULOGIES FOR THE LATE SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that eulogies for our late and beloved colleague Senator STYLES BRIDGES will be on January 17, next Wednesday, beginning at 1:30 p.m.

REMARKS TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I delivered to the Senate Democratic conference on January 10, 1962, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Today marks the beginning of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. On January 20, the 35th President will begin his 2d year in the White House. Those figures—35 Presidents, 87 Congresses—give one a sense of the continuity and the stability of our form of government.

The past year has witnessed another aspect of American democracy: its vigor. It was a year of achievement, marked by the President's increasing popular support and evident command of his office; marked also by the effective and responsible cooperation of this body.

To Democrats in Congress, the President's strength in the country—the confidence people have in his ability to lead us in the very tumultuous world we inhabit—is an asset of incalculable value.

It means that the climate for progressive legislation is good. It means that the country can face its problems with greater unity. And it means that Democrats will enter the 1962 elections supported by a public servant whose leadership is firmly approved by the electorate.

I think this conference of Democratic Senators can take a few bows itself, when we talk about public support. The two recent Gallup polls make good reading: one of them showed 79 percent of the people approving the way the President is handling his job; the other showed that 78 percent of the people believe the Democratic Party is best able to handle the problems they consider of paramount importance. I don't believe either one of these figures would have been nearly so high if the men in this room had performed less responsibly last year. In the check-and-balance system we serve under, the thoughtful cooperation of the Congress is essential for good government, and the public knows it. You provided it.

I do not think we should be troubled by the President's figure of 79 percent support, while the party at large drew only 78 percent. The difference is Caroline, and there's nothing we can do about it.

Let me take a few moments to go over some of the achievements of the last session in the domestic field. They include several laws of considerable importance to the country's present and future, and it is worth recalling what those are:

The area redevelopment program was established for economically distressed areas.

The minimum wage was increased to \$1.25 per hour, and more than 3½ million workers were brought under wage and hour protection for the first time.

The social security program was liberalized, benefits to widows increased, and men permitted reduced benefits on retirement at 62.

A far-reaching housing act was adopted, providing, for the first time, long-term, low-interest housing for middle-income families.

Assistance was provided for the dependent children of needy unemployed parents.

A highly successful feed grains program was enacted.

The highway and airport acts were extended and improved.

A realistic water pollution control program—that is, one that can begin to meet community needs—was adopted.

The Senate passed a manpower retraining program which will help those men threatened with the loss of their jobs to machines to develop new skills.

A mass transportation program was put underway.

In the field of natural resources, the Senate passed major legislation affecting wilderness and shoreline areas; created a great oceanographic research program; and stepped up the Government's work in saline water conversion.

Five major agency reorganization plans went into effect.

Federal criminal law was strengthened, particularly in the antigambling area.

The Senate adopted a large-scale aid to education program, the debate on which will serve to instruct many Congresses to come. That is a partial account of the work you did in the domestic area. In defense and foreign policy matters, the record was equally outstanding. Congress approved of the principle of long-term commitments to the mutual security program; appropriated \$600 million for aid to Latin America; created the Disarmament Agency and the Peace Corps; approved the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and, because it accepted the philosophy of Winston Churchill and John F. Kennedy, that, we should "arm to parley"—Congress gave the President what he asked for in military weapons and personnel.

Speaking of defense, I want to say a word about our military preparedness as we enter 1962. I expect most of you have been impressed, as I have, with the competence and drive of the Defense Establishment during the past year. It has clearly become, in the words of the Secretary of Defense, a more effective instrument of our foreign policy. In his report to the people last week, Secretary McNamara listed a number of accomplishments during 1961.

There has been a 50-percent increase in the portion of our strategic bombing force on 15-minute alert.

The size of the Polaris submarine force to be available by the end of 1964 has been increased by 50 percent.

There has been a 100-percent increase in our capacity to produce Minuteman missiles.

There have been substantial increases in the number of ready combat units and anti-guerrilla forces, and in our airlift and sealift

capacity to move these forces where they are needed.

Gains have been made in organization: in creating a Defense Intelligence Agency, a Defense Supply Agency, in planning and budgetary controls, and in the creation of a Strike Command combining the strategic Army and the Tactical Air Force.

The events of 1961 proved again how important our defense preparedness is to the security of the world. We suffered setbacks and frustrations in the world last year; Berlin and southeast Asia gave us many anxious days, and will continue to do so; and yet I believe the efforts made to strengthen our military forces during the year—including the sacrifices made by the Reserve and National Guard units called up in the autumn—resulted in a world picture on New Year's Day somewhat brighter than we expected it to be last summer.

In these times it is a commonplace to say that much work lies ahead to make free institutions safer and free people more prosperous. Nevertheless it is true; we turn from a heavy calendar of work in 1961 to an equally heavy one in the session ahead. We have profoundly important decisions to make in the field of international trade. We face great questions of tax policy, medical assistance to the aged, higher education—to suggest only a few of those matters on the horizon at this moment. We must expect other questions of urgency during the session, as critical as those we know about now.

In the resolution of these matters, I remind you again that I am your servant—as nearly as I can be, your advocate in discussions at the White House, and your representative in scheduling the business of the Senate. I learned a good deal about the Senate last year, and I expect to learn a good deal more this year—and indeed I should, because I am instructed in the subject by an incomparable faculty. I may add that, so far as I have anything to say about it, classes will usually end in time for dinner.

Before I close I want to say a word about our relations with the President. If my opinion of him is not already clear, I will spell it out: He has the capacity to be one of our greatest chief executives. I believe he will offer us this year, as he did in 1961, a sound program for America. I expect to be one of the most consistent supporters of that program in the Congress. I hope he will find the great majority of his party behind him when it counts. But I say again, as I did in our initial meeting last year, that the President is no admirer of monolithic thinking. He was too long a Member of Congress to believe that all wisdom resides in the executive branch. The best service we can render the President, and the country at large, is to speak our minds after mature reflection, and to make such laws as our conscience and reason demand.

No one in this room, and certainly no one in the White House, conceives that the world's gravest problems will be settled by the fiat of the President, or the bills and resolutions of the Congress. There are those who believe the President should propose a recipe for instant utopia, and that Congress should then be challenged to cook it. In my opinion that recipe has not been found, and the President will be suspicious of anything put up as qualifying for it. He knows that advances in human affairs are made painstakingly, by the cooperation and hard work of men of good will. I believe he will receive both from the Senate this year.

FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICY REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on November 15, 1961, the Senator from

Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, released a final statement bringing to a close the subcommittee's nonpartisan study of how our Government can best staff and organize itself to develop and execute foreign and defense policy.

The statement of the Senator from Washington sets forth and comments upon 10 major conclusions which he drew from the study.

This 2-year subcommittee inquiry represents the first comprehensive review of the national security policymaking process undertaken since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. The subcommittee held some 50 hearings, beginning with testimony of the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, on February 23, 1960, and ending with the appearance of Secretary of State Rusk on August 24, 1961. The subcommittee issued six staff reports containing detailed findings and recommendations for corrective action. Many of the recommendations contained in these reports and in the final statement of the Senator from Washington have been adopted by the administration; others are under study.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the closing statement of the Senator from Washington together with a representative group of editorials commenting upon this significant and successful inquiry.

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

FINAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY

Freemen are locked in a struggle being waged on the earth's continents, in the depths of its seas, and in the reaches of space.

Our Communist foes acknowledge no bounds except those imposed on them by expediency. They draw Twenty-Year Plans portraying a Communist utopia in 1981—while they build walls around their unwilling subjects in 1961. In their pursuit of power, they debase language itself. "Democracy," in their lexicon, becomes the rule of the few over the many. "Peace" becomes the surrender of freemen to Communist domination.

The question is this: Can free societies outplan, outperform, outlast—and if need be, out-sacrifice—totalitarian systems? Can we recognize fresh problems in a changing world—and respond in time with new plans for meeting them?

The requirements of national security press ever more strongly on our resources. Can we establish a proper scale of priorities which separates the necessary from the not really essential?

Program choice grows ever harder. Can we establish the right mix of military and economic aid? How are we to choose between competing multibillion dollar weapon systems?

Presidential control over foreign policy and defense programs becomes more difficult. How may the globe-girdling programs of the national security departments and agencies be harnessed on behalf of the Presidential purpose? How can we assure their efficient execution?

Standards of performance adequate for quieter times will no longer do. The Presidency and State and Defense and the rest

of our Government must now meet new tests of excellence.

Some 2 years ago the Senate of the United States established the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery and asked it to make a nonpartisan study of how well our Government is now staffed and organized to meet the challenge of world communism.

The subcommittee solicited the views of the ranking authorities in our Nation. Its staff prepared background studies on the problem of the inquiry, and the subcommittee held extensive hearings, during which distinguished witnesses gave generously of their counsel.

Over the past year, the subcommittee has issued a series of staff reports with detailed findings and suggestions for corrective action. The studies have found an interested audience in the Government, in the academic community, and among private citizens. Many of the recommendations contained in these reports have been adopted by the administration; others are being weighed.

The subcommittee inquiry is now ended. Certain broad conclusions have come home to me from our study.

First. We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them.

Faulty machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum. The underlying cause is normally found elsewhere. It consists in the absence of a clear sense of direction and coherence of policy at the top of the government.

Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below. This has been so under every administration.

In our system, two men bear the heaviest responsibility for giving our national security policy focus and structure. One is the President. The other is his first adviser—the Secretary of State.

A clear and reasoned formulation of national policy, and its effective communication downward, is the prerequisite of successful delegation and coordination.

There is still much to be done in defining our vital interests and developing a basic national policy which supports them.

Second. Radical additions to our existing policy machinery are unnecessary and undesirable.

Our best hope lies in making our traditional policy machinery work better—not in trading it in for some new model.

The subcommittee inquiry brought to light scores of plans for novel changes in the policy process. They include proposals for a so-called First Secretary of the Government who would stand between the President and his Cabinet chiefs, large planning staffs attached to the White House or the National Security Council, cold war strategy boards and councils of wise men.

Such proposals have certain weaknesses in common: They try to do at the Presidential level things which can better be done by the departments and agencies; they violate sound administrative practice by tending to interpose officials between the President and his key Cabinet officials; they rest on the mistaken assumption that the weaknesses of one organization can be cured by creating another.

In fact, any proposals for net additions to our present national policy machinery should be greeted with a basic skepticism.

This is particularly true of suggestions for new committees. Committee killing, not creating more committees, remains the important job.

Properly managed, and chaired by officials with responsibility for decision and action, committees can be useful in helping make

sure that voices that should be heard are heard. But a very high percentage of committees exact a heavy toll by diluting the authority of individual executives, obscuring responsibility for getting things done, and generally slowing decisionmaking.

Third. The heart problem of national security is not reorganization—it is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts.

Good national security policy requires both good policymakers and good policy machinery. But organizational changes cannot solve problems which are really not due to organizational weaknesses.

More often than not, poor decisions are traceable not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom.

Fourth. There is serious overstaffing in the national security departments and agencies.

The caliber of the national service is impressively high.

But like so many large private organizations, our Government faces the problem of people engaged in work that does not really need doing. The size of the national security departments and agencies has swelled out of proportion even to the increased number and complexity of our problems.

The payroll costs, although formidable, are less important than the price paid in sluggishness of decision and action. Unnecessary people make for unnecessary layering, unnecessary clearances and concurrences, and unnecessary intrusions on the time of officials working on problems of real importance.

Many offices have reached and passed the point where the quantity of staff reduces the quality of the product.

Occasional swings of the personnel ax, accompanied by much fanfare, yield more in headlines than in lasting results. The fight against overstaffing must be waged each day anew.

Fifth. The career services should be made better training grounds for posts of national security leadership.

Our career services are not producing enough officials with the large executive talents, the breadth of experience, and the width of perspective needed in top foreign policy and defense posts.

A program for improvement should give officials of exceptional promise much greater flexibility and latitude in job assignments; it should stress movement of personnel between agencies; it should offer more opportunities for advanced training of the kind made available by our most efficient private corporations.

And above all, we require higher salaries at the top of the civil service and at the sub-Cabinet level. The present pay scales are dropping further and further behind those obtaining in private life—not only in business but increasingly also in the academic world. These inadequate salaries discourage too many able people from entering government service and encourage too many to leave it.

Sixth. We should reduce the needless barriers which stand in the way of private citizens called to national duty.

Our system of government uniquely depends upon the contributions of distinguished citizens temporarily in high government posts, who come from and return to private life—the Stimsons, the Forrestals, and the Lovetts.

In time of hot war, we let no obstacle stand in the way of getting our ablest people to work in the Government. But in this cold war, whose outcome will be equally fate-

ful for the Nation, we tolerate pointless impediments to public service.

The present conflict of interest laws are a prime example. We will always need regulations to deter or penalize the rare official who tries to use his public office for private gain. But the laws now on the books are archaic—most go back to the Civil War. They are more responsive to the problems of the 1860's than the 1960's, and they often make it unduly hard for outstanding people to accept government posts. The job of updating these laws should be completed.

Seventh. Used properly, the National Security Council can be of great value as an advisory body to the President.

The true worth of the Council lies in being an accustomed place where the President can join with his chief advisers in searching examination and debate of the "great choices" of national security policy. These may be long-term strategic alternatives or crisis problems demanding immediate action. The Council provides a means of bringing the full implications of policy alternatives out on the table, and a vehicle through which the President can inform his lieutenants of his decisions and the chain of reasoning behind them.

The pitfalls to be avoided are clearly marked: At one extreme, overinstitutionalization of the NSC system—with overly elaborate procedures, and the overproduction of routine papers. At the other extreme, excessive informality—with Council meetings tending in the direction of official bull sessions.

Eighth. No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State.

In our system, there can be no satisfactory substitute for a Secretary of State willing and able to exercise his leadership across the full range of national security matters, as they relate to foreign policy. The Secretary, assisted by his Department, must bear the chief responsibility for bringing new policy initiatives to the President's desk, and for overseeing and coordinating our manifold foreign policy activities on the President's behalf.

State is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership.

State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. The Policy Planning Council is not now in the mainstream of policymaking.

State needs more officials who are good executive managers—and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems which now engage the Department. The administration of foreign policy has become "big business." This places a high premium on the ability to manage large-scale enterprises—to make decisions promptly and decisively, to delegate, and to monitor.

This need for "take charge" men is particularly urgent down through the Assistant Secretary level and at our large missions abroad. "Round pegs in square holes" are a luxury we cannot afford.

Ninth. We need a stronger, not a weaker, Bureau of the Budget.

Rich as we are, we cannot do all the things we would like to do to assure the national safety and provide for the general welfare.

The job of the President is to rank the competing claims on our resources in terms of their national importance—to distinguish between what cannot wait and what can wait.

The budgetary process is the President's most helpful tool in establishing such an

order of national priorities, and in seeing to it that the operating programs of the departments and agencies conform to these priorities.

In this task, the President needs the help of a Bureau of the Budget staffed still more strongly than it now is with officials who can interpret agency programs in terms of their contributions to the President's overall goals.

The danger is always present that Bureau members will become champions of their own, rather than the President's program preferences. A strong Bureau requires strong Presidential control.

Tenth. The Congress should put its own house in better order.

Although the subcommittee inquiry was directed toward the executive branch, there is clearly much room for improvement on Capitol Hill.

One major problem is fragmentation. The Congress is hard put to deal with national security policy as a whole.

The difficulty starts with the executive branch. Except in the state of the Union and the budget messages, it presents national security information and program requests to the Congress in bits and pieces.

The present mode of operation of the congressional system compounds the problem. The authorization process treats as separable matters which are not really separable. Foreign affairs, defense matters, space policies, and atomic energy programs are handled in different committees. It is the same with money matters. Income and outgo, and the relation of each to the economy, come under different jurisdictions.

There is no place in the Congress, short of the floors of the Senate and the House, where the requirements of national security and the resources needed on their behalf, are considered in their totality.

The need is to give the Congress, early in each session, better opportunities to review our national security programs as a whole.

For its part, the executive branch can take the initiative by presenting our national security requirements as a package, with dollar signs attached. To put these requirements in better perspective, the Secretaries of State and Defense and other ranking officials could make themselves available for joint appearances on the Hill.

The Congress should move in parallel. At the beginning of each session, it can encourage its authorizing committees to meet jointly to take testimony on the full scope and broad thrust of our national security programs. A closer partnership can be urged upon the revenue and expenditure committees. And parent committees can undertake to secure more comprehensive briefings on programs before dividing them up among the subcommittees for detailed analysis.

One last point: Too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of totalitarian systems in the cold war. Nothing could be more wrong.

Democracies headline their difficulties and mistakes; dictatorships hide theirs. The archives of Nazi Germany told a story of indecision and ineptitude in policymaking on a scale never approached by any other Nation.

The words spoken by Robert Lovett at the first hearing of the subcommittee are still the right words:

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

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SENATOR JACKSON'S
FINAL STATEMENT, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL
POLICY MACHINERY

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise,
Nov. 20, 1961]

JACKSON GROUP NAILS FAULTY GOVERNMENTAL
MACHINERY

An unrelenting group is the Jackson committee, at least its chairman, HENRY M. JACKSON.

And well may it be.

Despite the fact the Kennedy administration has adopted bodily at least a dozen of its major recommendations, that group comes now clamoring for still more that somehow got pigeonholed in Washington.

In a pointed statement, the committee is urging the administration to:

1. Trim seriously overstaffed defense agencies.
2. Raise top Federal pay.
3. Remove barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service.
4. Call upon the State Department to assume more leadership in the making of national security policy.

Nobody, except the purely political minded who cling to the idea that to the victor belong the spoils, should find much wrong with those propositions. And especially can we agree with the timely observation that the State Department needs to be less wedded to the philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. Good government needs men who can look down the road, see what's ahead, and get into position to deal with it effectively.

It is something of a valedictory by a committee that has been described as one of the most scholarly and nonpartisan investigators in modern congressional history. Officially the Jackson committee is a Subcommittee on Government Policy Machinery, but it has touched vitally internal concerns at a time when external matters hold the spotlight.

Its observation that faulty governmental machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum may amount to locking the barn door after the horse is stolen, but that shouldn't be the case. It is late, but not too late, for the Nation's taking seriously the Jackson report.

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Free Press, Nov. 20,
1961]

COMMITTEE'S SUGGESTIONS SHOULD BE
ADOPTED

The Jackson committee, a Senate group charged with making a detailed study for the administration on government policy machinery, has offered some pertinent advice in its windup statement. The group is headed by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington.

The committee wants the administration to trim the "seriously overstaffed defense agencies, to raise top Federal pay and to remove barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service." It also called on the State Department to assume more leadership in the making of national security policy and to be less wedded to the philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise.

The conclusion of this study, which has been described as one of the most significant and nonpartisan studies in modern congressional history, stressed the need for top officials to be in accord on the matters pertaining to paramount national interest. The chairman emphasized that unless the top leaders concur confusion is bound to follow in the lower ranks of Government service.

The Kennedy administration has already adopted 10 or more suggestions by the group and will have opportunity to act on other suggestions. Among the items set forth in

the windup statement for improving policy machinery were the following:

1. The Government must eliminate personnel in national security departments and agencies which are "doing work that does not really need doing."
2. The conflict-of-interest laws, some dating back to the Civil War, contain "pointless impediments to public service."
3. The State Department "is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the full range of national security matters as they relate to foreign policy * * * neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership."
4. "We need a stronger, not a weaker, Bureau of the Budget." The Bureau is the President's most helpful tool in determining which national needs come first, the chairman pointed out.
5. "Congress should put its own house in better order." Because of the "fragmentation" resulting from the committee system, Congress never deals with national security problems as a whole, Senator JACKSON declared.

The report also recommended that the authorizing committees of the House and Senate meet jointly at the start of each session to hear testimony on the full scope and broad thrust of our national security programs.

The committee has struck at many of the basic needs in the matter of policymaking. The implementation of these suggestions should be welcomed by all in Government and out who are concerned for America's survival.

[From the Olympia (Wash.) Daily Olympian,
Nov. 20, 1961]

TOO MANY COMMITTEES

How can a free government organize itself to outplan and outperform totalitarianism and achieve security in freedom?

Two years ago, a Senate group—headed by our HENRY M. JACKSON—tackled this challenging question. The solons and their staff interviewed hundreds of past and present Government officials and students of policymaking procedures. They held more than 50 hearings. As a result, the bipartisan Senate team has come up with some answers which are well worth considering.

An example from the Senators' final report: "We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them." This, the committee said, is the responsibility of the President and the Secretary of State. JACKSON added: "Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below. This has been so under every administration."

The answer, the Senators assert, is in better performance by people—not changes in procedure. Or, in JACKSON's words: "Our best hope lies in making our traditional policy machinery work better—not in trading it in for some new model. Committee killing, not creating more committees, remains the most important job. Committees exact a heavy toll by diluting authority of individual executives, obscuring responsibility for getting things done, and generally slowing decisionmaking."

The Senators said Federal national security departments and agencies are seriously overstaffed. "Many offices," JACKSON reports, "have reached the point where the quantity of staff reduces the quality of the product." While urging a reduction in the number of employees, the Senators urge higher salaries for those needed to do the job. "Inadequate salaries," JACKSON said, "discourage too many able people from entering Government service and encourage too many to leave it."

Sharp criticism was aimed by the Senators at our diplomatic service. The report says: "No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State. The need for 'take charge' men is particularly urgent down through the Assistant Secretary level and at our large missions abroad. Round pegs in square holes are a luxury we cannot afford."

Playing no favorites, the Senators then declared: "The Congress should put its own house in better order. One major problem is fragmentation. Congress is hard put to deal with national security policy as a whole. Foreign affairs, defense matters, space policies and atomic energy programs are handled in different committees. It is the same with money. Income and outgo, and the relation of each to the economy, come under different jurisdictions. The need is to give Congress, early in the session, better opportunities to review our national security program as a whole."

The Senators' task was to put a finger on Federal Government operations which need improvement. But 2 years of digging did not leave them disheartened. JACKSON's closing words are these: "Too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of the totalitarian systems in the cold war. Nothing could be more wrong."

The committee has done a remarkable job of assaying the Nation's political machinery. Prompt action to implement many of its recommendations should be taken by both the administrative and legislative branches of the Federal Government. Furthermore, the portions of the report concerning committees and overstaffed agencies should be studied thoroughly by those who run the State's government in Olympia.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News,
Nov. 21, 1961]

HOOVER REPORT BY JACKSON

For a couple of years, Senator JACKSON, of Washington, has been head of a special Senate committee examining the overall structure of the Government, and how it performs, chiefly with relation to national security.

The several reports filed by the committee should be required reading—and permanent guides—for all top officials.

The final sum-up boils down to these points:

There is serious overstaffing which leads to sluggishness in decisions and action. What the Government needs is better people, not more. Too many are doing work "that does not really need doing." Quantity of staff reduces the quality of the product.

Congress itself works by a process of fragmentation—committees working independently, too many jurisdictions, not enough partnership. Congress doesn't look at problems as a whole, only piecemeal.

The Jackson reports are the result of knowledgeable thinking, more than anything else. They are an attempt to give the Government direction.

President Kennedy has applauded the Jackson reports. And his administration, judging by the record to date, is especially in need of the main text. The burden of the report, as we read it, is an argument against going off in too many directions at once. In a word: First things first.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov.
21, 1961]

BETTER GOVERNMENT WITH FEWER PEOPLE

The departments and agencies concerned with national security, Senator JACKSON says, need fewer and better people.

His bipartisan Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery has just completed 2 years of study and hearings, and his conclusions

merit respect. His charges of serious overstaffing no doubt reflect the bureaucratic tendency, when faced with a crisis, to add bodies, multiply reports and divide responsibility. Getting better people—which he calls the heart problem of national security—is a perennial challenge.

Government has to compete for talent, and it does not always win the competition. One thing that should be done, as Senator JACKSON points out, is to modernize the present confusion of conflict-of-interest laws, which were designed for other eras and too often work unnecessary hardships.

The State Department comes in for special criticism. The Senator charges that it "is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy," nor is it staffing itself for such leadership; then it attaches "too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise." The Policy Planning Council—which is supposed to be concerned with long-range policy formulation—is not now in the main stream of policymaking.

These are serious charges, though when crisis piles on crisis there is a natural human tendency to neglect long-range planning in favor of short-range maneuver. Long-range planning requires the luxury of a perspective relatively detached from the press of daily problems. Yet these plans need the close personal attention of the top policymakers—who themselves cannot escape the press of more immediate crises.

There is no perfect solution, short of breeding a race of supermen. But Senator JACKSON is convinced that more can be done by strengthening the State Department qualitatively, particularly at the assistant secretary level. If it were in the main stream of policymaking, no doubt the Policy Planning Council could function more effectively in planning for the future crisis rather than, as too often is the case now, being swamped by the problems of today.

In calling for a stronger Budget Bureau, Senator JACKSON recognizes the value of budgetmaking as an exercise in the determination of priorities. Making the career services better training grounds for national security leadership, as he urges, would both boost morale and broaden the selection base for top posts. But the key problem does remain recruiting the best people for jobs crucial to the Nation's future—and then using them.

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 21, 1961]
TO MEET TODAY'S TESTS

Senator JACKSON has submitted a commendably brief, but effective, summation of the 2-year Senate subcommittee study on how well our Government is staffed and organized to meet the challenge of world communism.

The Washington Democrat, who is chairman of the subcommittee, bypasses the temptation which so often appeals to students of government, namely, of suggesting that a little, or a lot, of reorganization or expansion surely would make everything work better. In fact, he refers with a blunt sort of contempt to the scores of plans for novel changes in Federal policymaking machinery—ranging from a so-called first secretary of Government to "councils of wise men."

It is his own opinion, he makes clear, that there is less fault to find with the machinery than with the people who staff it. On this score, he starts at the very top by pointing out that it is the primary responsibility of the President and the Secretary of State to give "focus and structure" to our national security policy. From this level on down, the Senator points out, "standards of performance adequate for quieter times will no longer do." And while he describes the caliber of the national service as "impressively

high," Mr. JACKSON is frankly critical of the lack of "take charge" men in the national security agencies and in the State Department, of unnecessary people doing unnecessary work and even intruding unnecessarily on the time of others who are working on the problems of real importance. As one means of getting the better people, the Senator very soundly proposes an end to some of the "pointless impediments to public service"—such as outdated conflict-of-interest laws—and an upgrading of top Government salaries.

If there is a note of indignation in some of Senator JACKSON's criticism, however, there also is one of sound confidence that our system is not second to that of totalitarianism in either hot or cold war. We can, he suggests, do whatever we need to do to meet any kind of competition. Correcting some of the shortcomings which he has pointed out would make us even better able to face these tests.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Nov. 21, 1961]

UNCOMPLICATED SENSE

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON has advanced some suggestions for the improvement of our creaking national policymaking machinery which appear to be based on good, uncomplicated hard sense. The recommendations are said to represent a consensus of a Senate subcommittee which JACKSON headed and which has completed a 2-year study of the system under which our foreign and national security policy is evolved.

Senator JACKSON and the subcommittee rejected the temptation to blame everything on the inherent differences between a free and totalitarian society. They also rejected the view that the only solution lies in complete reorganization under a new post of first secretary of the government.

Our basic system is fine, they said, but added that it has some weak points which can and should be corrected. These weak points are overfragmentation and the failure to place topflight men to key positions.

Overfragmentation is reflected by the existence of numerous agencies and committees, many of which are overstaffed, which complicate but contribute little to the policymaking procedures, they said. It also is reflected by the fact that Congress gets its information in "bits and pieces." Senator JACKSON recommended joint appearances by Government officials before joint committees of Congress.

More capable men could be placed in the key positions, he said, by revision of the outdated and overly restrictive conflict-of-interest laws and by making the career services better training grounds for leadership posts. Once there, they should be given more responsibility.

The State Department, he said, must assert a stronger leadership across the whole front of foreign policy and must formulate a clear and definite national policy instead of reacting, as it does now, to individual problems as they arise.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald, Nov. 21, 1961]

LOOKING TO BETTER GOVERNMENT

The final report of the Government Policy Machinery Subcommittee, headed by Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, looks in the direction of a stronger administration, to be gained by eliminating workers not needed and attracting abler citizens to public service, and a more unified and coherent congressional operation.

The objectives of the report will arouse widespread public support. Because they call for upsetting bureaucratic practices and for changes in the established way of doing things, their realization may prove difficult.

In the first recommendation of this final report, the committee attacks a situation much criticized by the public: the employment of unnecessary workers in Government departments and agencies. Employees in national security departments and agencies "doing work that does not really need doing" must be eliminated, the Jackson committee declares. Such elimination will enable these departments and agencies to concentrate on essential work. Unnecessary work not only calls for workers who are not needed, but it also claims an undue amount of the time and consideration of department and agency heads. No one realizes better than the person doing it that the work is unnecessary; and the worker then goes to great lengths to justify his work—and his job—in the eyes of his superiors.

The other aspect of the personnel recommendations concerns attracting more able citizens into Government service. The steps to accomplish this would be a revision of the conflict-of-interest laws, to remove "pointless impediments to public service," and raising the pay for higher positions in Government service.

The committee has proposed no radical changes. What it suggests merits sympathetic consideration; some of its proposals are clearly advantageous, and their adoption would enable the Government to operate more efficiently. The Jackson committee study has been worthwhile; its findings look not only to making Government more efficient but also to making it operate with greater consideration of the public interest.

[From the Carbondale (Ill.) Southern Illinoisan, Nov. 22, 1961]

BETTER PEOPLE IN CIVIL SERVICE

Much of the criticism of the U.S. State Department contained in the final summary of a 2-year study of national security policy machinery by a Senate subcommittee has its roots in a problem common to all Government departments. This is recruiting and holding able personnel.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the subcommittee, said in the report that the State Department is not "doing enough in staffing itself for * * * leadership" across the whole front of foreign policy.

"State needs more officials who are good executive managers—and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems which now engage the Department," the Senator said. "The administration of foreign policy has become 'big business.'"

There can be no argument with the contention that the State Department, and Government generally, needs able and experienced managers and leaders. The question arises, however, where these are to be obtained. There is no shortage of capable administration in the United States. Whether these individuals are willing to accept governmental posts is another question.

Businessmen who must expect to absorb personal financial losses when they take Government positions must have compelling reasons to feel that they are contributing something eminently worthwhile to the national welfare, and that their service is needed and appreciated.

At the lower echelons of public service, pay and other incentives must be such as to attract capable personnel from private employment.

The subcommittee's complaint that the career civil service is not producing enough officials with large executive talents reflects the inadequacy of a system in which relatively low pay as compared to private opportunities, and conflict-of-interest laws "discourage too many able people from entering Government service and encourage too many to leave it."

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) News, Nov. 22, 1961]

THE FINDINGS OF A 2-YEAR STUDY: FEDERAL MACHINERY SOUND—IT NEEDS BETTER OPERATORS

After one of the most thorough and objective studies ever undertaken on the congressional level, the Senate's special Subcommittee on Government Policy Machinery has issued a final report reflecting steady confidence in the American governmental system.

For the last 2 years the subcommittee, headed by Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, has looked for ways our Government could better organize itself to cope with seemingly more efficient totalitarian systems. In its previous findings and in 10 broad recommendations contained in the final report, it has repeatedly struck two general themes:

Our basic national policy machinery is sound. There are weaknesses which should be corrected, but more harm than help would come from a radical overhaul or from extensive new additions to the machinery.

More often than not, the weaknesses in generating and carrying out national policy are traceable not to the machinery but to the people running it. The key to improvement lies in quality of personnel.

Said Senator JACKSON in the final report: "Our best hope lies in making our traditional policy machinery work better, not in trading it in for some new model. Committee killing, not creating more committees, remains the important job.

"Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below."

Here is a statement that deserves to become a national motto, both in and out of government. It should be etched in every high place where the all-too-human tendency is toward indecision and diffusion of responsibility.

The Jackson committee view in this respect is actually an extension of a number of recommendations it made last year. Largely because of them, top Washington officials quietly dropped a proposal that had been made for creation of a First Secretary of the Government, who would supervise national security affairs for the President. And in its first days the Kennedy administration streamlined the National Security Council and abolished more than 1,000 interagency and advisory committees.

In its final report the Jackson committee aimed especially strong comments at the State Department.

"State is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy," it said. "Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership. . . . The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and it too often is wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise."

The committee did not criticize Mr. Rusk or any Secretary of State by name. Its criticism, though, adds up to a warning to the President and Mr. Rusk that this country cannot afford a lack of initiative in foreign affairs and that no more urgent task exists than building a strong, forward-looking State Department.

Serious consideration also should go to its other recommendations, notably those calling for a stronger Budget Bureau, elimination of overstaffing in the Defense Department, and overhaul of our conflict-of-interest laws, which now deter many able men from public service.

The report ended on a note that would be well to remember:

"Too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of totalitarian systems

in the cold war. Nothing could be more wrong. Democracies headline their mistakes; dictatorships hide theirs. The archives of Nazi Germany told a story of indecision and ineptitude in policymaking on a scale never approached by our own Nation."

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Nov. 23, 1961]

THE REAL WEAKNESS

A Senate subcommittee on national policy machinery has been engaged for about 2 years in a nonpartisan study of how well our Government is organized to meet the challenge of world communism.

One of its conclusions, contained in a final statement released by its chairman, Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, is that no task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State.

In reaching this conclusion, the subcommittee has put its finger on what has become obvious to a large segment of the public as a critical weakness of the State Department and consequently of our foreign policy.

A paragraph from the conclusion says: "State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy and is too wedded to reacting to problems as they arise."

No official words have better described the way our foreign policy is being conducted.

When Khrushchev bellows, we react. When he smiles, we react. When the Communists build a wall in Berlin, we make hurried plans and issue eloquent statements.

In Laos, in Cuba, in any of the trouble spots of the world, our only policy—if it is a policy—seems to be to wait until the Communists make a move. Then we react with hurried conferences and expedient decisions designed only to meet the immediate problem.

There is no initiative on our part in taking steps that would throw the Communists on the defensive. There is no attempt to carry out a long-range plan for victory for the free world because there is no long-range plan.

If the subcommittee does nothing else than focus attention on this glaring weakness in our foreign policy, it will have rendered the Nation a considerable service.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 24, 1961]

CLUMSINESS ON THE BRIDGE

During World War II, Navy vessels in a certain sector suddenly began getting in each other's way; we recall the displeased admiral's command: "There will be no more collisions; repeat, no more collisions."

Well, in due course, collisions decreased. But the admiral's exhortation had little to do with this improved seamanship; it was the result of repairing those failings of foresight and judgment that had caused the accidents in the first place.

We are reminded of this sea story by Senator JACKSON's remarks on completing a 2-year inspection of U.S. policymaking machinery. What the Senator and his subcommittee found apparently impressed him with the futility of issuing orders that don't really change anything.

He sees no corrections of past U.S. policy failures through "radical additions to our existing policy machinery." Nor does he get enthusiastic about the perennial suggestion of "reorganization." Indeed, one trouble he finds with U.S. policymaking is "serious overstaffing" of security and diplomatic agencies.

"The heart problem of national security," says the Senator, "is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts. . . . More often than not, poor de-

isions are traceable not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom."

That is, or should be, perfectly obvious. But there are many who are impressed by elaborate organizational machinery to the point where they suppose that the beautiful thing runs by itself, or, at most, with occasional urging from on high. And so men of little experience and less judgment are installed in key policy posts, often to settle domestic political debts.

It is quite futile, of course, to exhort someone lacking commonsense to perform like a man of seasoned judgment; he simply doesn't know how. The only way to avoid the damage he will do, in countless daily errors of detail and poor judgment that eventually may produce a major accident, is not to put him on the bridge in the first place.

Even the finest piece of machinery won't survive clumsy handling. As we recall that wartime rash of collisions, the saddest part was the spectacle of fighting ships escaping enemy gunfire only to sink through self-inflicted damage.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer, Nov. 24, 1961]

FEWER PEOPLE

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of a special Subcommittee To Study National Policy, has reported that there are just too darned many committees, people are engaged in work that doesn't need to be done, overstaffing results in sluggishness of decision and action, meddling committees dilute the authority of individual executives.

JACKSON said that "committee-killing" is an important step needed to improve policymaking. Thereupon, he killed his own committee. Bravo for him.

JACKSON opposes major additions to existing policy machinery and thumbs down the silly idea of creating a "first secretary" of Government.

Actually, the need—and JACKSON underscores it—is for fewer people, but better people; for fixed responsibility, not watered-down authority.

The Jackson subcommittee's recommendations are valuable. We hope they don't just gather dust in some Presidential cubbyhole.

Government by committee is no good at any level, local, State, or national.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Nov. 24, 1961]

TO THE POINT

Few congressional committees have won the universal respect accorded the Subcommittee on Government Policy Machinery, headed by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington. Its impartial approach to touchy issues of policy, personnel, and procedure which too often are colored by partisan considerations; has won the confidence of Republicans and Democrats alike. Already a substantial percentage of the group's recommendations have been implemented, with every assurance given that the remaining proposals will be given sympathetic consideration.

The nature of the subcommittee's approach is indicated by two points stressed in a final statement submitted by Senator JACKSON in winding up the group's work.

The Government, said the committee in its first point, must eliminate personnel in national security departments and agencies which are "doing work that really does not need doing."

The other point is equally significant.

"Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below."

The Government could do with a little more clear-headed thinking like that displayed by Senator JACKSON and his associates.

[From the Yakima Daily Republic, Nov. 25, 1961]

SOUND ADVICE

Administration officials should give serious consideration to the recommendations just made by the Government Policy Machinery Subcommittee headed by Senator HENRY JACKSON.

The key to the whole report—made after consultation with many authorities—was contained in Senator JACKSON's initial statement:

"We need a clearer understanding of where our national interests lie and what we must do to promote them."

The committee also recommended that the administration trim seriously overstaffed defense agencies, raise top Federal pay, and remove barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service.

The committee called on the State Department to assume more leadership in the making of national security policy and added that the department should be less wedded to the philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise.

Specifically, the committee recommended that the Government eliminate personnel doing work that does not really need doing that the Budget Bureau be strengthened, that conflict-of-interest laws be reexamined and that Congress should put its own house in order.

One of the revealing criticisms was the conclusion that faulty government machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum. Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below.

Senator JACKSON and his committee did an excellent analysis of governmental machinery and its operation.

The citizens can hope that the administration will implement the recommendations.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News Sun, Nov. 24, 1961]

FEWER, BUT BETTER MEN

For many years now, there's been a popular notion that we can somehow attain better government by employing more and more people in government service. This kind of thinking is nudged along by the public official who meets public criticism with a plaintive wail: "But, oh, we're so understaffed."

While there is undeniably a certain connection between good work and ample manpower, better government is sometimes dependent on fewer—and better—workers, as the bipartisan Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery noted the other day.

Senator JACKSON, of Washington, reports that 2 years of study have prompted the subcommittee to conclude that the departments and agencies concerned with national security are, among other things, suffering from a serious overstaffing. The elimination of excess manpower and a fresh concentration on hiring better people is the heart problem of national security, the Senator advises.

We are not experts on how to organize our national security effort, but certainly what Senator JACKSON says makes a great deal of sense. The proper response to un-

relenting crisis is not an indiscriminate multiplication of personnel to the point of bureaucratic paralysis. The need is more one of brainpower than manpower, where the precious wisdom of a few top men can be far more valuable than the helter-skelter efforts of a legion of bureaucrats.

What Senator JACKSON is talking about then is the very fundamental and very difficult problem of attracting good men into public service. It is a qualitative problem rather than a quantitative one.

In this regard, it might be wise, as Senator JACKSON further suggests, that the Government take a new look at its tangled conflict-of-interest laws, particularly those which render a man impoverished before he can be considered worthy of public service. Probably the most recent outstanding example of this is Defense Secretary McNamara, formerly president of Ford Motor Co. In private life, Mr. McNamara made close to \$500,000 a year and owned about \$1.5 million in Ford stock, to say nothing of his stock options and retirement benefits. But all of this had to go before Mr. McNamara could accept his post in Washington free of conflict-of-interest suspicions or violations. Somehow we have always felt this is just too much to ask of most men.

[From the Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram, Nov. 24, 1961]

JACKSON COMMITTEE REPORTS

One of the most useful suggestions made by an investigating committee is the one that recommends the removal of barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service, particularly in the Federal Government. Coupled with this proposal, which was made by the Government Policy Machinery Subcommittee, were the recommendations that the administration trim seriously overstaffed defense agencies and raise top Federal pay.

Today in private industry there are plenty of executives who have the ability, drive, know-how that Government desperately needs. To get these men the Government must offer sufficient inducement. To leave private industry these men often give up fabulous incomes to serve. No one blames them when they often return to private industry after a short whirl in Government.

The statement issued by the subcommittee, known as the Jackson committee, closed the books on what has been called one of the most scholarly and nonpartisan investigations in modern congressional history. Although at least a dozen of the committee's major proposals have been adopted by the Kennedy administration, the concluding statement spotlighted 10 items of unfinished business.

At the head of the list was the conclusion that faulty Government machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained momentum. Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below.

Proposals include the recommendation to eliminate personnel in national security departments and agencies which are doing work that does not really need doing. Of course, that is going on all over the Government, and even reaching down into the State level as well. We all know that plenty of Government workers must develop the art of looking extremely busy when there's really nothing for them to do.

The committee report placed special emphasis on bringing higher grade people to key defense and foreign policy posts, and recommending higher salaries at the top of the civil service ratings and the sub-Cabinet level. There is the obvious need for weeding out excess staff; some of the agencies have

swelled out of proportion even to the increased number and complexity of our problems.

Kennedy has recognized the need for adopting many of the committee proposals, as witness his prompt action in reorganizing his National Security Council (which has seen two top leaders fired in the past few days), abolishing the supersecret Operations Coordinating Board, ordering the death of more than 1,000 interagency and advisory committees, and upgrading the role of the State Department in making national security policy. More needs to be done, but President Kennedy has certainly made a commendable start in this direction.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Nov. 26, 1961]

ADVICE TO DIPLOMATS

In conducting foreign policy, American diplomats too often react negatively against outside forces and too seldom react affirmatively to support the vital national interests of the United States.

This criticism of the U.S. Department of State now has been underscored in a statement by Senator HENRY JACKSON based on a 2-year inquiry into national policy machinery by a Senate subcommittee.

The statement is being given serious consideration in the executive branch of the Government not only because Chairman JACKSON is a prominent Democratic leader but because of President Kennedy's endorsement of the statement.

In praising the report, Mr. Kennedy called JACKSON "the chief mover of the most constructive, far-reaching hearings ever held on the Government's conduct of national security objectives." He said the administration and the country are indebted to JACKSON for the study.

JACKSON's first recommendation set the tone for his statement: "We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them." In effect, this recommendation emphasizes the same need for a national purpose and national goals that has been expressed earlier.

While JACKSON did not see the need for "radical additions" to existing policy machinery, he said he regarded the heart problem of national security as "getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts."

He criticized serious overstaffing in national security departments, urged the reduction of needless barriers that stand in the way of private citizens called to national duty, and recommended improving the effectiveness of the State Department.

JACKSON did not spare Congress itself from criticism. He said Congress should put its own house in better order. He cited in particular the "fragmentation" of the national security issue on Capitol Hill and the fact that Congress gets its information in "bits and pieces."

Congress' problems would be alleviated, of course, if jealous committee chairmen and committeemen could be persuaded to hold joint hearings for governmental officials. This would also reduce the amount of time officials now waste in explaining the same problem to different committees.

JACKSON was especially critical of the State Department for its failure to assert its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. His subcommittee heard former and present officials, including Secretary Rusk, and while JACKSON mentioned no specific official in this connection, he criticized State Department personnel for their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, their indecisiveness and their lack of wisdom.

JACKSON's subcommittee started its review with a hearing February 23, 1960, so that it had the benefit of studying national security

issues and their handling by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

It is easier, of course, to criticize than to change Washington procedures, policies and people. But the Jackson statement ought to stimulate more thoughtful review of national policymaking practices, spur more comprehensive forward planning, and remind our diplomats to act affirmatively in the national interest rather than merely to react negatively against threats to that interest.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Nov. 27, 1961]

POLICY AND POPULARITY

Many informed Americans will agree with Chairman JACKSON of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery that "no task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State." But like Mr. JACKSON, whose committee recently concluded a 2-year study, they will not be too certain of just what to do about it.

The Senator from Washington says the Department is not doing enough to assert its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy, nor is it doing enough to staff itself for such leadership. A partial corrective may be found in the shifts of administration leaders announced Sunday. But Mr. JACKSON further says State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning; that it is "too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise."

U.S. foreign policy in recent years has frequently been criticized for reacting rather than acting. Many critics before Mr. JACKSON have said that we should develop long-range policies that are based on our best understanding of the facts, and that we should persist in these regardless of temporary setbacks. Instead, so the critics have asserted, we do nothing until another country acts, and then we hastily improvise a policy of reaction.

Unfortunately this has often been the case, but finding the remedy is not nearly as simple as diagnosing the disease. Some blame must be attached to that amorphous entity, the people. Thus Norman Graebner, head of the history department of the University of Illinois, said at an American assembly conference in Columbia, Mo., a few days ago, that Secretaries of State have attached undue importance to the popularity of their policies at home.

Maintaining world peace, the speaker declared, "requires less the popularity of a nation's foreign policies at home than the ability of these policies, conducted by trusted public servants, to define and protect the specific interests of the United States in this Nation's conflicts around the globe."

That is true, and yet it is false to the extent that the policies must be supported at home or they will fail abroad. Take United States-China policy as an example. The experts who had the background to formulate a long-range China policy after the Chiang Kai-shek debacle of 1949 were hounded from the State Department by McCarthy. Chiang's partisans are so strong that the administration still cannot develop a rational China policy.

The success of a foreign aid policy may depend less on the preparation of an imaginative and carefully reasoned plan than on the support of two or three key Congressmen under pressure from their constituents to oppose all such schemes. On at least two occasions the State Department tried to bring President Tito of Yugoslavia to Washington for a state visit but was prevented by the opposition of a few influential Congressmen who had groups of anti-Tito Yugoslavs among their constituents.

What is really needed is a greater sophistication on the part of the American people, a greater awareness of what President Kennedy was talking about when he said at

Seattle that the United States is "neither omnipotent nor omniscient." Diplomacy does not consist of a moral approach to every problem, or the advocacy of a holy war. It consists in a realistic appraisal of the power at a nation's disposal and the prudent use of that power in the Nation's best interest.

Who is to know what is in the Nation's best interest? In a free country every man is entitled to his opinion; but he is also obliged to inform himself, to base his opinion on fact and not on prejudice or daydreams. If the people were informed it would be far easier for the State Department to make plans that would be assured of popular support.

A whole apparatus is required—a President who will take the lead in explaining the facts, as Mr. Kennedy is now doing; such changes in the State Department as will contribute to efficiency and the employment of the best talent available, and a program that will provide the public, in Mr. JACKSON's words, with a "clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them."

That means education. If the public understands the facts it will not be too difficult to translate that understanding into forceful, intelligent policies.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Nov. 27, 1961]

SENATE GROUP URGES SECURITY EFFECTIVENESS

For 2 years a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, has been conducting an inquiry into Government furtherance of national security objectives and how a free government could organize itself to cope with seemingly more efficient totalitarian systems. Chairman JACKSON now has come up with some pertinent findings and recommendations, some of which are as follows:

The cards are not stacked in favor of totalitarian systems.

We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them.

The real problem of national security is not reorganization but getting the best people into key foreign policy and defense posts.

There is serious overstaffing in the national security departments and agencies.

Needless barriers standing in the way of private citizens called to national duty should be reduced.

We need a stronger not a weaker Bureau of the Budget.

No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the State Department.

Concerning the State Department Senator JACKSON had some pointed criticism.

"State," he said, "is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership. State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. The Policy Planning Council is not now in the main stream of policymaking."

It is important that these comments come from an outstanding member of President Kennedy's own political party in the Senate, although the subcommittee he headed was a bipartisan one made up of Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, Democrats, and KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, Republicans.

The President has warmly praised the work of the subcommittee and expressed the administration's indebtedness for its recommendations, certainly an indication that something constructive is going to be done to implement them.

[From the Marietta (Ohio) Times, Nov. 27, 1961]

NEED STRONGER POLICY

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's subcommittee has completed its 2-year study into national policy machinery. Early reports indicate it has produced much for national leaders to consider. One of his statements concerning it is that too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of totalitarian systems in the cold war. The Washington Democrat said: "Nothing could be more wrong."

He listed these major conclusions of the study: A clearer delineation is needed as to where our vital interests lie and what we must do to promote them; the heart problem of national security is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts; the career service should be made better training grounds for posts of national security leadership; needless barriers in the way of private citizens called to national duty should be removed.

President Kennedy lauded the findings. It must be agreed that the country is indebted to the Jackson subcommittee. The administration should set about at once to carry out the findings, prodding Congress where its cooperative action is required.

The most important development should be an aggressive State Department, thinking ahead of the Soviets instead of just reacting to their moves.

[From the Bellingham Herald, Nov. 28, 1961]
STATE DEPARTMENT NEEDS GOOD MEN, NOT NEW MACHINERY

We don't know if the findings of the Senate subcommittee on National Policy Machinery had anything to do with President Kennedy's decision to shake up the State Department, but the timing and direction of the report and its reaction in the press indicate there may be some connection.

Of course there has been speculation for months about the role of Undersecretary Chester Bowles and the fact that his assignments and apparent interests have not coincided with the normal administrative emphasis associated with his title.

At any rate, Bowles is out and George W. Ball is in. At the same time, Walt Whitman Rostow, deputy special assistant to the President for national security affairs, has been named State Department counselor and chairman of its Policy Planning Council.

The subcommittee has been holding hearings for some time on the general subject "Organizing for National Security," with the operations of State, Defense and the National Security Council under scrutiny. The parent group is the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the subcommittee has been headed by Washington's Senator JACKSON, with HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, MUSKIE, of Maine, MUNDT, of South Dakota, and JAVITS, of New York, as members.

The San Francisco Chronicle notes that the subcommittee found the State Department "wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems" rather than looking ahead in foreign policy. According to the Chronicle, it is one thing to belabor State in general simply because the field of foreign affairs is not in satisfactory condition. "The Department gets too much of that criticism. But far from dismissible with a wave of the hand is Senator JACKSON's severe and specific indictment. We take the President's praise for it as a hopeful sign that something will be done about this report."

The Wall Street Journal points to JACKSON's statement that correction of past U.S. policy failures will not come through radical additions to our existing policy machinery. "The heart problem of national security is getting our best people into key foreign and defense posts," the Senator declares. "More often than not, poor decisions are traceable

not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom."

We say amen to that. Not because we have any special knowledge of the State Department, but because it is a truism that may be observed on every level of government or business. It is not so much the title or manner in which the executive operates. It is the caliber of the man involved and the way he operates that determines the effectiveness of any agency.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 28, 1961]

SHIFTS AT STATE

President Kennedy's first major reorganization, it is interesting to note, involves neither policy nor structure but people. In his own language, the State Department shifts are intended to "provide a more effective matching of people with responsibilities."

The changes announced Sunday might well have been made with the November 15 report of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in mind. That report declared:

"State is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership.

"State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. The Policy Planning Council is not now in the mainstream of policymaking.

"State needs more officials who are good executive managers—and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems which now engage the Department. The administration of foreign policy has become 'big business.' This places a high premium on the ability to manage large-scale enterprises—to make decisions promptly and decisively, to delegate, and to monitor.

"This need for 'take charge' men is particularly urgent down through the Assistant Secretary level and at our large missions abroad. Round pegs in square holes are a luxury we cannot afford."

The transfer of three important members of the White House executive staff to State comes close to being a structural or organizational change, but whether personal or structural it is a good thing. The ambivalent arrangement the President initially set up might have worked, but if it had worked it would have been a triumph of genius over logic. Walt W. Rostow, who now becomes counselor to the Department and head of the policy planning staff, is in precisely the slot he should occupy in the administration. Richard N. Goodwin and Frederick G. Dutton also are properly located where they can discharge line responsibilities. The White House establishment will continue to have McGeorge Bundy to rely on. The previous arrangement seemed ideally calculated to create second-guessing and jurisdictional overlapping.

W. Averill Harriman has earned the job of Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs by his skill and tact in handling the delicate policy problems entrusted to him. Brooks Hays moves to the White House in accord with his own wishes. Other changes seem practical and logical.

Displacement of Chester Bowles as Under Secretary of States will dismay many of the administration's friends. It will also distress leaders in many countries who have come to look upon the amiable Under Secretary as a warm, sympathetic, and understanding friend. The President has appointed Mr. Bowles as his special representa-

tive and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs. He is well equipped for that role, and it is to be hoped that pains will be taken to see that he undertakes his mission with such unmistakable marks of the Government's confidence that he can be effective and useful. His influence and ability should not be lost to the Government, and it need not be lost if it is made clear that Mr. Bowles himself is not altogether to blame because his genius and that of his immediate colleagues did not mesh.

The Jackson committee has widely pointed out that "faulty machinery" is seldom the culprit when policies are not satisfactory. The trouble is rather "absence of a clear sense of direction and coherence of policy at the top of the Government." The committee traced wrong decisions, not to machinery but "to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom."

It is to be hoped that the President now has the right people in the policymaking spots in the State Department. He has moved with energy and dispatch to put them there and has not hesitated, in the face of inevitable criticism, to move to correct initial mistakes of assignment and organization.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Nov. 28, 1961]

IT'S PEOPLE, NOT ORGANIZATION, THAT COUNT IN POLICYMAKING

Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, has for 2 years headed a Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery seeking to find out how our Government is staffed and organized to meet the challenge of world communism. Basic question was this: "Can free societies outplan, outperform, outlast—and if need be—outsacrifice totalitarian systems?"

The answer JACKSON comes up with is "yes." He attaches only the proviso of Robert Lovett, a notable witness before the subcommittee: "We must be willing to do our best."

When the Kennedy administration took office it was critical of some machinery through which Government was taking policy action—of various committees, the National Security Council, large planning staffs, etc.

So were some witnesses before the subcommittee. Some suggested a first secretary to stand between the President and his advisers and the confusing complex of departments and boards and committees. Through experience the administration has come to look with more favor on existing machinery. JACKSON, in the final report of his subcommittee, reveals why.

The major problem of policymaking is not in the machinery itself but in finding the best possible personnel. As JACKSON put it, "poor decisions are traceable not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom." Faulty machinery "is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum."

Not that Government machinery can't be improved. It can always be simplified. Deadwood committees and personnel should be weeded out. Overstaffing can be avoided. Needless barriers to bringing top men into Government need to be removed—such as unnecessarily complicated and burdensome conflict-of-interest laws. Planning can be improved. Congress can change its methods. It should look at a problem in its completeness instead of piecemeal as it does now when different committees handle matters relating to national security, decide on priorities and approve financing.

But it all comes down to people. We need the best we can get and then need to give them the opportunity to do their best. This may seem a simple conclusion for a 2-year study. But it is an important and basic one. All too often leaders tend to believe that by some miracle of organization the inadequacies of personnel can be overcome.

[From the Economist, Dec. 2, 1961]

SPANNERS IN GOVERNMENT

After the last great war the way the American Government handled its national security policies—on defense, foreign politics, and economics—was reorganized to reflect the lessons that had been learnt during the struggle. But, as the cold war has become semipermanent, there have been many doubts about whether even this new machinery provides the planning, flexibility, and coordination to enable the right decisions to be taken in time, and many changes have been proposed. Two years ago the Senate established a Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, under Senator JACKSON, to find out how well the Government is organized and manned to meet the challenge from the Communist world. The committee's staff was able; its members included Senators HUMPHREY, JAVITS, MUNDT, and MUSKIE; its approach was nonpartisan; and its witnesses amounted to a rollcall of many of the most distinguished public servants America has had: Mr. Lovett, Mr. Kennan, Mr. Harriman, General Taylor, and Mr. Nitze among others. Their testimony makes enthralling reading.

Last week, just before the Government changes were announced, Senator JACKSON issued a personal "final statement" with which other members of the subcommittee are expected to agree. Its major conclusion is that no new machinery is needed and that any proposal to add to what exists should be examined with the utmost skepticism; in particular, committee-killing, rather than committee-creating, should be the order of the day. (In this respect and a few others the President has already taken the committee's advice.) But the machinery needs to be used better; it is plain that the subcommittee considers that the National Security Council was allowed to become too large and overinstitutionalized and to deal too often with routine matters under President Eisenhower, and that it should be confined to presenting the President with major alternatives of policy. The authority of the Secretary of State (who in the American system is the President's principal adviser in the foreign field) should be clearer and his effectiveness greater; this apparently answers those who advocate a "First Secretary" to share the President's load.

Senator JACKSON, who thinks that the main problem is to get the best possible people into the important jobs, finds a good deal to criticize on this score. For one thing the Government is, he says, overstuffed; the real crime is not that this wastes money but that it wastes the time and energies of the men who are really doing the work. Higher salaries are needed to attract good people; better training arrangements are needed to give them breadth of view and of experience; and it should be made easier to bring in distinguished men from outside by relaxing and modernizing the conflict-of-interest laws. Finally, Senator JACKSON argues that a stronger Bureau of the Budget would help the President to establish an order of national priorities and that Congress, whose dealing with matters of national security is dangerously fragmented, should improve its own organization.

[From the Foreign Service Journal, January 1962]

BALANCE SHEET FOR 1961

As in most years, the past year brought new demands on the Foreign Service and

changes in organization and personnel practices designed to enable it better to meet these demands. The first year of a new administration is a time of testing of many new ideas and people. Also, 1961 was no exception to this pattern.

Three new agencies have come into being. New forms and methods of foreign assistance will, with congressional blessing, be vigorously pursued by AID. The Peace Corps has been born. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) has begun its important work.

To insure the coordination of the activities of these agencies both at home and abroad, the authority of the Secretary of State over them has been made clear. The Foreign Service, on its part, must do all within its power to support their activities. This will require, in particular, a much closer integration of effort, especially in Washington and in the substantive areas of our embassies, than has existed heretofore between the Service and ICA-AID.

Ways of formulating policy have also undergone changes which have strengthened the leadership of the Secretary of State. The passing of the Operations Coordinating Board and the Planning Board of the National Security Council, together with the new emphasis on forward policy planning at the Bureau level of the Department, are illustrative.

But—in the words of Chairman JACKSON of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery—"the heart of national security is not reorganization—it is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts."

It is to the quality of personnel that we must look to make a prognosis on the future effectiveness of the Foreign Service. Here some progress was made in 1961, yet much remains to be done.

As far as the Service itself is concerned, significant legislative amendments were won on Capitol Hill and will undoubtedly make both conditions of service and career opportunities more attractive. The successful inauguration of personnel exchange programs with the Treasury and Defense Departments strengthens an important aspect of training. Also to be welcomed are a number of steps designed to place more responsibility on the embassies generally and upon the Mission Chief in particular. By wise decision, this year's budgetary problem will not disturb the vital recruitment of FSO's-8, nor affect the established selection-out process.

Senator JACKSON's terminal report mentions a number of things which need attention in 1962 and beyond. We agree with him that the Department and the Foreign Service need "more officials who are good executive managers and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems." Insofar as it may be directed at us, we are concerned by his criticism that "our career services are not producing enough officials with the large executive talents, the breadth of experience, and the width of perspective needed in top foreign policy and defense posts." Hopefully, 1962 will see the Department and all its associated components make progress comparable to that achieved in 1961.

MONTANAN—WORLD'S TOP COWBOY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the western section of this country has for many years been associated with bucking broncs, cowboys, and Indians. Today, the Indians no longer ride the plains, true cowboys are hard to find, and the bucking broncs are rapidly being surrounded by rodeo corrals. Nevertheless, a Montanan has again taken the title as the world's champion cowboy.

Benny Reynolds of Melrose, Mont., has won the famous RCA—Rodeo Cowboy Association—all-around title, at Dallas, Tex. Benny comes from a long line of rodeo performers; in fact he has been riding in rodeos since he was 5 years old. The last Montanan to win the title was Bill Linderman, of Red Lodge, Mont., winner of the title on two occasions, 1950 and 1953.

Riding the rodeo circuit is an exciting world to the young and the old. A feature story which appeared in the January 7, 1962, issue of the Great Falls Tribune gives a glimpse of the life and experiences of the Nation's top cowboy, Benny Reynolds. Mr. President, I ask that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MONTANA'S BENNY REYNOLDS, TOP COWBOY—WINNER OF RCA ALL-AROUND TITLE COMES FROM FAMILY OF RODEO PERFORMERS

(By 'Tana Mac)

One of the riding Reynolds family of Melrose rode right to the top of the rodeo world and brought Montana another world's champion cowboy title.

Twenty-five-year-old Benny Reynolds, who was reared on a ranch on Moose Creek about 7½ miles from Melrose, went into the National Finals Rodeo at Dallas, Tex., a week ago with a good lead over his nearest competitors for the all-around cowboy championship of the Rodeo Cowboys Association.

When the final event was completed, Reynolds had boosted his 1961 winnings to \$31,309 for a clear claim to the title. He went into the Dallas finals with regular season winnings of \$28,698.

Reynolds is a big, easygoing man—he is 6 feet, 3 inches tall and weighs 195 pounds. He's got a ready smile and he likes to meet people, although he's a bit on the bashful side.

His size and weight are an advantage in steer wrestling, but other cowboys say his long legs may be a handicap in spurring a bucking bronc.

He entered the National Finals in steer wrestling, in which he won \$9,128 during the regular season, and bareback bronc riding, which earned him \$8,856 prior to the finals. He also competes, and earns money, during the regular season in saddle bronc events and bull riding.

Benny wasn't the only Montana cowboy to bring home a title from the national finals. Ronnie Rossen, 24, of Broadus won the RCA bull riding championship.

The last time the RCA all-around cowboy championship was won by a Montanan was in 1953, when Bill Linderman won it. Linderman, of the famous Red Lodge rodeo family, also won the title in 1950.

Benny's boyhood on the Moose Creek ranch was good training for the rodeo world. His father, Frank, ran cattle and horses in the rough mountain country that surrounds the Moose Creek Valley.

That range not only afforded adventure for a boy, but it demanded riding skill to chase cattle and horses over the rugged terrain.

Those Reynolds horses were not all saddle horses, either, which had a lot to do with Benny's and his brothers learning how to ride well. Frank Reynolds staged many smalltown rodeos and he had a good string of bucking horses to keep the family in top riding condition.

Benny and his brothers, Johnny and Louis, often rode these broncs to school. All that was needed to encourage the horses to buck

was a tight flank strap or a sudden jab of the spurs.

Benny well remembers one of the first horses he rode to school in Melrose. It was a small, well-built animal that had the temperament of a mule. It wouldn't offer to buck, strike, or kick, but it would suddenly balk.

When it planted its four legs wide and refused to take another step, no amount of coaxing would make it move until it was of a mind to do so. If another member of the family was on hand, a few applications with a quirt on the rump of the bottle-raised, spoiled horse might make it change its mind, but Ben's application of reins or whip never was enough.

"What'll I do if I'm alone and it balks?" Benny demanded of his father.

"I suppose you could get off and build a fire under it," Frank offered.

Benny could appreciate this type of humor that was so much a part of the family life. Yet sometimes people outside the family failed to see the joke.

Between the balky horse and a cow that hated to be milked, Benny was sometimes late for school.

"What's your reason today, Benny?" the teacher demanded one morning.

"Well, ma'am," Benny explained, "the cow's teat was sore."

Benny's father, Frank, who was himself a topflight cowboy, never believed that members of his family should be slaves to work. They never missed a rodeo. They could always take time out to visit when company came, and they had many visitors. The family had a host of friends, and many cowboys came for advice on how to ride. Because Frank never forgot a bronc, cowboys were always asking him to coach them on how to ride certain horses.

Benny was performing in rodeos when he was 5 years old, riding calves. He didn't always make a ride, but soon he was able to stay on until the calf quit bucking. As he says, "I just grew up in rodeo. I've been around it all my life."

No member of the riding Reynolds family was ever limited to one horse. The family owned too many horses for that, and they were always trading horses, with the result that they had all kinds, some with thoroughbred blood, some with Morgan, some with the strain of the quarter horse. As the boys grew older and began going with girl friends, they often made the girls presents of a horse.

"I ain't never gonna give Idaho away," John would say of a favorite brown gelding he rode. But he did, and the recipient was usually a member of the fair sex. It little mattered to him if he gave the same horse to two or three girls.

Yet the family, although they traded often, still formed lasting affection for some of their horses. There was the bay mare that the boys called "Goofy" that Frank would never trade. She was a thoroughbred, a race mare that gave birth to beautiful colts. She had at one time injured her head on a starting gate, and as a result she continually threw her head in nervousness when under saddle, yet she was a fast, gentle animal.

But the boys gave her the name Goofy for trying to go through a fence with Louis at a race meet at Dillon. She had seen someone open a gate on the far end of the track, and before the race was over, she tried to go through the gate, which had been closed by then. Fortunately, the injury to Louis was only a wrenched hip.

Today, Benny takes great pride in his own saddle stock, and his affection for his horses is similar to that of his brother, Louis. Ben remembers the day Louis and he were chasing horses on Chicken Creek, and the lovely mare Louis was riding and gentling for someone else fell in gopher hole and broke her neck. Louis was ill for the remainder of

the week. Not only was he shaken up physically, his grief went deeper.

Benny tried to imitate the riding ability of his father and mother, who had been Gertrude Schmidt before her marriage, but he also had his two brothers, John and Louis, to emulate.

John's name had stood among the top 10 cowboys in the Nation in saddle bronc riding. Too, he had ridden the world's champion bucking horse, Trall's End, in one of the finest rides ever executed on the horse. This was in Montana, at one of Oral Zumwalt's shows at Livingston 2 years ago.

After the whistle blew, John bucked off, and the horse, stumbling on the buck rein, rolled end over end, but missed crushing the tall cowboy, who at the time he made the sensational ride was suffering with a spinal injury.

John has not contested in the past 16 months due to this injury. Louis has not followed the circuit, either, for the past several years, because he is running his own cattle ranch out of Dillon.

Unlike his brothers, however, who started rodeo competition early in life and were champions before they were 16 years of age, Benny was slow commencing to ride in RCA shows. Instead, he took part in all the jackpot rodeos he could enter until he had perfected the finer points of staying on the hurricane deck of a pitching bronc. In the amateur circles, he began taking first money. Coaching him, in addition to his brothers, were his stepfather, Donal Smith of Melrose, and Smoky Beldon, former Wild West show rider for Tim McCoy.

The year prior to following big time rodeo, Ben rode in all the amateur shows staged by Horace Raty. The fine broncs of Raty's shows—horses like Scar Face and Tipperary—gave Ben the final schooling he needed. It was the following year, 1958, when the RCA announced Reynolds had won the Rookie Cowboy of the Year award.

But he received greater national attention that season when he became a hero on television's "Name That Tune." His earnings from that show were almost equivalent to his earnings in rodeo, and made him the idol of thousands of young would-be and genuine cowboys.

Youngsters all over the Nation sent in names for Benny's horse, the winning name receiving for its youthful entrant a prize pony. That particular year, Benny stood second in the Nation for world's all-around champion cowboy, Jim Shoulders edging him out by a slim margin.

The early spring of this year, Benny began to take a big lead in the all-around category, and he consistently held that lead throughout the year. In Montana, Benny won top honors at four of the State's biggest rodeos: Great Falls, Butte, Dillon, and Missoula.

One of his best purses, however, was claimed at Albuquerque, N. Mex., where in four events he walked off with a grand total of \$2,128. He gave a fine accounting of himself at other top rodeos like Denver, Douglas, Wyo., and San Francisco.

Last spring Benny was married to a Texas girl who has her own cattle ranch and raises registered quarter horses. Benny also has ranch investments.

There's a story about Benny that may explain his rise to the world's rodeo championship.

One of those calves that Benny rode when he was a little shaver threw him hard. Pete Crump, a veteran rodeo hand, gave Benny an ice cream cone to take away the hurt.

Benny dashed back to the chutes and demanded he be given another calf to ride.

"Think you can ride this one?" the chute boss kidded.

"Nope, I don't think I can ride him but I might get another ice cream cone," chirped Benny.

So perhaps ice cream cones, not prize money, started Benny on the championship trail.

SENATOR SMATHERS' VISIT TO LATIN AMERICA ON A FACTFINDING TOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the best traveled and most knowledgeable Members of the Senate with respect to affairs in Latin America is the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. This fall, in pursuance of his official duties, he made an exhausting and worthwhile trip to Mexico and Central America on a fact-finding tour as chairman of the Senate Latin American Trade Subcommittee, and a member of the Senate Commerce and Finance Committees. Following is a set of seven articles concerning his trip published in Florida's leading newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent that the results of his findings on that trip be incorporated at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of the Senate.

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

[Dec. 6, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 1

(By Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS)

MEXICO CITY.—The Mexican man in the street is having serious second thoughts about Fidel Castro * * * and he may be getting ready to turn his back on the Cuban dictator, forever.

For the United States this is important because Mexico—Latin America's second largest country in population—exerts a powerful political and economic influence on the entire hemispheric system of nations.

It is always exhilarating to visit Mexico City, this bustling, sprawling metropolis of 4.6 million people, second only to New York in population among all the great cities of the New World.

Even now, bright Christmas decorations are being strung across the broad, tree-lined boulevards, a reminder of the country's deeply religious traditions, and a sharp contrast to the poisoned philosophy the Communists seek to spread in ever-increasing doses.

In the massive ideological assault that Castro has leveled against this nation of 36 million people, he has had the full cooperation and the seemingly endless resources of the Soviet Union's huge Mexico City embassy. Its hundred-man staff is large enough to take care of the Soviet's diplomatic business in every country of Latin America—if that were the Soviet's goal. (By way of example, every member of the Soviet Embassy here is a Russian citizen. In contrast, more than one-half of the employees of the American Embassy are Mexican.)

Last year the Soviets spent \$11 million in Mexico for propaganda, much of it tied into the Castro pattern, compared to less than a million for our entire information program in this vital country. This \$11 million does not include the active participation in pro-Communist propaganda activities carried out by the Czech and Cuban Embassies here.

Each week 7 tons of Russian-produced, Spanish language propaganda—textbooks, comics, movie films, slick magazines, newspapers—are unloaded from planes from Moscow, then sent to the Soviet Embassy and thereafter widely distributed. In remote village schools, as well as the national university, textbooks, laced with sly Communist propaganda, are distributed free to thousands

of trusting students, too poor to buy their own schoolbooks.

I learned just today that last year the Soviet Union gave all-expense, 6-year scholarships to 150 Mexican students, to study in Moscow at the so-called Friendship University. Next year the Reds will grant 500 of these propaganda scholarships to Mexican youths. Five thousand applications are on file for such Soviet scholarships. On the other hand, the United States provided only 14 part-time scholarships for Mexican students to American universities last year, with 1,200 competing for the awards.

I was told that one night recently moviegoers all over Mexico paid premium prices to buy tickets for a special premier of a new Mexican film. The proceeds went to a national children's charity. Audiences were surprised to discover that immediately preceding the Mexican film a 30-minute Russian-made movie was shown, technically perfect, and masterful as a piece of Red propaganda.

Obviously, the battle against the Castro-Communist-attempted penetration of democratic Mexico is far from over.

Castro has the backing of powerful leftist elements on the Mexican political scene. Former President Lazaro Cardenas, who has made himself a hero to many of Mexico's 14 million peasants, is sought as an ally by the Castroites.

But there are bright sides, too. Within the last few days, hundreds of thousands of Mexicans who had hopefully looked upon Castro as some sort of social reformer who could export his promise of a better life for all were shocked to read Castro's boast: "I am a Marxist-Leninist and will be one until the day I die."

Now the Castro mask is off and reaction, in some quarters at least, has been swift.

Said former Mexican President Miguel Aleman: "We don't want communism or any other ism that will interfere with the institutional life of our country."

There are other Mexicans, too, many thousands of them, who have realized all along that the Castro revolution was a fraud.

And that is helpful, for the danger of Castroism in Mexico is not that it triggers off occasional antigovernment demonstrations or promotes anti-American slogans. Its real threat lies in the fact that it attempts to inject Marxism into Mexico's grassroots revolution, launched half a century ago and still going on. Castro's aim has been to subvert and destroy the Mexican revolution and bring about the ultimate loss of liberty for the people of this vibrant country.

That is what happened in Cuba. This is what Castro plans for Mexico.

Castro in Cuba rallied the people with false promises of liberty and justice. But when the black curtain was drawn back Castro had enslaved his people, stolen their liberty, deprived them of their religion, and killed many of those who opposed him.

Millions of Mexicans—probably the majority—have been appalled by Castro's admission—his bloody excesses and tyranny. They now see clearly that the revolution which Castro speaks about is not the same kind that the Mexicans had and believe in and revere.

Tonight I look forward to a meeting with the President of Mexico, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, and in my next article I will give you my impressions of the meeting.

[Dec. 7, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 2

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

MEXICO CITY.—No one can expect to visit Mexico and return home with simple answers.

Mexico is as complicated as it is beautiful. Its history and culture have resulted from the melding of ancient Indian civilizations

overlaid with five centuries of a Spanish conquistadore-type civilization and, more recently, the impact of an intense rebirth of Indian nationalization. This leads to seeming contradictions and inconsistencies in programs and policies of the government.

This was never more evident than in the recent vote cast by Mexico at the meeting of representatives of the Organization of American States which sought collective inter-American action against Fidel Castro.

At that meeting a resolution was offered by Colombia, which called for a January meeting of the foreign ministers of the OAS to determine a course of collective action on Cuba.

Fourteen nations, including the United States, voted in favor of the resolution; five nations abstained. Only Cuba and Mexico voted against the resolution.

In my meeting here with Manuel Tello, the fatherly, soft-spoken Secretary of Foreign Relations for Mexico, I said: "The people of my country do not understand Mexico's vote, nor do I. Frankly, we are confused."

The benign Foreign Minister, a deeply religious man, leaned across his old-fashioned desk and at some length earnestly explained that Mexico approached this question of OAS action against Cuba from a legalistic, juridical view.

According to Senor Tello, and many other Mexicans, the Rio Treaty, under which collective OAS action against Cuba is proposed, would have to be broadened before such action could be voted by the OAS. He told me that this would necessitate ratification of a broadened Rio Treaty by the Mexican Senate.

But, to my mind, there was probably a much more compelling reason than the juridical one. In 1910, when the Mexican Revolution got underway, there was a serious threat of collective action against it by Argentina, Brazil, and the United States. Action never materialized, but Mexicans have never forgotten the threat, and today while following the principles of multiple nation action to meet economic and social problems of the hemisphere, they shy away from any multi-nation action that to them smacks of intervention.

There were three other significant visits in this busy day. I spoke at a luncheon given by the American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico City and discussed with them the proposed U.S. tax on the earnings of American businesses abroad.

I told the businessmen that I am opposed to the tax, since I believe that U.S. companies should not be put in a less favorable competitive position than the firms of countries such as England, France, Germany, and Japan—all of which have important business interests in Mexico.

Free enterprise is a hallmark of our democracy and must be maintained and demonstrated in these rapidly emerging countries of the Western Hemisphere if they are to choose this system over that of government ownership. After a briefing at the Embassy, we had a large and spirited press conference at the Reforma Hotel. Unlike recent years, there was less evidence of the influence and impact of Castroism in the questions asked. I was able to remind some of my questioners that they took me rather seriously to task last year and the year before for my assertions that Castro was a Communist tool and menace and should be fought as tenaciously as one would fight a burglar in his home. Further, I was delighted to get in a few licks on the so-called image of Castro—and the duty of the press, to now report that Castroism was no longer individualistic since his admission of Marxism. It should now be labeled for what it is—complete unadulterated communism.

At 8:30 last night I drove with Tom Mann, our Ambassador, to the residence of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos. There, in his

unpretentious functional office, we discussed many facets of United States-Mexican relations.

The 50-year-old President, a handsome, vibrant man, pointed out that Mexico had sided with the United States and the free world in many recent issues—for example, Mexico voted against Russian demands for a troika secretaryship in the United Nations, for the U.S. position of strength and no retreat at Berlin, and other vital and important Free World issues. While the matter was not discussed with the President, nevertheless, in talking with him and other officials and the so-called man in the street, I leave Mexico with the feeling that they will vote with us against the admission of Red China to the United Nations and that, since Castro's admission of long-time Communist beliefs, there is growing unhappiness over their vote with Cuba at the Organization of American States meeting.

It will be interesting to see what Mexico does when the OAS foreign ministers meet in Washington January 10 to vote on the Cuban question.

My meetings with U.S. Ambassador Thomas C. Mann, both at an informative briefing session at the Embassy, and at a dinner at the residence in the evening, left me with a sense of confidence in his ability and dedication.

His grasp of these many complex Mexican problems—the needs for increased Mexican economic productivity in the light of its rapidly increasing population, the aspirations and the intricacies of the PRX, Mexico's leading political party, which covers the full spectrum from extreme left to extreme right—reveals a man of deep knowledge of the country's psychology and political makeup.

We leave Mexico with the growing impression of a giant awakening—a restless, ambitious giant who is warm and friendly—whose motives are good—but who yet has not quite understood the true struggle and that he is involved in a fight.

[Dec. 8, 1961]

ARTICLE No. 3

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

GUATEMALA CITY.—Seven years ago this capital city and this country were caught behind the Communist iron curtain. Today Guatemala is a free and democratic nation, liberated from the Red grasp—but its problems are far from solved.

Guatemala is a ruggedly beautiful land of 4 million, about the size of Tennessee, and traces its history back to the time of a highly advanced Indian civilization which flourished nearly 2,000 years ago. Well over half of Guatemala's population today is Indian.

Guatemalans proudly boast that their mile-high capital has natural air conditioning the year around. A ring of volcanoes—a few of which are still active—circle the city, jutting upward sharply into the crystal atmosphere.

Without doubt one dominant personality stands out in Guatemala today. He is the President of the Republic—Gen. Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes.

Shortly after arriving by jet from Mexico, and after meeting with our Embassy officials in a briefing session, I visited the Guatemalan President in his mahogany-paneled office in the massive and beautiful Spanish colonial-style national palace.

In the long corridors outside his office a score of Guatemalans of all classes sat on benches, waiting their turn to see the President. There were businessmen, Government officials, and Indian peasants, some of them wrapped in shawls and holding infants in their arms. In the light of the recent violent history in Guatemala and the fact that Ydigoras' predecessor was shot and killed in

the presidential palace, Ydigoras' accessibility to the people is remarkable.

As we entered the office I shook hands with the alert, clear-eyed 67-year-old national leader, whom I had met 2 years ago on my last trip here, and said, "Mr. President, you look fine."

With a wry smile he replied, "I am lean and hungry. One doesn't get fat on hope."

Having been exposed for many years to the subtle amenities of Latin American political figures, this directness was surprising and refreshing.

The President went on to say that not all Latin American countries are alike—that each has its special problems. He asked that the United States give careful attention to the unique problems of his country, and that we give sympathetic consideration to its pressing needs.

Guatemala's plight is linked directly to the recent Communist domination of the country, under the Red puppet Jacobo Arbenz who tyrannized Guatemala from 1951 to 1954. For several years before that there had been a softening-up process, when the country was controlled by a self-dubbed "spiritual socialist" president, Juan Jose Arevalo.

The Communist reign of terror, instituted by Arbenz, came to a sudden and dramatic end in 1954, when Col. Castillo Armas led a revolution which overthrew the Reds.

Castillo Armas himself became president and was on his way to leading the country on the road back to democracy when assassinated by one of his trusted guards. Then Ydigoras was elected president.

The memory of the frightful killings and torturing, ordered by Arbenz, may have softened with time, but as President Ydigoras solemnly pointed out yesterday, although he and Castillo Armas wiped out the Communist cells in the country, some of the evil roots still fester just below the surface. Years of Communist indoctrination are not easily swept aside.

The Communists still greedily eye Guatemala. It was the first Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere and the only nation in the world ever to escape from Communist control.

Arbenz is today in communism's Cuba, where he plots to seize control of Guatemala again. Nightly broadcasts from Cuba, beamed to Guatemala, promise to "liberate" the country and "return it to the Red fold."

The President, in good English, told me that there are Castro agents constantly at work in his country and that hundreds of thousands of dollars are funneled in from Cuba through Mexico for use by Red subversion experts.

Ydigoras asserted that there are Communist military forces being trained in Cuba and on the Yucatan Peninsula for an invasion of Guatemala.

But Guatemala's leader is not idle. A vigorous man of action, he has rallied his own people, sought to alert Central America to the Communist's designs against every free government.

Guatemala was the first hemispheric nation to break off relations with Cuba. Since then the United States and nine Latin American countries have followed suit. Now Ydigoras has taken the fight one step further. He has proposed that the Central American nations set up a military alliance for mutual security against communism.

I was flattered when the President quoted from a recent Senate speech of mine, in which I suggested the establishment of a NATO-type inter-American military organization to deal effectively and directly with the Castro menace. He has gone beyond the talking stage of such a plan, and is now seeking basic agreements with his neighboring nations to translate the idea into action.

But Ydigoras doesn't spend all of his days brooding about Castro. There are wars to

be waged against poverty and economic underdevelopment, as he knows well.

He has been a leader in setting up a common market for Central America, which is already reaping benefits. Last year, for the first time, the Central American nations exchanged \$30 million worth of goods, and old and unrealistic trade barriers which walled off one country from another—to their mutual disadvantage—are beginning to fall away.

There are other hopeful signs. Guatemala has pushed its exportation of frozen beef to the \$1 million-a-year mark. Under a new industrialization law 210 new factories have been established in the country within the past 3 years. Roads, irrigation projects, and schools are being built—30 new schools will be dedicated within the next month. Many of the latter programs were helped by U.S. foreign aid to Guatemala and the people of this country are grateful.

But Guatemala has economic dilemmas too. Within the last few years the price of Guatemalan coffee—by far its largest money crop for export—has slumped from \$70 a hundred pounds to a little more than \$20.

Two fierce tropical storms last year devastated millions of dollars worth of crops, and all parts of the country have felt the pinch.

I left the hour-and-a-half interview with President Ydigoras with this feeling: Guatemala is a country beset by many problems. It has come through a stormy period of Communist domination and now stands with the free governments of the Western Hemisphere. It has a great potential. It has a vigorous, enlightened leader. It is a nation deserving of our assistance.

[Dec. 9, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 4

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA.—Twenty miles northwest of this capital city, across a dusty, tortuous mountain road, an old Nicaraguan carpenter teaches school beneath a sheltering tree.

His pupils are seven barefooted peasant children. They sit on a long bench, facing their teacher at his kitchen table-desk. While the children diligently trace their first letters on pieces of slate the carpenter-teacher goes to the front of his workshop where he laboriously turns a piece of wood on an ancient hand-powered lathe.

An American visitor who came upon the scene, asked the carpenter how it happened he was teaching school.

The old man explained that the village school was already filled, and that further, his students were the children of poor people, unable to provide books and paper for their offspring.

He said: "I am not well-educated myself. But I thought that these children should at least be taught to read and write."

With these words the old carpenter summed up the burning aspiration of most of his countrymen—the desire for education.

But the road to that goal is a hard one. In this country of mountains and plains, lying between the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean, 63 percent of its 1.4 million people cannot read and write. In some remote villages 95 percent of the people are illiterate.

When I arrived here yesterday I agreed with our Ambassador, Aaron Brown, that in the field of primary education the United States can make an important and lasting contribution to help this country solve many of its basic problems.

Ignorance breeds poverty, denies people the chance to gain a better life, keeps them tied to a primitive economic system, and makes them ready targets of the false promises of communism.

U.S. foreign aid, under the Alliance for Progress, has made primary education one of its main goals in Nicaragua.

But the education problem is massive, and U.S. aid can only serve as a catalyst to cause the Nicaraguans themselves to embark on a meaningful education program.

Today, even though the Nicaraguan Government spends 20 percent of its budget on education, this is far from enough money to meet the needs. Education for all Nicaraguans is linked to the depressed national income, which has suffered from falling market prices for its agricultural exports.

There is another problem. Nicaragua is the largest of the six Central American countries—about the size of Indiana, but has a population not much bigger than that of Dade County, Fla. As a result, much of the good land is not as yet under cultivation.

Last night at a dinner in the Embassy residence, situated on a hilltop overlooking Managua, I discussed the land problem with a cross-section of the country's business and government leaders.

They told me that a comprehensive land reform law is now before the National Congress, which would create an agrarian institute to further land settlement.

The agrarian institute would see that farmers who cultivate a plot of public land for a year or more would be given title to a 125-acre tract without charge, and have the opportunity to buy the balance of the land they till.

Nicaraguans are also seeking to increase the quality and quantity of their beef production. Yesterday, on a tour of a ranch near the capital I saw a herd of Brahmin cattle, the same breed which has proved so successful in Florida. Cattlemen here are hopeful of a bright future.

To me these steps indicate that progress is being made with some of the country's agricultural problems.

On another subject, I learned from several sources that although the Communist Party is outlawed in Nicaragua, its underground agents are hard at work. They have infiltrated the labor unions, intellectual groups, and the national university. In a country where most of the people can neither read nor write, the spoken word becomes most powerful and Castro's radio transmitters steadily bombard the Nicaraguan air with Communist propaganda.

At the start of the 20th century Nicaragua was seething with unrest as rival political parties fought for power. The country was burdened with mountainous debts.

In 1912, U.S. Marines landed to restore order, beginning an era of occupation which lasted until 1933.

As an interesting sidelight, the Marines introduced baseball to the country and today it is the national sport.

In 1936, Anastasio Somoza came to power and ruled as a strong-man president until his assassination in 1957. Most observers termed Somoza a dictator.

Somoza was killed 5 months before the national elections of 1957 and his son, Luis Somoza, a graduate of Louisiana State University, and the then president of the national congress, assumed the presidency. Five months later he was elected in his own right.

In 1959 a constitutional amendment was adopted, prohibiting the succession of President Somoza at the end of his term in 1963, or of any member of his family to the fourth degree of consanguinity.

The President's brother, General Anastasio Somoza, Jr., a graduate of West Point, is chief of the nation's national guard.

The Somoza brothers head the Liberal Party, which is actively and openly opposed by the Conservative Party. Fortunately, the leadership of both parties is anti-Communist, and friendly to the United States.

Nicaragua is a land of great potential. Much of its abundant natural resources have not yet been fully developed, and its fertile lands offer bright promises. However, its political future is in doubt, and the next few years will be critical ones in Nicaragua's history.

[Dec. 11, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 5

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

PANAMA CITY.—"I dare Panama to break off relations with Cuba."

This challenge, flung out by Dictator Fidel Castro, was headlined across the front page of Panama newspapers as I arrived here. But to most Panamanians Castro's shout was one of desperation.

Everywhere I have been in this ancient, Pacific coast city I have asked people for their views on Castro. Said a leading political figure: "The people of Panama are sick and tired of Fidel Castro."

His view was shared by most of those with whom I talked. The aura of Castro's appeal to Latin America's destitute and impoverished is fast waning. His cynical promises, made 3 years ago, to give the masses a chance for a new life, have been drowned out by the fusillades of Red execution squads.

Millions of Latin Americans have shuddered in revulsion at the brutality of Castro's dictatorship.

Two years ago the cry of Fidelistas stirred thousands in this smallest of Central American nations. Today Castro may still hold the ideological support of isolated pockets of people here, but his image as a Robin Hood savior of the impoverished is shattered forever.

A few days ago Panama's chargé d'affaires in Havana was recalled for consultation, and yesterday the National Assembly overwhelmingly adopted a resolution calling for an immediate diplomatic break with Castro.

However, in Panama as in the United States, foreign policy is carried out by the Government's executive branch, under President Roberto Chiari.

Last night I met with the President, an alert, softspoken man, in the Presidential Palace. He nostalgically recalled having lived there as a boy, some 35 years ago, when his father served as President. The palace setting for our meeting was serene, but not too many years ago several men had been killed in this very building, during a bloody uprising.

The President, who speaks English, is a staunch friend of the United States, and an anti-Communist who is well aware of the Castro menace. Panama, 2 years ago, was the target of an invasion force launched from Cuba under Communist direction. The invaders were captured shortly after the landing but Panamanians remember this blow at their security and the affront to their national dignity.

The National Assembly vote has put great pressure on the President to break now with Castro, but he must consider another factor. On January 10 the Organization of American States will hold a vital meeting to decide what collective action it will take against Castro. Panama could be the host nation for the conference, and the Panamanian President might well not want to be put into the position of slamming the door in Castro's face at this time, and give Castro a built-in excuse for boycotting the OAS conference.

Earlier, at a luncheon meeting the affable Ricardo Arias, a former Ambassador to the United States who was defeated in the last presidential election and is now a leader of opposition to President Chiari's political party, spoke to me of his own party's anti-Communist and pro-United States posture.

However, even though the Reds have been outlawed in Panama since 1953, hard-core Communists are active underground, and have infiltrated influential student groups and labor unions.

Encouragingly, the Panamanian Government has dealt effectively with floods of Red propaganda and subversive material spewing into this country from Cuba.

The Panama Canal, which cuts a rugged swath across the isthmus linking North and South America, obviously has a great impact here. Panama's history as a Republic dates from the beginning of the canal.

When the canal was opened to world shipping in 1914, 1,100 boats piled their way across the isthmus. Last year more than 12,000 ships from 39 nations carried 65 million tons of cargo through the waterway, and therein lies a problem.

The canal, a \$400 million manmade wonder of the early 20th century, is rapidly being choked with traffic. In 10 years, tonnage through the canal has soared 75 percent to an all-time high.

Now there is talk of a new, lockless, sea-level canal, built to allow speedy passage and big enough to take any ship in the world. I think it should be built, for reasons of military security as well as economic ones.

It would take 10 years to construct and might cost \$4 billion, but some engineers say atomic explosions could blast a channel from Atlantic to Pacific at half that cost.

Engineers in Colombia and Nicaragua, as well as Panama, are already pouring over charts of their territory, all of them eager to have the canal cut through their nation, if such a canal is ever built.

Because the Panama Canal has existed here for 50 years, Panama's economy has developed far differently than that of other Central American countries.

The country, a lush and fertile land, has not developed its great agricultural potential. Oftentimes fruit and vegetables rot where they grow because there are no farm-to-town roads linking jungle-bound plantations with the seacoast markets.

Discussing the problem with our able Ambassador, Joseph Farland, I learned that he has been cooperating with Panamanian officials to determine the feasibility of a proposed 70-mile road which would link vast inland agricultural lands with the Atlantic coast. The road, if it receives engineering approval, would be built as an alliance for progress project.

The Ambassador, incidentally, a Republican appointed in the last administration and who served as U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, has proven his abilities as an American representative and has been retained by President Kennedy. His sincere, hard-working approach to Panama's problems, and his handshaking, speechmaking tours all over the country have won him the respect and admiration of thousands of Panamanians.

Last night, seated on the veranda of the Presidential Palace, President Chiari reminded me that Panama historically has earned most of its income by servicing and supplying the Panama Canal. Most of its purchases, in a seriously adverse balanced import trade, are made from the United States.

He felt that the country's great agricultural potential could be realized—to the enormous benefit of Panama's 1.1 million people—if consideration were given to her unique relationship with the United States. Markets, he pointed out, must be found for the products Panama wants to grow and produce.

A Cabinet member at his side earnestly nodded in agreement and added: "We don't want handouts from the United States. We

want to develop our resources. If you can help get us the markets we'll take care of ourselves."

[Dec. 14, 1961]

ARTICLE No. 6

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

CURACAO, NETHERLANDS WEST INDIES.—The dateline on this report of my Latin American tour was originally intended to read—Caracas, Venezuela.

However, when I arrived in Panama, my plans were changed. I was informed that the Venezuelan authorities in charge of arrangements for President Kennedy's arrival in Caracas on December 17 believed that—because I was considered a controversial figure in Venezuela—my presence in Caracas might possibly upset the President's visit.

Venezuela obviously is in a tenuous and difficult situation. On previous visits there I saw ample evidence of the strident anti-American groups that are shrilly vocal and difficult to control.

So in an effort to be cooperative and recognizing the tremendous importance of President Kennedy's first visit to Latin America, I gladly acceded to the request and rerouted myself to arrive in this small but virtually important Caribbean island, 40 miles off the Venezuelan Coast.

The shock of suddenly coming upon a Dutch-European type town in the midst of the verdance, the expansiveness and lassitude of the Caribbean is enough to bring anyone up short, gasping for breath and understanding.

Curacao is strikingly different from Latin America. The lush, extravagant foliage of Central America is a startling contrast to this island's barren growth, pushing forth skimpily from the volcanic rock.

But even more vividly contrasted is the habitated areas of both places. Central American cities are sprawling ambivalent affairs, the product of Old Spain and modern pressures—glass-fronted, space-age skyscrapers surrounded by medieval straw and palmetto villages.

Willemstad, the capital of Curacao, is for all purposes, a thriving, neat 18th century Dutch commercial town, set down on a sun-splashed Caribbean finger of land. Never has the name "Dutch cleanser" had such practical meaning as here in this orderly, clean town.

Willemstad's orange and brown gabled roofs subdue the harsh brilliance of the tropical sun. A townsman explained to me that, unlike other Caribbean islands, Curacao's residents use no white colors on the outsides of the buildings they erect, because long ago a Dutch governor's wife was annoyed by the sun's glare off the white buildings and decreed that a more restful color was to be used in all edifices. Thus developed the color of mamaya (pronounced mammy'-ya)—a rusty brown orange color that adorns every building in sight.

Curacao, 38 miles long and only 7 miles wide at its broadest point, was discovered in 1499 by a Spanish navigator who had sailed with Columbus on this first voyage to America. Like so many of the West Indies it knew many masters. The Spanish first, then the Dutch, then the British, but in 1814 at the Treaty of London, the Dutch regained control and have maintained it ever since.

The peglegged Peter Stuyvesant was appointed Governor of Curacao in 1643, and in addition was later made the Governor of the New Netherlands. Through him the island of Curacao was first linked with New Amsterdam, the present New York City.

During the colonial period, this island earned the dubious reputation of being the center of the slave trade in the Caribbean

area. But with the decline of the slave trade early in the 19th century Curacao lost much of its economic importance, and for a century the island lazed along as an unproductive dependency of the Netherlands.

It was not until 1916, when the oil refining industry was established to process oil bubbling forth from nearby Venezuelan wells, that a new era of prosperity and importance began for Curacao.

Today Curacao is—amazingly enough—the world's fourth largest port in terms of tonnage, topped only by New York, London, and Rotterdam. The massive refinery on Curacao, the fifth largest in the world, and an even greater refinery on the neighboring island of Aruba, spew forth millions of gallons of oil to be carried by ships to every part of the world.

Huge tankers, to reach Curacao's harbor and the refinery built on its shore, must steam up a channel which runs directly through the very heart of the city. Passengers aboard the vessels are startled to find themselves sailing in the midst of a sea of Dutch gabled roofs.

One of the New World's wonders is a bobbing pontoon bridge which crosses the downtown channel and which must be towed open by a tugboat each time an oil tanker arrives to load up at the refinery. In spite of the normal order in arrangement of life in Curacao, the resulting traffic jams are as choked as any 5 p.m. auto snarl on a street of a major Florida city.

When the Dutch seized this island and drove off the Spaniards, they also drove off the Indians who had lived here. Thus, when in 1863, slaves in Curacao were given their independence, they became at once freemen and the natives of the island.

Their numbers were made up chiefly from the peoples of five major African tribes. Today many of their descendants, who constitute 85 percent of Curacao's population, speak an unusual dialect—Papiamentu—a mixture of Spanish and Portuguese, flavored with Dutch and English. Papiamentu is spoken in Curacao and the neighboring islands of Aruba and Bonaire, and nowhere else in the world.

Dutch is the official language. However, in the city streets, and in the shops and business offices, I heard English spoken frequently.

I noticed in my hotel room a sign saying: "Fresh water is potable but scarce in Curacao. Please use it sparingly." It reminded me that on my last visit here, because of Florida's interest in salt water conversion, I had seen Curacao's \$11 million saline water distillation plant—the world's biggest—which converts enough sea water daily to provide all of the pure drinking water for the island's 115,000 people.

Yesterday I drove through the city's old and narrow streets to visit Mikve Israel synagogue, the oldest Jewish house of worship in the Western Hemisphere, built in 1732. Later our car climbed the steep and winding hill leading to the handsome American consulate, and there visited with the U.S. Consul General, Mervyn V. Pallister, our country's chief representative in the island. The consulate, and the adjoining consul's residence, commanding an imposing view of Willemstad, were the gift to the United States 11 years ago from the Dutch Government.

Outside my window the Dutch flag flaps in the breeze. Were it not for the fact that I can also see palm trees and tropical plants, I would think I were viewing a typical Dutch city on a warm summer afternoon.

The imprint of the Netherlands tradition is everywhere but the island's natives have a strong national spirit of their own. In recognition of this fact, the Dutch granted Curacao a semiautonomous status in 1954.

There is little unemployment and a thriving economy, resulting from a sound administration, good local government and an educated native population. In general, Curacao is a happy island.

[Dec. 28, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 7

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

Two years ago I wrote in an article, "Latin America, as a Giant Rip Van Winkle, Is Slowly Awakening From a Long Sleep." On my trip just completed to Central America, it was everywhere evident that the giant has indeed awakened. He is getting to his feet—and the direction in which he walks will affect all of us.

The long ignored forces at work in Latin America can no longer be ignored. For surely no one can visit any country south of us, and not feel the burning desire of humble people to better their lot in life—and to accomplish this quickly. For centuries having had little or nothing, these dispirited people see no harm in striving for a change—any change. The idea of change holds out to them hope of improvement.

Fortunately, there are enlightened leaders in Latin America who recognize these pressures—and the danger of not translating them into practical programs of better education, better health and better living through democratic processes and peaceful means.

The problem, of course, varies to a large extent as one goes from country to country. In fact, President Ydigoras Fuentes of Guatemala kept emphasizing the point during our hour and a half discussion that "you North Americans make the mistake of lumping all the Latin American countries together and attributing to them the same problems, solutions and characteristics."

This, of course, is too often the case. We frequently don't distinguish sufficiently between those nations and governments that work toward democracy, for a closer relationship with the United States and a better life for their peoples—and those governments who pretend to be our friends, but who actually play both sides of the street.

There are still other leaders—Castro and the Communists—trading on the long frustrated hopes of the humble people, who promise quick solutions to ancient problems—through revenge, revolution and bloodshed. Fortunately, Castro's excesses have frightened most Latin Americans and at the same time shocked the seekers of the "status quo" into the realization that the aspirations of the large numbers of people can no longer be swept under the rug or suppressed.

In an affirmative effort to improve their economic conditions—five countries of Middle America, with a population of approximately 10 million people, have already set in motion the idea of a common market which will tear down strangling tariff barriers, stimulate the development of industry, and result in an improved economy for the participating countries.

For many years, in the Congress, I have advocated U.S. leadership in the creation of an Inter-American Bank to make development loans exclusively to the countries of this hemisphere. I therefore listened with fascination, at a meeting in Nicaragua, as Mr. Enrique Delgado, who is the first Executive Director of the newly formed Central American Bank, spoke enthusiastically of the low-interest-rate loans that the Bank is already making for new industries in Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, and El Salvador.

There is—in my opinion—a growing cautious optimism over the future of Latin America with its 20 different nations and its 20 sets of complex problems.

The alliance for progress holds the brightest promise for Latin America. Every-

where I went on this recent tour I asked and was asked about it. The responses varied. I'm sure to the vast majority of people the alliance offers great hope. It demonstrates the genuine interest of the United States in helping our neighbors to help themselves. It is a practical approach to the many problems at hand—and it is earnestly supported by most of those who have heard about it.

But, strangely enough, there is also some opposition and criticism of it—springing principally from those groups who for centuries have held the reins of political and economic power in their hands. They don't like the alliance, for it demands a change from the status quo. It requires them to do something to improve the lot of their people in their country.

But, surely, they must help and cooperate in sensible land reform programs. They must pay a fair share of their income in taxes, they must bear a fair share of the burdens of programs for education, sanitation, hospitals and roads.

Many times on the tour I was accosted by Latin American friends of wealth and position—and even by some U.S. businessmen doing business in those countries—who voiced their dislike of the alliance for progress. In reply, I would say to them, "How can we ask the people of my State and the other States to reach into their pockets and pay money to provide an education program for a Latin American country, when the wealthy people here, whose responsibility it really is, are not willing to bear a fair proportion of the burden."

"A far-reaching revolution is underway in Latin America and we shall either help guide it into democratic, free enterprise channels, or else we will watch it explode into Communist dictatorship—where all is lost. Surely, the local people who can contribute have a greater stake in the outcome of this revolution than do we in the United States, even though we have a big stake in the future of Latin America."

Frankly, I like the quid pro quo concept of the alliance for progress, for it says briefly and sternly—we will help you put your house in order, but you must simultaneously demonstrate a willingness to help yourselves, and do so before it is too late.

Fortunately, many of the economically powerful in Latin America recognize the problem for what it is and they are willing to act constructively to solve it. Already in Guatemala, Colombia, and Peru I know of wealthy business groups and vast landholders who are taking the lead in land and tax reform programs. These men applaud the alliance for progress and its objectives. They fully realize that time has run out on the old way of life. They know that if they are to have anything to say about their country in the future they must cooperate now in bringing about conditions whereby they and their countrymen can enjoy a democratic future—a future where all people's rights and personal property are protected and respected.

This is the present hope, that these changes can be accomplished as we replace a program of foreign aid grants based on unbridled idealism, with one of democratic ideals based on solid realism.

The time has long since passed when we can continue to confuse our friends by helping our enemies with the same degree of generosity with which we help our friends. We must begin splicing together our economic and political programs so that negotiating leverage can be obtained in our efforts to bring about reform within democratic institutions as we understand them.

Certainly we need never apologize for this effort on our part of this program.

There are many other recommendations but there is neither the space nor the time to outline them here. This I shall do subse-

quently on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I'm grateful to the editors for this opportunity to report my observations of this recent trip.

ADDRESS BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last night at the annual congressional dinner given by the Women's National Press Club we were privileged to hear what, in my opinion, was one of the greatest and most profound speeches ever given in this Capital City. I refer to the brilliant and moving address of Walter Lippmann.

Every man and woman who was privileged to attend this dinner was, I am safe in saying, deeply moved by Mr. Lippmann's address in which he spelled out the causes of our present day frustrations and confusion. Mr. Lippmann diagnoses the basic cause of these frustrations as being the production of nuclear weapons, which made, for the first time, war an impossible action for rational statesmen to contemplate. For the first time, as President Eisenhower observed, there is no longer any alternative to peace. And because a nuclear war would result in victory for neither side, we are faced with the difficult task of finding new ways of meeting the great issues which confront us, new ways of settling disputes between nations. Mr. Lippmann is of the opinion that the great struggle between Western civilization and the Communists will not be ended within the foreseeable future. In this long and difficult and trying struggle, Mr. Lippmann expresses confidence that the Western World, if its member nations work together and cooperate in a common cause, will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent, magnetic attraction upon Eastern Europe. But, in order for us to succeed, it is necessary for the Western community of nations to act in a positive and progressive fashion with the purpose in mind of building a strong and healthy society. If we only act in a negative fashion and with an obsession of a fear of Russia, Mr. Lippmann is convinced that our future will be bleak indeed.

Let me quote what Mr. Lippmann said on this subject:

We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become a stagnant, neurotic, frightened, and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Mr. President, I only wish that Mr. Lippmann's address could be put into the hands of every American and read by him—indeed by every citizen of the Western World. Let me take this occasion to pay tribute to this great writer, columnist, and political philosopher. His writings and his thoughts receive the great respect to which they are entitled by all who are interested in the future of our society. He is respected and listened to by liberals and conservatives

alike, for his words have meaning to all who believe in a free society and have faith that we can and will build a better world.

We are all greatly indebted to Walter Lippmann, especially those of us who are engaged in the political affairs of the Nation. We respect his judgment and we welcome and appreciate his advice and counsel. In the hectic day-to-day pace we lead as legislators, Walter Lippmann serves to remind us where we stand, of our aspirations, our hopes, and the direction which we travel.

I sincerely hope that we will have the benefit of Mr. Lippmann's counsel and commentaries for many years to come. I believe all my colleagues here in this body would join with me in expressing to this journalist our great respect and affection.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address Walter Lippmann delivered last evening be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

It is an honor, which I greatly appreciate, to be asked to speak on this occasion. It shows how good are the relations between our two national press clubs. It is also a personal kindness. For Congress is about to convene, and that means that there will be many speeches in the months to come. Experience has taught me that it is always a good idea to be able to speak early in the program. By the time Congress has adjourned next summer, adjourned in order to go out and make more speeches in the constituencies, your bright and eager faces may not be so bright and eager at the prospect of hearing yet another speech. I am happy to catch you while you are still in such robust good health.

When I sat down to prepare this talk, I considered and rejected the idea of delivering a kind of preliminary message on the state of the Union. I remembered that this will soon be done with much more authority by the husband of a former newspaper-woman. So I decided to talk to you tonight about the state of our minds, the state of our nerves, and perhaps even about the state of our souls.

I am moved to do this by a letter I received just before Christmas. It was from a friend of mine, who was a great hero in the First World War. He has been an extraordinarily successful man since then, and his letter began in this cheerful fashion:

"MY DEAR WALTER: Another year of frustration, confusion, and compromise is about over."

I know that my friend is not alone in feeling this way and that during the coming session of Congress there will be many who will say what he says and feel as he does. At different times I suppose all of us share his feelings. There is indeed much frustration, much confusion, and—because we live on earth and not in heaven—there is, of course, much compromise.

I could have written back to my friend, reminding him that in every year of which there is any historical record, there has been much frustration and confusion and compromise. Anyone who thinks he can get away from frustration, confusion, and compromise in politics and diplomacy should make arrangements to get himself reborn into a different world than this one. Or, if that is beyond his powers, he should move to some country where there are no newspapers to read.

However, it is certainly true that in our own time we are experiencing a very special

frustration and confusion. There is, I believe, a reason for this. Certainly, if we knew the cause, we might feel better, even if we cannot do quickly something drastic to end the difficulty.

The age we are living in is radically new in human experience. During the past 15 years or so there has occurred a profound revolution in human affairs, and we are the first generation that has lived under these revolutionary new conditions. There has taken place a development in the art of war, and this is causing a revolutionary change in the foreign relations of all the nations of the world. The radical development is, of course, the production of nuclear weapons.

As a scientific phenomenon the nuclear age began with the explosion at Los Alamos in 1945. But in world relations the nuclear age really began about 10 years later. For during the 1940's the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But by the middle fifties and in the years following, the Soviet Union has created an armory of nuclear weapons and has built rockets which have made it, for all practical purposes of diplomacy, a nuclear power equal with the United States.

The essential fact about the appearance of two opposed great powers armed with nuclear weapons is that war, which is an ancient habit of mankind, has become mutually destructive. Nuclear war is a way of mutual suicide. The modern weapons are not merely much bigger and more dangerous than any which existed before. They have introduced into the art of warfare a wholly new kind of violence.

Always in the past, war and the threat of war, whether it was aggressive or defensive were usable instruments. They were usable instruments in the sense that nations could go to war for their national purposes. They could threaten war for diplomatic reasons. Nations could transform themselves from petty states to great powers by means of war. They could enlarge their territory, acquire profitable colonies, change the religion of a vanquished population, all by means of war. War was the instrument with which the social, political, and legal systems of large areas were changed. Thus, in the old days before the nuclear age began, war was a usable—however horrible and expensive—instrument of national purpose. The reason for that was that the old wars could be won.

In the prenuclear age, right down through the Second World War, the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. We did that with Germany and with Japan. The damage they had suffered, although it was great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany and Japan and the Soviet Union.

But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean 100 million dead, after the devastation of the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere and the contamination of the earth, the water, and the air, there would be no such recovery as we have seen after the two World Wars of this century.

The damage done would be mutual. There would be no victor. As far in the future as we can see, the ruin would be irreparable. The United States has the nuclear power to reduce Soviet society to a smoldering ruin, leaving the wretched survivors shocked and starving and diseased. In an interchange of nuclear weapons, it is estimated coolly by experts who have studied it, the Soviet Union would kill between 30 and 70 million Americans.

A war of that kind would not be followed by reconstruction, it would not be followed by a Marshall plan, and by all the constructive things that were done after World War II. A nuclear war would be followed by a savage struggle for existence, as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the

American Republic would have to be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship, trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be. After he and Prime Minister Churchill had studied some of the results of the nuclear tests, President Eisenhower made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

When President Eisenhower made that statement no one of us, I think, understood its full significance and consequences. We are now beginning to understand them, and here I venture to say is the root of the frustration and the confusion which torment us. For while nuclear weapons have made war, the old arbiter of human affairs, an impossible action for a rational statesman to contemplate, we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issue that used to be resolved by war.

It is enormously difficult to make peace. It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war about the fundamental issues.

That is where our contemporary frustration and confusion originate.

We are confronted with an extraordinarily tantalizing and nerve-wracking dilemma.

For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be settled by a treaty that can be negotiated. There, I repeat, is the root of the frustration which our people feel. Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages. But the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts of the past; namely, organized war, has become an impossible instrument to use.

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy are the only two American Presidents who ever lived in a world like this one. It is a great puzzle to know how to defend the Nation's rights, and how to promote its interests in the nuclear age. There are no clear guidelines of action because there are no precedents for the situation in which we find ourselves. And as statesmen grope their way from one improvisation and accommodation to another, there are masses of people who are frightened, irritated, impatient, frustrated and in search of quick and easy solutions.

The nuclear age is only a few years old. But we have already learned one or two things about how to conduct policy in this age. It was once said of a British admiral in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the British Fleet and with it the whole war in an afternoon. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are in a similar position today. In a few days or so Mr. Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the promise of a Communist economy. He can lose all the work of all his 5-year plans, his 7-year plans, and his 20-year plans. In that same time, Mr. Kennedy can lose the Constitution of the United States, the free enterprise system and the American way of life and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I don't think I am exaggerating. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred in recorded history. We cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter, which has been going on since they met at Vienna last June, unless we remind ourselves again and again of what war has become in the nuclear age.

The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb,

have no idea of what they are talking about. They do not know what has happened in the past 20 years. They belong to the past, and they have not been able to realize what a nuclear war would be.

Only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however lunatic it might be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond the tolerable limits, it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as is the megaton bomb, and it is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy. It is the central fact in the whole diplomatic problem of dealing with the cold war. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable. It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it.

Those who do not understand the nature of war in the nuclear age, those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement. It is not any of these things. It is not softness. It is sanity.

But it leaves us with a task: Because we cannot make war, because we cannot achieve peace, we must find some other way of meeting the great issues which confront us. For life will go on, and if the answers of the past do not work, other answers must exist and must be found.

The answer lies, I believe, in the nature of the struggle between our Western society and the Communist society.

It is often said that the struggle which divides the world is for the minds and the souls of men. That is true. As long as there exists a balance of power and of terror, neither side can impose its doctrine and its ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men, moreover, is not, I believe, going to be decided by propaganda. We are not going to convert our adversaries, and they are not going to convert us.

The struggle, furthermore, is not going to be ended in any foreseeable time. At bottom it is a competition between two societies and it resembles more than any other thing in our historical experience the long centuries of conflict between Christendom and Islam. The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes.

The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilization lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic Community. Will this Community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do. I speak

with some hope and confidence tonight. For I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society.

I dare to believe that this powerful Western economic community will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union, and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent magnetic attraction upon eastern Europe. This will happen if we approach it in the right way. Jean Monnet, who is the original founder of this movement, has put it the right way. "We cannot build our future," he has said, "if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other peoples, indeed for the Russians themselves."

At the same time the wealth and confidence of the new community will enable the Western society to assist and draw to it the societies of the southern hemisphere, where social and economic change is proceeding rapidly.

You will have seen that I do not agree with those who think that in order to defend ourselves and to survive we must put a stop to the progressive movement which has gone on throughout this century. This movement began in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its purpose was to reform and advance our own social order, and at the same time to recognize that we must live in the world beyond our frontiers. We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become a stagnant, neurotic, frightened, and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Is all this conservative? Is all this liberal? Is it all progressive? It is, I say, all of these. There is no irreconcilable contradiction among these noble adjectives. Do not Republicans believe in democracy, and do not Democrats believe in a republic? Such labels may describe political parties in England; they do not describe political attitudes in the United States.

Every truly civilized and enlightened man is conservative and liberal and progressive. A civilized man is conservative in that his deepest loyalty is to the Western heritage of ideas which originated on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Because of that loyalty he is the indefatigable defender of our own constitutional doctrine, which is that all power, that all government, that all officials, that all parties and all majorities are under the law—and that none of them is sovereign and omnipotent.

The civilized man is a liberal because the writing and the administration of the laws should be done with enlightenment and compassion, with tolerance and charity, and with affection.

And the civilized man is progressive because the times change and the social order evolves and new things are invented and changes occur. This conservative who is a liberal is a progressive because he must work and live, he must govern and debate in the world as it is in his own time and as it is going to become.

ADVANCEMENT IN USE OF B-52 BOMBER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Air Force announced today that Maj. Clyde P. Evelyn, 39 years of age, from

Petersburg, Va., with seven crew members aboard, established a new world record by flying 12,519 miles from Kadena Air Base, Okinawa to Torrejon Airbase, Spain in a B-52 bomber.

This flight, which arrived at 7:52 eastern standard time, January 11, in Spain, was accomplished without refueling, and required only 21 hours and 52 minutes. The average speed for the entire course was 575 miles per hour, with the highest speed at 662 miles per hour between Kadena, Okinawa, and Tokyo.

This is an unusual feat, and I desire to congratulate Major Evelyn and his crew, and further to commend the Air Force for such advancement in the use of the B-52 bomber.

TRIBUTE TO ALLEN W. DULLES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this first session of Congress this year I wish to voice a very brief tribute to Mr. Allen W. Dulles, who, during our adjournment, resigned as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I pay this tribute because I worked very closely with him during the period that he was the head of CIA, during which time I learned to have the greatest respect and admiration for his mental qualities and for his physical courage.

Mr. Dulles has given a lifetime to public service. He first evinced an interest in foreign affairs at the age of 8, when he wrote a little narrative on the Boer War, which was then being fought. It was published quite extensively.

He entered the diplomatic corps in 1916 and was appointed legation secretary in Vienna. Later he served as a member of the American Commission to negotiate peace at the Paris Peace Conference.

In 1926 he was offered the post of counsellor to the U.S. Legation at Peking, but resigned from the diplomatic corps to join a law firm in New York, where he remained for a period of time.

However, in 1927 he acted as legal adviser to the American delegation at the Three Powers Naval Conference, and later as adviser to the delegations at the Geneva disarmament conferences of 1932 and 1933.

From 1942 until V-E Day he was chief of the OSS in Switzerland, and until late in 1945 he headed the OSS mission to Germany.

In 1948 he was made chairman of a three-man group, commissioned by Washington, to make a survey of the U.S. intelligence system.

Then in 1950 he joined the CIA, and became its Deputy Director in 1951. In 1953 he was made Director of CIA, and remained in this post until December 1961, when he resigned from that organization.

Mr. President, I pay this tribute to Mr. Dulles because I know of no man who has been more objective in his public service and more sincere in his efforts to build up an intelligence system in the United States which would be worthwhile, and at the same time give us the greatest possible opportunity to obtain information that was available.

He is a man of great intellectual ability and great physical courage. I know of no man for whom I have more respect for his integrity and his character and his service to his country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts on his fine statement relating to the exemplary, dedicated, and unselfish service given by Mr. Allen Dulles to the United States of America and to the freedom of the world.

I would not want this opportunity to go by without noting that Members on this side of the aisle, I am sure, join in the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. Speaking for myself, I must say that I have the highest regard for Mr. Dulles. He is a most gifted and able man, who gave of himself unstintingly and unselfishly for the best interests of our country.

He developed a great service in the Central Intelligence Agency, and served with that Agency under Democratic and Republican administrations, without any regard to partisan politics.

I am greatly pleased that the Senator from Massachusetts has made note of this service, because all too often a man who has done so much and given so much, once he is no longer holding a position or title of respect or honor, is forgotten. Let us make sure that that does not happen in the case of Mr. Dulles.

I am pleased that the Senator has brought this matter to our attention.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Allen Dulles is not only a constituent of mine, but also a brother in the law and a close friend. I am pleased to join in the expressions on this subject which have come from people all over the country, and which are voiced very appropriately and eloquently by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that earlier today some comment was made in regard to the service of Allen Dulles as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

As one who was associated with Mr. Dulles during the entire period of his service, and who had many occasions to have conferences with him, in company with the distinguished Senator from Arizona, as a small Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to add my tribute for the public services of Mr. Dulles.

Of course, mistakes are made from time to time in all matters of intelligence, particularly when we are undertaking to pierce what has been so eloquently designated by Mr. Churchill as the Iron Curtain. But Mr. Dulles had a particular talent for directing the Central Intelligence Agency. I thought it particularly appropriate that the President of the United States made a visit to the office of the Central Intelligence Agency to award to Mr. Dulles a Medal for Merit for his distinguished services.

I hope that in the future the CIA will have as dedicated and as able a Director as Allen Dulles.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in regard to the services of Allen Dulles. I think he was well qualified by experience; and he did perform with great ability, integrity, and dedication as head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of the world's leading citizens have assembled in Paris and are earnestly at work on recommendations which will have an ever-deepening influence on the future course of the free world.

I refer, of course, to the Atlantic Convention of representative citizens from the nations comprising the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Their deliberations began last Monday and will continue through 2 weeks.

Of all the problems mutually confronting the free world nations, particularly those of the Atlantic Community, one of the most urgent is the need to achieve greater solidarity in the economic, political, and spiritual realms. The Atlantic Convention has been commissioned, through the actions of the U.S. Congress and the parliaments of the other NATO nations, to chart the way toward this greater unity.

As one of the original sponsors of the resolution authorizing United States participation in this convention, I know I speak for a great majority of the Members of the Senate in wishing all of the delegates and convention administrators in Paris godspeed and success in their undertaking.

The world—both halves of it—is watching this meeting; our half with hope and confidence, the enslaved half with anxiety. There is no better evidence of this than the news reports and commentaries about the convention which have appeared in the Washington press. I ask unanimous consent that examples of this attention by the press be printed at this point in the RECORD. They include an Associated Press dispatch, an editorial, and a column written by Crosby S. Noyes, all published in the Washington Evening Star of January 8, 1962, and an editorial published in the Washington Daily News of the same date.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 8, 1962]

HERTER URGES NATO TO INTEGRATE POLITICALLY

PARIS, January 8.—Former U.S. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter today urged NATO nations to integrate politically to meet modern-day threats.

Mr. Herter, speaking to 80 delegates of the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, said:

"We are gradually realizing that the modern world as we know it is coming to an end and we must conform our national actions to this historical fact.

"We feel in our bones that to fulfill our destiny to maintain freedom, we must link our national lives more closely with others. And in a world deeply split by ideological differences, a close-knit Atlantic Community seems our only hope for eventually establishing world order based on justice and the consent of the governed."

The Atlantic Convention opened a 2-week session today. Delegates will make recommendations to their governments on how to achieve greater cooperation and unity in NATO. Mr. Herter is cochairman of the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO.

Political integration is the most difficult of all practical steps toward a close-knit Atlantic Community, Mr. Herter said.

Mr. Herter said "our present military posture stems in good part from the shock of Korea. In the backwash of Sputnik, we took measures to make our alliance more effective. Now the obscene wall of Berlin, the outlaw breach of the nuclear testing moratorium, the torpedoing of the disarmament negotiations, stare us in the face.

"How much evidence do we need that this hostile force on the march must be met by a real combination of Atlantic force—military, economic, political—and the most important, spiritual?" he asked.

Mr. Herter repeated a proposal he made when he was Secretary of State in 1960 for a seaborne NATO-owned ballistic missile force. He also called for a substantial increase in mobile conventional forces.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 8, 1962]

THE ATLANTIC CONVENTION

For the next fortnight or so, beginning with today's opening session, 98 distinguished citizen delegates from the 15 member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will take part in potentially far-reaching discussions designed to bring about greater political and economic cooperation within the vast community that makes up the alliance.

Nothing quite like this gathering has ever before been held in the free world, and it is thus rather experimental in character. Even so, although it is not likely to accomplish miracles, its sponsors—the parliaments of the various countries involved—regard it as a highly promising undertaking that can do much to strengthen NATO, and promote ever-increasing unity which it, to cope with the nonmilitary aspects of the growing Communist threat to man's freedom around the globe.

Our American delegation—created by Congress as "the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO"—is the largest of the 15 now gathered in Paris. Its cochairman are former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and former Under Secretary William L. Clayton, who have coauthored a highly significant report on foreign trade. Other members (the group is evenly bipartisan) include Vice Chairman Elmo Roper, Eric Johnston, and such additional outstanding individuals as Hugh Moore, a retired manufacturer, and William Burden, ex-Ambassador to Belgium.

As set forth in the bill establishing the Commission, these men (all congressional appointees) are "not in any way to speak for or to represent the U.S. Government." Nevertheless, because they constitute a highly competent group with a lot of prestige, their work at "the Atlantic Convention" can hardly fail to serve a good purpose. They will report in due course to both House and Senate. Meanwhile, all of us have reason to wish them well. Certainly, if this unusual conference is fruitful in even only a limited sense, NATO and the free world at large will be the stronger for it.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 8, 1962]

CONVENTION OF ATLANTIC CITIZENS
(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS.—There is a kind of poetic justice in the fact that William L. Clayton and Christian A. Herter are in Paris today.

As Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton was one of the guiding spirits of America's greatest postwar initiative in the field of foreign policy—the Marshall plan. As Secretary of State, Mr. Herter gave his official blessing to the idea of a Citizens' Commission on NATO.

Today these two men are in Paris as co-chairmen of the American delegation to the first Atlantic convention of NATO nations. The convention is a brainchild of the Citizens' Commission. And, it is hoped, it may, in turn, give birth to another major diplomatic initiative aimed at strengthening the Western World.

The idea of the citizens' convention has been kicking around in the U.S. Congress and NATO circles for more than a decade. For years it was firmly stymied by John Foster Dulles, who had little use for amateur advice of any kind and who saw a potential danger in the notion that a congregation of prominent citizens should meet to debate current Western problems. The danger, which is still real enough today, is that the issues of national and international importance might be compromised if subjected to uninformed and unrestrained enthusiasm which such an intercontinental congress would be likely to generate.

HERTER BOOSTED IDEA

Mr. Herter saw the problem in a different and somewhat more liberal light. Under competent leadership, he thought, a NATO citizens' convention could do no harm. Indeed, on the theory that papa doesn't always know best, it might provide invaluable enlightenment to the governments on some of the most vital issues facing the Western alliance. With Mr. Herter's backing the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO was set up by an act of Congress in 1960. Other NATO countries followed suit, and the present, 2-week meeting of 100 prominent citizens hailing from 15 countries is the result.

It is, by normal diplomatic standards, a somewhat unusual exercise. The Congress and its delegates have an official status in the sense that they are appointed by their respective governments and their expenses are paid out of public funds. It is unofficial in that no delegate is authorized to speak for anyone but himself.

Even the leaders are slightly bemused by the broadness of the directive urging them simply to "explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed" within the Western community. And so far as the American delegates are concerned, they have no idea to whom the final results of the Congress—if any—should be reported.

STRONG VIEWS HELD

There should, however, be no shortage of intellectual fodder dished up at the forthcoming sessions by the broad assortment of politicians, intellectuals, businessmen, soldiers, and philosophers in attendance. Most of them have strong personal views on the future of the Western alliance, and most will demand to be heard. Among the many delegations there is a strong flavoring of internationalist radicals favoring some form of Federal Atlantic union. Clarence Streit, godfather, and indefatigable lobbyist of Union Now, is wheeling around town as if the convention represented the opportunity of a lifetime.

What may come of it all in practical terms is anybody's guess. The leaders are anxious to avoid exaggerated expectations and point out that whatever conclusions the Con-

gress may reach, they will be valid only in their impact on public opinion and in their advisory effect on the various governments involved.

If there is any one concrete expectation that one can see at this point, it is in the economic field. Most certainly the Congress will dramatize Europe's growing unity and strength, together with the hope of other Western countries, including the United States, for closer association with the Common Market group.

If it does no more than give new expression and emphasis to this facet of the Atlantic community the Congress will have served a useful purpose. It comes at a time when closer economic cooperation could serve to mobilize public opinion behind the fight to liberalize trade within the group of nations represented here. If so, Mr. Clayton and Mr. Herter will have made no small contribution to the success of the Kennedy administration and to the future of the community of nations which they have served so long.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 8, 1962]

THE ATLANTIC CONVENTION

Some 100 outstanding citizens from the 15 NATO nations began a challenging task in Paris this week—exploring ways that the West may achieve closer economic and political unity to counter the cold war front put up by the Soviet bloc.

They are members of the Atlantic convention, invited into session by our own U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. They are working together not as instructed national blocs but as individual citizens without power to bind their governments.

They will, after exhaustive study, have some recommendations to make to the member governments of NATO. The governments, however, aren't committed to heed them.

Thus, what they recommend must bear such weight of reason and good sense that the nations will want to adopt their recommendations. This is indeed a challenge. We hope it is met.

We hope that these citizens, sharing and pooling their best efforts, may make some significant contributions to the strength of freedom, which has perhaps never before been so sorely tried.

THEY RIDE STRONG IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. President, out of the storm which whipped through the northern Great Plains the past week there came an epic saga which caught and gripped the attention of the Nation on newspaper page and TV screen alike. It was the story of Don Hight's drive of 1,800 cattle over 70 miles of frozen ground and through wind and snow to market them at Winner, in the Rosebud country of South Dakota.

Not in some time has a story from out of the West put pictures on the pages of the big city newspapers and produced word stories of man's contest with the elements as stirring as this one. One is prompted to ask, "Why?"

I venture, Mr. President, to suggest that it is because this rancher on the White River has not only demonstrated that a tough job could be tackled, and done but has revived a story from our past and rekindled the natural pride of our people in self-reliance and courage and determination.

Our famed South Dakota cowboy poet laureate, the late Badger Clark, wrote a poem which he named "On the Drive," which carries these lines:

My pard may sing of sighn' love
And I of roarin' battle,
But all the time we sweat and shove
And follow up the cattle.
Heeya-a! the bawlin' crowd of you!
Heeyow the draggin' cloud of you!
We're glad and gay and proud of you,
We men that follow cattle!

But all the world's a movin' herd
Where men drift on together,
And some may spur and some are spurred,
But most are horns and leather!
Heeya-a! the rider sings along,
Heeyow! the reined hawse swings along
And drifts and drags and flings along
The mob of horns and leather.

The outlaws fight to break away;
The weak and lame are crawlin',
But only dead ones quit the play,
The dust (snow) cloud and the bawlin'.

So, today, as the world's moving herd swings along, I call attention to one man's challenge of the difficult, and to voice my salute to Don Hight and his cowboys who have once again painted on a broad canvas the enterprise, determination, and grit that have made America great.

Out in South Dakota, Mr. President, they still ride strong in the saddle.

INAUGURAL STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES R. SCALES, PRESIDENT, OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on December 10, 1961, one of Oklahoma's distinguished scholars was inaugurated president of Oklahoma Baptist University. He is Dr. James R. Scales, a former dean of men students and a former vice president of this great denominational university.

Dr. Scales is recognized in the academic world because his stimulation of academic excellence and his scholarly interest in all phases of education have already contributed to the building up of this great institution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the inaugural address delivered by Dr. Scales at Oklahoma Baptist University be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INAUGURAL STATEMENT BY DR. JAMES R. SCALES, PRESIDENT OF OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY, DECEMBER 10, 1961

This ancient ceremony resembles nothing so much as a pretentious wedding. The banns have been posted, the musicians appointed, the guests invited, the family summoned. The marriage of the university and the man is finally to take place. The guests come, wearing the traditional garments, not really suitable for any other occasion, and thus supply the pageantry, their own entertainment. In every mind are unspoken questions. "How did she do? Is he good enough for her? Is the father of the bride really so affluent as he pretends to be?" As for that last, may I set at rest all anxiety: We are really poverty-stricken. The very pews you occupy may not be paid for, and only a lingering, prepresidential sense of delicacy restrains me from posting the

groomsmen to the exits to panhandle the departing visitors.

I am surrounded here by human goodness. Great friends do me honor. Faculty colleagues have worked tirelessly to plan this hour. Chief of them is Vice President Nance, who organized numerous faculty committees for our first inauguration in 27 years. When Mr. Nance sought my views on the inaugural, I suggested we keep it simple, cut it short, and not spend any money. If all my recommendations are to be obeyed so scrupulously, our future here will be very lively indeed.

I am glad that the investiture could be conducted by three men who have been at the center of my life:

My father, whose proud friends form so large a part of this audience, the beneficiaries of his long and faithful ministry;

Chancellor Raley, whose tenure extends well beyond half the life of the institution. He has been most gracious to me in these months of transition, accepting his new responsibilities with imagination and enthusiasm;

Mr. Currin, the chairman of the board of trustees, who has given his best years in the service of higher education in Oklahoma. Only yesterday he was honored by his fellow townsmen as Citizen of the Year—and that could be any year. He is a shining exemplar of enlightened business statesmanship. When such men become committed to the goals of Christian education, and strengthen the partnership between private enterprise and private colleges, our horizons expand. When he has learned of our needs, great or small, his characteristic gesture has been to reach for his checkbook.

I must not fail to acknowledge the participation on this day of the accredited leaders of the great Baptist fellowship. Dr. Lackey, our executive secretary, who always makes time in his crowded schedule for the university; his assistant, Mr. Ingram, who so readily agreed to take the program assignment of Dr. Hobbs, the president of the Southern Baptist Convention; Dr. Bumpas, president of the Oklahoma Convention; and Dr. Hultgren, minister of the First Baptist Church, of Tulsa, who presides on this cold day as my warm personal friend.

Distinguished leaders of the Nation have come: Congressman STEED and, to bring the official greeting, Senator MONROE. They would be welcome were their mission less auspicious. I shall prize the letter from the President of the United States.

It is a pleasure to welcome the Governor to this campus. I recall that we sat next to each other in the classroom of the late Vern Thornton. The subject we studied was State government. I remarked to the students in the old chapel last spring that I had reached the awkward age—too old to be Governor and almost too old to be President. But the trustees have rectified that, and saved my pride a little by making me a president—and No. 9 at that. Dr. Dale, you will recall that Gov. William H. "Alfalfa Bill" Murray set great store on his own mystic powers and plumed himself on his science of numerology. No. 9 was Bill Murray's lucky number, and he was inordinately proud to be the ninth Governor; I am not sure all of the people shared his pride.¹

Nothing has pleased me more than the involvement of the alumni in the plans we have announced for the University. That an alumnus, Dr. Richard Hopper, should be chairman of the trustees' committee to nominate a president, and should come here today, not disavowing the act, is a source of joy.

I certainly want to earn the respect of the students, whose president and eloquent spokesman you have heard. Last spring, I

¹ Governor Edmondson was not able to be present.

told the student demonstrators, who were circulating petitions and making assorted noises intended to influence the trustees' selection, that this was like very old times—for in the medical universities students chose the rector and even the professors; and then, when they wanted a change, they got that, too. My warning was this medieval practice had gone far enough: the first part is all very well; but, as for the other, let us leave the board of trustees to their business.

In the presence of venerable and beloved figures of church and school, we sense here the university as an unending community. Two scholarly ministers dramatize that continuity. As I was growing up in eastern Oklahoma, I came to know Dr. J. W. Storer, who spoke this morning, and Dr. E. C. Routh, whom we have just heard. I have taken them as my models in much. Can the values of a lifetime of learning be more sharply embodied than in these men—devout, literary, urbane—knowing much of history, ancient, medieval, and modern; no strangers to the world of ideas, who have never used their rare gifts in the spirit of haughtiness or pedantry?

From them and from Dr. Dale, another aristocrat in the republic of letters, I gained some sense of the structure of language and the importance of style. That the dean of Oklahoma historians should come on this occasion, in the ninth decade of his life, to set his imprimatur on me is a gladsome thing indeed.

Those whom you have heard represent only a few components in the modern university. But the most significant representative comes from this remarkable faculty, Dr. Warren Forbes Yarborough, the distinguished service professor of religion, with whom I studied New Testament in 1935; I never mastered the subject, but more edifying than his books has been his life, which has been fruitful by every measure of reckoning. I stand on many shoulders today, and I hope I stand as the champion of the sacred rights and sacred obligations of the teacher.

Without exception, I have had nothing but expressions of esteem from the trustees, from townspeople, from the academic community, and from churchmen of many faiths.

All this reminds me of a remark of a fellow educator in another Baptist school, "We have been complimented almost to death." We appreciate your good wishes, yet you must know that good wishes do not build strong white columns or soaring towers, or quiet laboratories—or scholarship funds. I have received much from you; I shall be asking for much more.

My brief address is on the subject, "Christian Education: The Leaven of Leadership in a Free Society."

I here publicly accept, in the presence of this great company of scholars, the office of president of the university. Eight great and good men have wrought well here; one of them remains to serve with me.

I assume these responsibilities with certain convictions: that education is life's greatest investment; that the higher learning is essential to the survival of civilization; and that this kind of school is indispensable in the total pattern of public and private education in this country. The leaven of spiritual leadership in Christian lands comes from places like this. I announce no new discovery but, as William Blake said, "When I tell the truth, it is not for the sake of convincing those who do not know, but for the sake of defending those who do."

In reviewing the life of an institution, as in language study or in philosophy, it is good practice to go back to the roots. On the medallion I wear is the motto of the university, "Veritas eruditione religioneque" (Truth through Learning and Religion).

Baptists have always been in the mainstream of our society, and their concern for education indicates they intend to stay there. They believe with William Penn, "Religion ought not take men out of the world; it ought to put them back into the world to better it and purify it." Like the great Quaker, our people have been activists; they have not been afraid to put their faith or their learning to the test of human experience.

We despise not the day of small things when we say that our beginnings were humble, that the educational fare was often limited, and the social program the classic one of the hilltop denominational college: high thinking and plain living. If we may believe the reminiscences of early alumni, the climate had something of the sourness of puritanism without the discipline and beauty of that great movement. The founders committed us in the charter to "instruction in all branches of knowledge," a ruinously ambitious program. Even today it is beyond the scope of any single institution.

But there was here 50 years ago the nucleus of a good college. Fortunate were the first students in the quality of their seven-man faculty. The curriculum was not much more than the medieval trivium and quadrivium, but these dedicated men, who endured privations to found this school, did the main thing well. Knowledge grows exponentially with every passing decade, so that the 1961 curriculum is more nearly a centrivium of subjects, many of them unknown in 1910, but our purpose holds: to do the main thing well.

Those halcyon days of peace before 1914, when most of our colleges were established, seemed to be a solid, ordered world of certainties. To those who come into places of leadership in these parlous times, few things are certain: Every morning's surprises rob last night's certainties of their meaning. The atmosphere of our time is contaminated with the fallout of rampant evil. Our country, our planet, our universe, are theaters of strife. We are in danger of tearing ourselves apart—youth against elder, rural interest against urban, class against class, race against race, the radical left and the radical right.

There is another danger imposed on us by the struggle for continents and space. General Eisenhower, in his farewell address as President, voiced the curious warning—curious, that is, from a man of his background—that our way of life may be threatened by a military-industrial complex, ready to regiment our lives in the name of military necessity. It is a warning that the custodians of free institutions must heed.

For submerging everything else is the cold war, waged with every weapon short of Armageddon. And we must not complacently suppose that the ultimate cannot happen to us. In Robert LeVitt's warning, "If Khrushchev's public statement 'We will bury you' does not have a message for us, then words have lost their meaning."

What kind of response do we, the bountifully endowed 6 percent of the world's people, have in this crisis? What appeal have we against the battle song of the Communist International?

"Arise, ye workers of the world;
Arise, ye wretched of the earth;
For justice thunders condemnation,
A new world's in birth."

Do freemen have the spiritual resilience for the sacrifices ahead? We need not go beyond the best-seller list to form a disquieting picture of the average American college graduate: "The Organization Man," "The Waste Makers," "The Image Merchants," "The Operators," "The Status Seekers," "The Ugly American," and other recent sociological works and contemporary novels. These are hollow men who have lost their

way—cynical, grasping, lacking in abiding values—society is adrift, meretricious in its standards. If these are accurate judgments—

We are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and
light
Where ignorant armies clash by night.

And thus paralyzed, we shall be one with Nineveh and Tyre.

Education must do better than this. If, by applying the motto on this emblem, we can achieve a new integrity in our individual lives, and a new unity in our corporate life, we may yet witness not the sunset of civilization, but the explosive dawn of a new age of genius. There have been two such creative periods in the history of the West: one, in the city states of Greece in the fourth and fifth centuries before Christ, and the other, throughout Western Europe in the age we call the Renaissance. The third great age of human creativity can be now. If this vital link is to be strengthened, we must address ourselves to two groups—the learned who are indifferent to religion; the religious who are afraid of learning.

We, of the scholarly professions, have often failed in the painful process of interpreting the real issues of life—in history, and science, and philosophy. We wait for the Gallup poll to tell us what to think. We seek the ivory tower, escaping into a world of detachment and frivolity. Our scholarship is too often irrelevant to the world's sore need. True understanding cannot be forced, but our students are justified in the impatient question, made famous by Marshal Foch: "De quoi s'agit-il?" (What's the point?). In the phrase of our own "Uncle Jimmy" Owens, we must teach as for eternity.

The laudable ideal of learning for its own sake becomes, on too many a campus, a precious intellectualism, shared by an evermore restricted circle, a private dialog ending in a private joke. It is right that we guard against the tendency to become wise in our own conceits and to remember the obligations of sharing in a democratic society. The gifted do their best work, I think, where they must observe a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

In the house of intellect, we are needlessly divided, even men of good will. Pettishly, we refuse to recognize other scholars and their work. C. P. Snow's concept of the two cultures, the sciences and the humanities, each indifferent to the other, is well known. Communication between the two, he says, is all but stopped. One of the advantages of a small campus is that men of many disciplines can still talk to one another in an easy fellowship.

No one who cares about the future direction of our society can afford to ignore science, at least since August 6, 1945; and I am glad that the young dean, a scientist who took office with me, is dedicated to bridging the gap in our understanding. Under his leadership, strong programs will be advanced. Yet it is not too much to ask that the scientific subjects be taught in the humane tradition. If science and technology are to gain a monopoly of the curriculum or to be taught in a mechanical way, we are already brutalized. Rockets and missiles are no more urgent than Plato or Paul, Isaiah, or Santayana.

All of us recall Job's catalog of woe, and his final humiliation, when God revealed himself to Job and to us:

"For I will demand of thee and declare thou unto me, where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare if thou hast understanding. Whereupon were the foundations of the earth fastened? Or who laid the cornerstone thereof, when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

We, like Job, sometimes fail to see the unending miracles passing before our eyes every day. You recall, further along in that 38th chapter:

"Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea? Have the gates of death been revealed unto thee? Declare, if thou knowest at all. Hast thou entered the treasures of the snow, or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail? Hast thou seen the rain a father? Or who hast begotten the drops of dew? Canst thou bind the cluster of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?"

And on and on—God's great satirical questions to Job, each of which admits of but one humbling answer.

And the scholar is humble before the questions he cannot answer. We must remember that truth enters lowly doors sometimes, as it did enter this world in the person of Him whom we serve, and whom to know aright is Life Eternal.

We of the intellectual community must do a better job of understanding the business community; the special needs of the churches; the achievements of men who toil in hard places to lift mankind a little above the bestial level of existence.

We of the spiritual community must defend the scholar. From primitive times, people have feared the scholar and his magic. Even sophisticated Athens, at long last, took its vengeance on the superior Socrates. There are still those who fear the implications of free inquiry.

Church-related colleges have known the caution of expediency. After Darwin, there was the flight from higher criticism; after Scopes, the flight from anthropology. After three centuries of geographical isolation, the flight from foreign languages as unnecessary and possibly un-American. Let us absorb the lessons of the census figures. A once great rural denomination has become, like the society of which it is part, a greater urban denomination with a better educated constituency. Shall we retreat into idle hopes and empty dreams about a world which is past? Shall we temporize with the forces that would curb the free growth of the human spirit? Can we compel the heart to remain what the head has rejected?

For my own part, let me say that my beloved denomination has never imposed restraints on me in two decades in these classrooms. In times of bitter conflict, and teaching in a controversial field, I have been restricted only by my own ignorance. And I have been constrained by a sense of responsibility.

But there are those who look on the role of the college as a mirror—only reflecting the society that created it, and the most timid, common denominator of the constituency it serves. Let it be said in billboard language: A university does not follow, it leads. If it retreats, it retreats into disaster. We drive out the good minds of our fellowship at our own peril.

An unexamined faith will not sustain us long. As President Boone commented in the 1930 inaugural, "Ignorance may be bliss, but it is never piety." No Christian can mark off any area of his life as out of bounds to the intellect. No citizen can quarantine his life or his nation's life as out of bounds to the theological and the ethical. If the education of the individual is viewed in its entirety, disciplined hearts must dwell in the same body as disciplined minds.

This, then, is our mission: nothing less than providing Christian leadership for a free society. The role of reconciliation is better taken by those who have an enlightenment from within. We must not fail to speak freely and responsibly. To perpetuate freedom we have to practice it. In the spirit of reconciliation, divergent views are blended. Warring men identify in their foes the spark of divinity that reposes in us all.

Old enmities give way; intellect stoops to candor; and reason to faith.

Any discourse on education in a free society must advert to Thomas Jefferson, to whose sublime spirit we credit the most significant American contributions to the rights of men: freedom of the person, freedom of religion, freedom of the mind. With sure instinct, he saw these three achievements when he wrote his own epitaph. Ignoring the great offices he had held, he chose for his monument the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Statute on Religious Liberty, the University of Virginia. In an age when Burke was extolling the wisdom of prejudice, Jefferson bestowed on his fellow countrymen a passion for a divine sanity—which has not faded under the pressures of war or revolution or reaction. This versatile mortal, who in his letter to the Danbury Baptists, acknowledged his debt to our own fellowship, set us on the right course. And today the yeast of his revolutionary thought still moves upon the waters and in the spirit of man in Africa and Asia, and Latin America. His vow of eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man remains a beacon to scholars everywhere. This founder of the public university system, himself a product of the liberal arts college, never believed that all wisdom had been crystallized in his generation, and must be handed down intact, for "the earth belongs to the living." Julian Boyd, the distinguished editor of Jefferson's papers, said of the intellectual preparation Jefferson had at William and Mary College, "One thing we can be sure of is that his teachers did not try to instill in him the idea that this was the best of all possible worlds or that colonial Virginia was a stable orderly society incapable of improvement. William and Mary prepared him for a world of change."

And he helped change it.

What Jefferson had to say about freedom was not just for colonial rural society. His principles have served well this empire of cities; and today, where cross the crowded ways of life, men of intellect no less than untutored men of the soil, bless his memory. Soul freedom, intellectual freedom go together.

Jefferson was the living embodiment of the spirit of reconciliation in his own spacious life. There was no more bitter rivalry in American history than that which pitted him against John Adams. Yet in their retirement, as passions cooled, the two became great friends; and American letters have been enriched by the volumes of correspondence that passed between them. It is a feast of reason. Every subject was examined by these elder statesmen, so different in backgrounds and attitudes. Adams, with his unbending New England sense of duty, mellowed under the gentle urging of Jefferson's mind. Jefferson, confessing that music was his great passion, science his delight, agriculture his cherished occupation, and his beloved Monticello the end of all his private dreams, subordinated all these pursuits to the higher duty that society imposes on the citizen. Each man, in the spirit of reconciliation, helped the other, and together they have enlightened all posterity.

It is a coincidence of American history that on the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1826, both lay dying. The old man in Massachusetts, in his last words saluted the old man in Virginia, his erstwhile enemy but eternal friend. "Thomas Jefferson still lives"—and he does, he does, so long as men love freedom and cherish truth.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. SAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 31, 1961, SAM RAYBURN left

Washington on what was to be his last journey home to Texas.

On September 7, 1961, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 133, to provide for the coining of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of SAM RAYBURN. Before referral to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 49 fellow Senators joined as cosponsors of the resolution.

When SAM RAYBURN heard about the resolution, he wired me, asking that no action be taken on it, saying he felt such medals to be inappropriate for the living.

At this session, I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who for the past 29 years had served in the Congress with Speaker RAYBURN. I have been informed through the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget that the administration has no objection to this resolution. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has advised me that he would be pleased to bring up this resolution in the near future.

A gold medal for SAM RAYBURN is like "carrying coals to Newcastle." I can say this because I offered the resolution for the Congress to honor the service to his country of this great man.

The genius of this American democracy has been that we have been blessed with men like SAM RAYBURN. They are the men who get the job done. Men like SAM RAYBURN are the men who make democracy work.

When the Founding Fathers had finished their work of fashioning the Constitution of the United States, there was established a system of laws by which our people agreed to live.

Ever since, we have talked about a government of laws, rather than a government of men. But our system of government by law would long since have gone by the board, had it not been for men like SAM RAYBURN; for SAM RAYBURN respected the law; SAM RAYBURN honored the law. SAM RAYBURN served the basic law of this country. Therein lies the greatness of the man.

To understand SAM RAYBURN, one has to appreciate the environment from which he came—the wonderful Fourth Congressional District of Texas. This is not said in deprecation of Tennessee, the State of his birth, the State which has produced so many fine Texans. I know the Fourth Congressional District; I know the people there; I know what SAM RAYBURN means to them and what they meant to SAM RAYBURN. Every elected official is a mirror of his constituency. He reflects, in the best sense, the considered judgment of the people he represents. A few great men magnify, rather than reflect; and SAM RAYBURN magnified the greatness of his constituency.

I do not apologize for being a partisan Texan. All Texans are wonderful, by definition; but SAM RAYBURN was the magnificent Texan; he was the tallest Texan of them all.

I need not review here today his public record; all Senators know it as well as I do. And when the record is finally compiled, the outstanding fact is not

that he served his congressional district almost 50 years, or that his record of service as Speaker of the House of Representatives twice over exceeded that of Henry Clay. The record in which we are interested is a qualitative one, rather than quantitative. SAM RAYBURN had the tough moral fiber and the intellectual tenacity to produce when his country called. And produce, SAM RAYBURN did—and in the grand manner.

"Mr. SAM" was not perfect, and he would have been the first to disagree if anyone had said he was. His limitations were human. He had his likes and his dislikes; but, overall he had a sense of the pulse of history and a ready recognition of what the times demanded. Whether the subject under consideration was a Utility Holding Company Act, a Rural Electrification Administration measure, or an extension of the draft just prior to Pearl Harbor, SAM RAYBURN produced. And it is by results that we judge a man.

Today, we are saying to history and to the generations of public servants who are to follow us in the Congress that SAM RAYBURN was a great example of the finest tradition of public service in the United States. He heard when his country called, and he knew how to respond. His legacy, his example of service devoted to his country, will be an inspiration to young men and women so long as the United States survives.

This resolution, calling for a gold medal in honor of SAM RAYBURN, asks that a simple tribute be engraved on the medal, as I feel it is engraved in the hearts of his countrymen: "For services rendered to the people of the United States."

This was SAM RAYBURN'S record—a record of services rendered. We are the beneficiaries. There is no partisanship in patriotism; SAM RAYBURN belonged to us all.

He was a great Texan; but, most of all, SAM RAYBURN was a great American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of newspaper and magazine articles.

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

[From the Houston Chronicle, Nov. 17, 1961]

SON OF OLD FRONTIER PLAYED POWERFUL
ROLE IN NEW

(By Ralph McGill)

SAM RAYBURN is dead in the autumn season of harvest and fulfillment: "Don't ever count the crop until it is in the barn," he used to tell young, impatient Congressmen. The crop of his life is now in eternity's barn and it can be counted and measured.

SAM RAYBURN was not an average man. He was not, as some thought, taciturn and short of temper. He was not a man for smalltalk. He did not tolerate fools easily. Now and then he annoyed the more idealistic newcomers to the House by telling them that the "way to get along is to go along." (He did not mean it as cynically as it sounds.)

As we begin to look at the harvest of RAYBURN'S long, rich life, we discover that in the years of the New Deal, and the first of the New Frontier, it was he, the smalltown, rural conservative, who labored most successfully in the vineyard of social reform. He could be, and was, both conservative and

liberal. But what he really was, was a man of great sensitivity and feeling for the needs and rights of people. He had no patience with those who proposed legislation which he thought had for its purpose merely the coddling or rewarding of people. But when the real needs of people were at issue, Mr. SAM was on their side.

AVERTED DISASTER

Had it not been for him, President Kennedy, for example, would have been brought to disaster in the first months of his administration. The Rules Committee was in defiant, hostile hands. It would not permit bills which established a new minimum wage, expanded social security payments, a housing act, and other legislation pledged by the Democratic administration, to be voted out to the floor. To get them there SAM RAYBURN had to do battle with an old friend, Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia.

It was a close vote—217 to 212. But the margin was wide enough—especially in a battle which might not have been won at all.

This was in early January 1961. It was in late summer that what seemed like an old man's lumbago pains began to bother Mr. SAM. He went home. Worried doctors found it was not lumbago at all, but cancer, already spread through the lymph system, and impossible to cure.

In the sorrow which welled up at the news, men began to remember that he had served well three Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John Kennedy. They each learned to lean on him. They encountered his sometimes irascible stubbornness. They knew moments of irritation and anger. But none doubted his loyalty. They knew that when the chips were down they could count on his complete loyalty to the Democratic Party and its basic principles. He might, and often did, refuse to accept presidential urgings and proposed legislation. Not even his enemies ever suggested he was a rubber-stamp. But he was unfailingly a Democrat.

SAFE WITH RAYBURN

There are many examples of this presidential awareness.

One weekend when a VIP caller telephoned Washington he found the President and the Vice President were away. He reached the President in a distant city and asked, "Who's tending the store in Washington?"

"RAYBURN," said the President. "The country's safe with him there."

Even Harold Ickes, though he quarreled often with SAM RAYBURN (and with everyone else), wrote that Roosevelt's most vital legislation could not have been had without SAM RAYBURN.

The President did not obtain all he wanted. But in the field of public utility reform, for example, strong legislation was enacted over the bitter fight of the powerful electric and gas industry lobbies. RAYBURN was storm-tossed and under terrific pressure from interests in his home State. Yet he held on.

Rural electrification came via the Norris-Rayburn bill. Here again, the electric companies fought hard to prevent passage of it. RAYBURN put it through the House and the Senate followed this leadership.

This was the period when President Roosevelt said, "I am fighting communism, Huey Longism, Coughlinism, Townsendism. I want to save our system, the capitalistic system; to save it is to give some heed to world thought of today."

In all these things SAM RAYBURN was a stalwart.

LONELY, HARD LIFE

Perhaps he remembered his own harsh boyhood. He was the eighth child of 11. On an isolated 40 acres, young RAYBURN

grew up. He recalled the far stretching, level emptiness of the plains, and the hours when he swung on the gate on Sundays, hoping to see some rider coming on a visit. (Once he said of those days, "I have known loneliness that breaks the heart.") He toiled hard in the fields. He read history books at night.

He wanted school. When it came time for SAM to go to East Texas Normal, the young man had perhaps \$5 saved from the meager amounts which came his way. His father waited until the train was in. He then silently handed his boy \$25.

"God knows how he saved it," said RAYBURN, in talking about that day. "He never had any extra money. We earned just enough to live. It broke me up, him handing me that \$25. I have often wondered what he did without, what sacrifice he and my mother made beyond those which every day demanded of them."

DID ODD JOBS

At the Normal school he swept floors and did odd jobs for his room and board. He studied hard—especially history. He managed to get to law school. Politics were always in his mind. He once said that at 10 years of age he was determined to go to Congress. In the Southern States law is regarded as a necessary steppingstone to politics.

He went to Congress in 1912, the year Woodrow Wilson became President. Wilson was ever one of his heroes. He never thought of the Senate, and never aspired to it. To him, the House, the legislative body, was the most important and meaningful.

He was often at odds with Democratic Presidents. But he never even considered bolting the Democratic Party. He thought it not unusual that the country turns to Democrats when there is trouble. "I think this is because they are, for the most part, closer to the people and think in broader political terms," he once said. "The Republicans have a tradition of representing business—not people."

WAS FOR PEOPLE

This may help explain his support of legislation, attacked by the GOP Old Guard as socialistic, which enabled people to have a better life. REA is a perfect example. He pushed it hard. "It will take some of the harsh labor off the backs of farm men and women," he said.

He was elected Speaker in 1940. He held that position until his death, save for the first Eisenhower administration. He respected President Eisenhower, and believed him to be an honest, well-meaning man. But he also thought him a Republican in the sense that Mr. Eisenhower's image of wisdom and "the best brains" seemed to be any man who had attained financial success.

JOHNSON FRIENDSHIP

There was a long, fast friendship between him and LYNDON JOHNSON, now Vice President. The current Vice President first came to Washington as a Congressman and it was his fellow Texan RAYBURN who schooled him and taught him the ropes. At the 1960 convention it was RAYBURN who placed his protégé's and friend's name in nomination for the Presidency. It was RAYBURN, too, who was one of those who gave the green light to Senator JOHNSON's surprise acceptance of the Vice Presidential nomination.

SAM RAYBURN's life was not Spartan, it was rich. Yet, he lived simply. He never took congressional junkets. Indeed, the record shows that he never left the United States but once. He went once to inspect the Panama Canal. When Congress adjourned he went home. He had two farms. On one he raised cattle. On the other he grew corn and cotton. He liked to fish and read. But he was not a man who had to be entertained. He could live with himself.

It is proper, in seeking to sum up the life of the man who served with (not under) Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy, and who gave to each advice which was wise and politically pragmatic, to note that he is the last of his breed. He came quite literally from the frontier. The last President he served projected for the country a New Frontier in a time of growing population, automation, computers, and industrial techniques which approach the miraculous.

RESILIENT

SAM RAYBURN came from the old frontier. Yet, none was more alert or at home in the New Frontier than he. His mind was so resilient that he could serve the Presidents in whose administrative years the Nation made its greatest social changes.

Our system has endured because the profit dollar developed, in the years spanned by RAYBURN's life in the Congress, a social conscience. American capitalism came to mean, among other things, public education, social security, unemployment insurance, aid to crippled children, to the blind, and, through hospital construction, aid to the sick. Capitalism pays the bill for disasters; it subsidizes farmers; it builds dams and irrigates deserts. It clears slums, finances housing, guarantees bank deposits. American capitalism resembles almost not at all the classic capitalism of Queen Victoria's day. It is almost unbelievable that one man's legislative experience spans these tremendous reforms—from 1912 until now. And rare is the important bill which does not bear his name or the stamp of RAYBURN's advice or influence.

GREATER THAN PRESIDENTS

It is easy to see that he was, and that the sum of his life is greater than that of any one of the Presidents with whom he served. "Don't ever say a Speaker of the House served under a President, son," he once told a young reporter.

In writing about men who have served for a long number of years, it is too easy to slip into the trite conclusion that an era has ended and that it is perhaps as well that death has come to save a man from heartbreak and disappointment.

This is not true of "Mr. SAM." Until the lumbago pains would no longer respond to aspirin or mustard plasters, he could sniff the battle from afar and go forward confidently to meet it. He was a magnificent field commander. He grew old, but his mind, his political tactics and strategies did not. He was not losing his grip. The fact is there is none to take his place in the House. And, in certainty, he will stay on in the hearts of the thousands who knew and loved him.

[From the Daily Texan, Nov. 17, 1961]

'TWEEN THE HORNS

(By Hoyt Purvis)

When a famous person dies, every writer, large or small, important or nonetrical, wants to write of the time they talked to or saw the famed person.

Certainly there are hundreds of writers who knew more of SAM RAYBURN than I. And there are persons who read this paper who were well acquainted with Mr. SAM. But just the same, I can't help recalling my meetings with him.

Elsewhere on the page I write of the accomplishments of SAM RAYBURN. But here I want to talk about some personal reflections.

The first time I met Mr. RAYBURN was several summers back, when I was spending time in Washington, and the Capitol was my habitat. Having thoroughly familiarized myself with the place, I was resting obscurely in one of many out-of-the-way rooms, my nose in the paper. After a while I noticed a man sitting next to me, also reading, but I didn't pay much attention. Then, recog-

nizing the famous Rayburn head, I hastened to introduce myself and shake hands.

Coming face-to-face with that Rayburnish scowl, I almost expected a growl, but instead got a smile, a friendly and warm conversation.

Now I am sorry that I only indulged in small talk, but so often that is the way you react.

My second meeting with Mr. SAM came just last June. The 14 of us from UT who went to Chile for the Student Leaders Seminary spent some prior time in Washington for orientation from the State Department and Foreign Service Institute.

One afternoon we paid visits to the various Texas legislators, and of course Mr. SAM was tops on our list.

That was just a few months back, and Mr. SAM was in the Speaker's chair, in full charge of the House.

I recall that just as we arrived at RAYBURN's office, the bell indicating a rollcall sounded and we were amazed to see Speaker RAYBURN literally galloping back to the floor.

It was a remarkable experience to observe the 79-year-old gentleman scurrying through the corridors, or banging down the gavel or his fist to get a point over.

When we gathered in his office a few minutes later we expected only a hurried introduction, but the busy bulwark of the Democrats took time for a heart-to-heart talk. It seemed highly significant at the time. And it was. People suspected that Mr. SAM was in his last days, but no one really would say it.

We remembered how it was so quiet as he started talking, and how once again that stone face melted into a friendly grin.

He described himself as a man who "has always been in a hurry." He said, "I did 3 years of college in 2 years, and had to sweep floors and ring bells to make it. I studied law at the university after being elected to the State legislature."

Mr. SAM told our group that if we wanted to be good Americans, one of the most important things was knowledge of our country's history. And he spoke with pride of his library in Bonham, and urged us to visit it soon. I think I will.

"Read about the men who were alive, and know particularly about the formative period. The most romantic thing in the world is U.S. history," said RAYBURN.

And then, speaking as a man who knew, he said: "One man has as much sense as the next. It's those who work that make it. Ability is no good without energy. There is no primrose path to success."

He banged his fist on the desk as he made his final point. But he didn't need to. We would all remember. And I will always remember.

[From the Daily Texan, Nov. 17, 1961]

GREAT CAREER ENDED

Dedication to Texas, to the Democratic Party, and to the United States were inherent qualities in SAM RAYBURN. Courage, wisdom, and firmness, combined with this dedication, made Mr. SAM one of the great men of the 20th century.

RAYBURN was a man who earned respect not just from Texans, or Democrats, or Americans, but from citizens of all States, and nations, and of all sorts of political beliefs.

He was not a back-slapping politician, but he knew how to pull the strings and was superb at getting what he wanted. Even in his days as a university law student and State representative he was demonstrating vigorous devotion to what he believed in. He followed the pattern for 48 years in Congress, serving longer than any other man.

Mr. SAM was not flashy. But his straight shooting and constant hard work allowed

him to move up steadily in the national echelon. In 1940, a tense year in all the world, his fellow Representatives elected him to head the House. He made his position powerful, probably second only to the Presidency. He served as Speaker twice as long as Henry Clay, the previous record holder.

In 1961 he was still proving to be the vigorous captain of the House. One of the toughest battles in House history arose over changes in the rules committee. And Mr. SAM won out in a hot fight with his old friend, HOWARD SMITH of Virginia.

When Mr. SAM first went to Washington back in the pre-World War I days, Texas was still a relatively young and undeveloped State. Such is no longer the case, and the Lone Star State has become more urbanized, and industrialized, and a strong force in national affairs. But it never outgrew SAM RAYBURN. Rather it grew with RAYBURN and because of him.

When he came home to Texas to live his last days the eulogies started pouring in. And they were all unanimous in sterling praise.

Early Thursday Mr. SAM left the great American stage. But the shadow of his greatness, and the sound and solemnity of that gavel he so often banged will remain indelibly impressed in American annals.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Oct. 19, 1961]

TEXAS REAPS BENEFITS—RAYBURN A PARTNER OF F.D.R. IN BRINGING ABOUT NEW DEAL
(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—The qualities making for leadership in a democracy are blurred by television and radio, the media of mass communication that infinitely expand the opportunity of the clever demagog. It was out of quite another era, the era of the individual speaking from a body of conviction and belief deeply rooted, that SAM RAYBURN came.

Mr. SAM has always known who he was. When he did speak sparingly and sparsely in language of almost Biblical simplicity, it was out of his origins in an America that still reflected the glow of the struggle for freedom and the harsh, demanding life of the frontier.

A SILENT PARTNER

Because he was so little concerned with his own personal prestige—his is one of the shortest biographies in Who's Who—a later generation is hardly aware of how much he had to do with shaping the Democratic Party. He was a partner of Franklin Roosevelt in the New Deal. And if for the most part he was content to be a silent partner he was nevertheless an indispensable component of the partnership that brought what was in effect a new party into being.

Roosevelt spoke for the city masses, the bosses and their constituents. RAYBURN worked for the dispossessed South and West, for those who were in effect colonial drawers of water and hewers of wood for the industrial North. The partnership was highly successful in that the two major interests complemented each other and impressive majorities were rolled up in one election after another.

PUSHED HARD FOR REA

One of the New Deal goals that RAYBURN pushed hardest was rural electrification. He had grown up in the age of oil lamps when the farmer's wife pumped all the water for the household by hand, besides doing the innumerable other chores for a big family. RAYBURN was determined to have the farmer share with the city dweller the benefits of technology. He worked hard to get benefits for his own State of Texas and particularly when he recruited as his adjutant a smart young Texan new to the House named LYNDON JOHNSON.

The end of RAYBURN's career coincides with a revolution of the right in Texas that seeks to take that State not only out of the New Deal but into the arms of the Republican right. This uprising, symbolized by Texas new Republican Senator, JOHN TOWER, is for States rights and against the Federal Government and all its works. The wealthy Texans financing the movement are well to the right of Louis XIV in the conviction of their own sovereignty.

Yet Texas today gets more Federal hand-outs than almost any other State. In 1960 Texas got 5.82 percent of the divvy from the nine largest Federal programs and in that same year paid 4.43 percent of the total tax burden. The total was \$534,352,000 for Texas with a population of 9,850,000.

MORE THAN NEW YORK

This compares with \$655,889,000 for New York State with its population of 16,782,000 and California which got \$677,584,000 with a population of 15,717,000. The comparison shows up even more sharply in individual programs. On old-age assistance, for example, Texas got \$103,187,000 while New York State got \$46,732,000. This may be a reflection of the degree to which Texas out of its own sovereign tax revenues helps its own old people.

In military contracts Texas outranks all but three States with well over a billion dollars in defense procurement in 1960. In short, the process that RAYBURN began many years ago to try to equalize the distribution of the Nation's wealth has gone forward with a vengeance. And, as Mr. SAM has from time to time wryly observed, those who shout loudest about States rights are often those who work hardest to snare the Federal dollar.

Nothing riled him so much as the fulminations of these conservatives who were at the same time eager to get all the benefits going from the measures initiated under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. A year ago, when President Kennedy was in Texas, Mr. SAM campaigned with him with the vigor of a man half his age. He showed that he could still hit at what he believed to be prejudice and hypocrisy with the fire of his youth.

In the House, where he has been Speaker far longer than anyone in history—he passed that record in 1951—he has in recent years been tired and sometimes impatient and indifferent. Discipline in the unwieldy Democratic majority was lax and both southerners and northerners strayed off the reservation with Mr. SAM's sanction in the belief that if they had to vote a certain way to get reelected then they had to vote that way.

When he came to Congress in 1913, Washington was a small provincial capital, a southern town with a transient population moving in and out as the Congress met. Increasingly the foibles of the time oppressed him. But he never lost the integrity, the sense of being part of a nation he knew and loved, that he brought with him from the last frontier.

[From the Austin Statesman, Nov. 17, 1961]
MR. SAM WON MANY BATTLES, BUT DEATH IS VICTOR IN HIS LAST FIGHT

SAM RAYBURN has won many battles. But the last one he could not win, that against rapidly spreading cancer. Though Mr. SAM was spared the excruciating agony of terminal cancer, his once-hardy frame was emaciated by his affliction, and his mind lost the alertness and sharpness, for which he was famous, in the last days and hours.

RAYBURN was a Congressman and Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other man, breaking the speakership record previously held by Henry Clay.

He was a responsible custodian of the prestige of that office, acutely conscious of being a Democrat, but scrupulously fair in

his rulings and in his treatment of his opposition, as shown by the fact that one of his intimates was Republican Representative JOE MARTIN of Massachusetts, who functioned as Speaker during the interval of Republican control of the House, lost early in the Eisenhower administration, and as shown by the fact that Republicans in Congress had a warm affection for him despite his being a vigorous exponent of numerous Democratic policies.

Yet he was no rubberstamp man. He disagreed with parts of Democratic administration objectives and said so. But in the stern disciplinary area of party politics he was a good soldier. He was a man about whom a sort of legend has grown as to his tactfulness and reluctance to make speeches. But when it became known that RAYBURN was to address the House, the House filled speedily as the word passed that "RAYBURN is on."

RAYBURN, one of this land's greatest Americans, loved his country with a passion. Profoundly disturbed when the House, in the face of the imponderable of World War II which we had yet to enter, was about to abolish the Selective Service System and in stern, plain talk, demanded that it heed the realisms of the day which found German submarine war already seeking to drive us from the seas and about to sink the U.S. destroyer, the *Reuben Jones*, he demanded an extension. The issue was won by the closest of votes, that of one for retention of the Selective Service System, which won for this country irreplaceable time to prepare for the certainty of war.

He led the fight against the principle of holding companies controlling vast corporate domains, as was shown in the busted bubble of the Samuel Insull utilities empire. He stood for good and responsible Americanship, the rights of the people, a solidly endowed economy.

Having experienced poverty he had a broad sympathy for the unfortunate in times of stress and never hesitated to uphold the principle of public assistance until those in plight could be rehabilitated, though often under bitter attack from the wearers of silks and satins.

It is difficult for anyone long familiar with RAYBURN at the gavel of the House to believe that that body can for a long time to come ever be the same without him.

In many major matters he was above mere partisanship. He had also the qualities of statesman. His death is a heavy blow to Texas, which derived prestige from his long incumbency in the chair and as House Member.

It is a blow to the Democratic Party, beset by the responsibilities of stewardship at a time when problems greater and unlike those at any other time in this country's history, face it, with the threat of devastating nuclear war and the intransigence of Russia and its leaders toward any proposal that would soften or avoid the danger, and thus is a blow to the Kennedy administration. Neither party has a figure comparable to the unusual abilities and stature of RAYBURN.

But in the midst of death life must go on. The world is for the living, but this is the time for shedding of tears. Comes now after a decent interval, and with the reconvening of Congress which shall know his presence no more, with the Chamber's artificial light bouncing off his baldpate as he sat or stood at the podium, with a face often as inscrutable as that of a sphinx, when a successor must be named. It will call for the most mature of decisions, with all the way from half a dozen to a dozen being mentioned, most largely unknown save in their own districts.

For the Democratic Party itself it also is a time for self-examination. One of its greatest, able to guide it through the shoals waters of party disunity and resulting prejudices, is gone.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

SAM RAYBURN

The end came for SAM RAYBURN in the community he loved, in the midst of friends in the district that first sent him to Austin 54 years ago and chose him 25 times to represent it in Washington. The record he wrote is not likely to be surpassed. His achievement is among the amazing superlatives of American political history.

Mr. RAYBURN's career was the epitome of the practical functioning of democracy where such intangibles as loyalty, friendship, and individual persuasion shape events more surely than the oratory of a Roosevelt or a Kennedy.

Above all else, Mr. RAYBURN was human. Four of the eight Presidents of the United States who knew him live today to mourn the loss of a personal friend. So do two young Dallas boys whom he greeted with "Glad to see young folks my age," when he interrupted a busy conference schedule not long ago. For millions of other Americans, too—who knew him only as the unsmiling, gavel-pounding arbitrator of Democratic national conventions and sessions of the House of Representatives—a friend is gone.

Of all the lessons learned in mankind's chronicle, the most certain is that only history can weigh fairly the real worth of men. Many opposed with deep conviction the issues for which Mr. RAYBURN strove. In the struggle, he was a relentless fighter but usually a warm friend when the tumult died.

So be it today, for in death there are no foes. There is only the lasting memory of the love of the many Mr. RAYBURN befriended, and of the unique service he rendered longer than any other American.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 1, 1961]

RAYBURN: "TALLEST TEXAN OF THEM ALL"
(By Bicknell Eubanks)

BONHAM, TEX.—"He was the tallest Texan of them all."

That was the comment of the senior Senator from Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH, at the passing of Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN. Senator YARBOROUGH, who occasionally found himself at odds with Mr. RAYBURN in the roly politics of Texas, spoke for his fellow Texans in general.

While Texans are proud of the historical stature of their neighbor, they have not been unanimous in approving his political policies, perhaps because he stands out as a towering individualist among people who themselves still reflect the individualism of their pioneer heritage.

But SAM RAYBURN brought great prestige to his home district, the smallest congressional constituency in the State, and to Texas as a whole. Most Texans felt a pride in this prestige.

NATIVE OF TENNESSEE

Only a few political intimates ever got close enough to Mr. RAYBURN, however, to sense the respect he held for the position, both official and historical, which he had been thrust into.

Interestingly, Mr. RAYBURN never possessed the political power in his home State that he wielded on the national scene.

He had many political foes in the Lone Star State, though few bitter enemies.

[President Kennedy changed the itinerary of his western trip in order to attend funeral services in Bonham Saturday for Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Kennedy was scheduled to arrive in Texas shortly after noon Saturday, attend the funeral, and then fly back to California for a Democratic Party dinner in Hollywood Saturday night.]

Mr. RAYBURN, a native of Tennessee, was brought to Texas as a young boy. He was

the eighth of 11 children of a Confederate veteran and farmer, William Marlon Rayburn, and Martha Waller Rayburn, both of them originally from Virginia.

He was so widely known as SAM RAYBURN that few persons ever knew his full name, SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN.

CLASSIC TRADITION

Mr. RAYBURN rose to prominence in the classic American tradition. He grew up amid simple surroundings. He said his father told him, "SAM, the only thing I can give you is character."

His boyhood on the farm near Bonham left its stamp on his political and economic philosophy. He once explained that a major reason why he worked so hard for rural electrification was because he remembered how his mother had to carry firewood and water, and he wanted to spare other mothers from having to perform such difficult chores.

Mr. RAYBURN worked his way through college and attended what is now East Texas State College at Commerce. He later got a law degree at the University of Texas.

He showed his political aptitude early when he was elected speaker of the Texas House of Representatives at the age of 29, the youngest speaker in Texas history. The next year he ran for Congress and was elected. He took his seat on March 4, 1913, and had served ever since. His reelection soon became almost routine. He seldom had any opposition.

TWO DISAPPOINTMENTS

Mr. RAYBURN once told Texas newsmen that he had had only two major disappointments. He had wanted to be President, but he explained that at the time when he could have been a choice, Franklin D. Roosevelt came on the scene, "and I didn't have a chance." The other was that his protege, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, did not get the Democratic nomination for President in 1960.

When Mr. RAYBURN was at home, he filled a busy schedule. He would receive many visitors and long-distance telephone calls.

Once when this correspondent visited him during the lunch hour, he was interrupted by a caller from Oklahoma. The Oklahoman, a young garage operator, had come to Bonham to ask Mr. RAYBURN for a top diplomatic job. Mr. RAYBURN received him cordially and discussed the request gravely and calmly for about 30 minutes.

When Mr. RAYBURN returned to the dining room, a sister asked him what did he do about the request. It was during a period when the Republicans controlled the House and Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, was Speaker. Mr. RAYBURN chuckled:

"I just told him to get in touch with JOE. I wonder what JOE will do about it."

He chuckled some more as he told his guests to have second helpings.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 17, 1961]

RAYBURN: A SOLID, UNFILLED CITIZEN
(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—The President, the Vice President, the Members of Congress, and the whole Nation is honoring the memory of SAM RAYBURN, the plain-living, direct-spoken, unfilled American who passed on in Bonham, Tex., after serving as Speaker of the House longer than any man in history, and twice as long as Henry Clay.

The House of Representatives won't find it easy to replace "Mr. SAM," whose strength of character and sense of duty helped keep the splintered, populous lower Chamber in step with the White House and Senate. President Kennedy saw this as the House kicked over the traces when Mr. RAYBURN went home early this year, and defeated Senate-passed legislation.

SPEAKER 18 YEARS

Oldsters are saying around town that they don't build men like SAM RAYBURN any more—solid, quietly believing in the basic goodness and rightness of things American, shunning the uses of publicity and televised congressional hearings, an "old-fashioned," conservatively dressed man from the small towns of the Nation.

But quite possibly his example has taken hold, as passed along in friendships on Capitol Hill, at numerous Washington dinners where he spoke briefly and pithily and in such a calm remark as this—to someone who asked him to define his philosophy: "Well, a little applied Christianity wouldn't hurt."

The Washington consensus, as Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON canceled his west coast flight and headed instead for Texas, was that it is the Nation's strength that it does produce such individuals.

"He was always there when he was needed," Mr. JOHNSON commented. "His voice and judgment were heard and respected. In the end, it all added up to one thing—he did what was right."

Mr. RAYBURN was Speaker of the House 18 years. He served more years in the House of Representatives than any man since the Nation was born.

SHUNNED LABELS

Now the choice of House Speaker is expected to fall on Representative JOHN McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, the present Acting Speaker, with perhaps some of his authority shared by a younger and more effective man, Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, who would be House leader.

Northern liberals often called Mr. RAYBURN a southern conservative—though he helped to send much of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal through the House. Vigorous conservatives called him a liberal. Personally, he shunned labels even as he shunned making long speeches.

In 1960 he was for Mr. JOHNSON for President. But the bright young men and adroitly organized efforts of the Kennedy campaign defeated him. He had gavelled numerous Democratic nominating conventions into activity, and by quick nods and recognitions of those clamoring for notice from the floor he often influenced the course of events. In 1960 he had stepped down from this role, so he could work for his friend LYNDON.

Those who looked around Washington today for memories of "Mr. SAM's" work could recall the time just before World War II when the Nation's whole military program hung in the balance. On August 12, 1941, isolationists were on the verge of defeating the bill to extend the Draft Act.

Mr. RAYBURN called upon Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the top men of the Armed Forces for letters to read to the House to impress its membership with the seriousness of the situation.

During the final debate he took the floor and appealed for support. And in the voting confusion as the ballot was taken, he used his knowledge of parliamentary procedure to freeze permanently the announced bare majority vote of 203 to 202—the vote which helped make the Nation prepared for war.

Many have testified that Robert E. Lee was Mr. RAYBURN's real national hero, not because he was southern but because the name Lee meant duty, love of country, self-denial. In his inner-sanctum office in the Capitol, the photographs of General Lee are prominent.

The late David Cohn wrote of Mr. RAYBURN: "He was born on the farm in the pre-packaging era when folks got their cheese off the big round and their crackers out of the barrel, and so he clings to the outmoded concept that the contents are more important than the package."

Which, as many today would opine, is a lesson for this modern commercially vibrant country to remember well.

[From the Bonham (Tex.) Daily Favorite, Nov. 19, 1961]

THOUSANDS PAY LAST TRIBUTE TO MR. SAM
"He has finished his course."

With those words, Speaker SAM RAYBURN was laid to rest Saturday afternoon in Willow Wild Cemetery.

The new grave is beside that of his beloved sister, Miss Lu, and in the family plot with his mother and father and other members of his family who have gone before.

His pastor, Elder H. G. Ball, had spoken the comforting and reassuring words, "We do not say farewell, we only say goodnight."

He spoke the words before possibly the greatest assemblage of Government leaders ever to gather outside the Halls of the Nation's Capitol.

He spoke them to President John F. Kennedy, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, former Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, more than 100 Members of Congress and the U.S. Senate, and scores of other high officials representing almost every department of the Nation's Government.

His impressive eulogy to Mr. SAM came during funeral services in the First Baptist Church which was filled to overflowing. The services were piped outside by loudspeaker in order that the thousands who could not get in might hear.

rites in Washington

The services were carried in full by national television. In Chicago the Chicago Symphonic Orchestra played special music before the services, while the body was being taken to the cemetery, and then after the interment rites were complete.

Simultaneously with the services here, memorial rites were being held in the Washington Cathedral, where those hundreds of friends in the Nation's Capital who could not come to Bonham could join in the final tribute.

It must have been just as Vice President JOHNSON had said it would be in Washington—"a lonesome place without Mr. SAM."

It was the same in Bonham.

THE WORLD GRIEVES

"We must realize that we are grieving not only in our own hearts—but the world, or most of it, is grieving with us today," Elder Ball, of the Tioga Primitive Baptist Church, said as he opened the impressive tribute to the man he referred to often as "our friend."

"The poor, the lonely, the less fortunate were objects of his compassion and his consideration.

"Such men are not born. They are made." Elder Ball spoke of the ambition that began in a cottonfield of Fannin County, of Mr. SAM's climb to national prominence and the high position he achieved.

"He had the feeling that in that place he could be a servant to so many people in the world.

"He made himself a good servant of all the men and women and children who support the freedom and liberties we seek.

"He has fought a good fight for the liberties and freedom of this country.

"He has fought a good fight for the people of this country and the district he represents. He has kept the faith with the democracy of our country.

"He has finished his course."

KEPT FAITH WITH GOD

Elder Ball said that Mr. RAYBURN "not only met local and national obligations in his position, but he has kept faith with God."

"As we come to this hour, the future holds all that is bright and eternal," Elder Ball said. "It can only be had when we enter through the portals of death. He is now where there will be no strife, no threats of

war or destruction, but where there is nothing but peace.

"We are not saying farewell, we only are saying goodnight."

Immediately following the services, the presidential party left the church, followed by members of the family. Many hundreds of others had gathered at the cemetery for the brief committal rites. Chaplain Bernard Braskamp of the U.S. House of Representatives led the prayer at the opening of the service and at the cemetery.

So numerous were the arrivals Saturday morning of people in high government places that knowing who was here was difficult.

PRESIDENT FLIES IN

President Kennedy flew into Perrin Air Force Base and came to Bonham by helicopter. Former President Truman had arrived early and gone to see Mr. RAYBURN's surviving brother and two sisters at the Rayburn home west of Bonham.

Former President Eisenhower flew to Perrin and came to Bonham by helicopter.

The First Baptist Church filled rapidly as ushers, directed by William "Fishbait" Miller, longtime doorkeeper at the House of Representatives, took congressional and senatorial representatives and their wives, and the scores of other high officials, including Congressman John McCormack, Secretary of Navy John Connally, Gov. Price Daniel, of Texas, and many others to their seats.

When the seating of distinguished visitors and others who occupied reserved sections was completed, the hundreds of others who had gathered outside were permitted to enter so long as seating facilities were available. Classrooms and other areas of the church had been opened and the services carried to them by loud speaker.

PRESIDENTS SEATED TOGETHER

President Kennedy and his party arrived moments before time for the services to begin, followed by members of Mr. RAYBURN's family, his staff and others close to the family. The President sat in a front pew on the aisle. In order, next to him, sat Vice President Johnson, Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Truman, 84-year-old Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona and Maj. Gen. Chester Clifton, Presidential military aide.

The casket had been moved directly to the church from the Sam Rayburn Library, where the body had lain in state from Friday until Saturday morning. It was not opened at the church.

Immediate members of the family surviving are Mrs. S. E. Bartley and Mrs. W. A. Thomas, sisters; Dick Rayburn, brother; nieces, Mrs. Joyce Lightfoot of Bonham and Mrs. Judy Rayburn Lowry of Dallas, and a nephew, Robert Bartley.

Mr. RAYBURN died Thursday morning, November 16, 1961, in Risser Hospital following an illness of several weeks. He returned home from Congress for rest and treatment in August, was transferred to Baylor Hospital in Dallas early in October, and was returned to Bonham late in October.

His condition had been critical for the last several days as he fought the losing battle to cancer.

[From Life magazine, Dec. 1, 1961]

UNSEEN SIDE OF THE MAN THEY CALLED MR. SPEAKER

(By D. B. Hardeman)

(AS SAM RAYBURN's research assistant, the author enjoyed a close relationship with the Speaker. He is writing a biography of Mr. RAYBURN.)

SAM RAYBURN was all that has been said of him in the eulogies. He was a man of great honor and high ideals. But he was also a man of earthy humor and plain ideas and this was the man I got to know in my years of close association with him.

His roots were deep in the land of north-east Texas. "I love the dirt," he said. "I like to walk on it. I like to grow things on it. I like to preserve it. Everything comes from the dirt and eventually goes back to the dirt." He shared a mutual respect and understanding for his people—the real people, he always called them. Soon after he became Speaker of the House—"Mr. Speaker" he was called—he went home to discuss with his neighbors the threat of Adolf Hitler to Bonham, Tex., and the world. "We meet always and in all places as equals," he told them. "Among us we have no classes and no cliques."

His devotion to "the real people" and his enthusiasm for serving them were part of his heritage. From his father he acquired a love of politics. "Pa took his citizenship as a sacred duty," SAM said. From his mother, a woman of stern self-discipline and a keen mind, he learned judgment and patience. From both parents he acquired a deep sense of honor. "Matt" Rayburn lived to be 80 and was a strong, loving influence on SAM throughout her life. Early this year when he was in the middle of the hardest battle of his congressional career over a proposal to enlarge the House Rules Committee, he told me: "What I wouldn't give to be able to sit down and talk over some of these problems with my little old mother right now."

Outside his family, SAM's affections ran strongly toward children and young people. "I've never seen the Speaker around dogs," Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON said, "but I'll bet they love him because children do." They took to him instinctively. They crawled all over him and rubbed their hands over his bald head. I believe the only great disappointment of his life was that he had no children of his own. His brief marriage in 1927 was childless. Once when the Bonham Campfire Girls visited his home he said, "Now what do you girls want to talk about?"

"Where is your wife?" one small girl piped up.

"I don't have a wife," he replied gently. "Why don't you have one?" she persisted. "Oh, I'm so cranky that nobody would have me," he said with a laugh.

"I'll marry you," another girl said. RAYBURN roared with delight.

In Washington Mr. SAM enjoyed meeting groups of young people. A high Government official might be lucky to get 10 minutes of his time on a busy day but the Speaker would gladly devote an hour or more talking with high school or college students. "I like young men," he said. "Their minds and bodies are more resilient." LYNDON JOHNSON once confessed: "The Speaker and I have always been very close but if we are not as close as we were once, it is because I'm almost 50. If you notice, he never has old men around him."

The young men—and the old—who got to know RAYBURN best in Washington were those who were welcomed in his hideaway on the ground floor of the Capitol. There in the late afternoon the "board of education" met for some light drinking and informal politicking. Away from work SAM's personality was dominated by laughter, cajolery and down-to-earth humor. He rarely told jokes in his speeches ("I tried it once and before I got through I was the joke"). But in private he liked to tell jokes on himself. Soon after William P. Rogers became Attorney General in the Eisenhower administration, the Speaker struck up a conversation with him at a formal dinner although they had not been introduced. Finally RAYBURN inquired, "Do you have a position in the Department of Justice?"

"Yes," came the reply. "I am the Attorney General."

To work for SAM RAYBURN was to join the large family as another admiring member.

He was very sentimental about his employees—at his Washington office, at home in Bonham, at the Rayburn Library. His Negro cook, Bobbie Phillips, was master of the Rayburn kitchen for 24 years until she died. When another employee once complained that his Christmas gift was not as large as hers, Bobbie flared: "Shut your mouth. You just ain't been a Rayburn as long as the rest of us."

Although he could be hard and cold on business matters, a basic gentleness always showed through when he was dealing with his helpers or acquaintances on a personal level. I once remarked to him about his extreme politeness to waitresses and bellhops. "I wouldn't be unkind to a little boy or a girl waiting on me for all the gold in Fort Knox," he said. "That little girl might be your sister or mine. What we do in this life is often determined by a mighty small margin. I missed being a tenant farmer by just that much"—he snapped his fingers—"but someone was kind to me in my youth."

Despite his courtesy and patience, Mr. SAM did not believe in taking an insult lying down. When a constituent wired demanding that certain action be taken and implying that the Speaker was not doing his job, RAYBURN replied: "I have received your insulting telegram. I think I am perfectly capable of tending to my business and if you would tend to yours, I think it would take most of your free time. The matter has already been taken care of."

One of the big irritations in RAYBURN's life was tardiness. We once got a late start on a drive from Bonham to Dallas where he was to address the delegates to the American Medical Association. When he realized we would probably arrive behind schedule he exploded, "I loathe being late. And I loathe people who are late."

Then he began to laugh at himself. "That reminds me of John—who lived out from Bonham," he said. "He was getting married Saturday afternoon at 6 o'clock. He picked cotton till noon, then shaved, got a haircut, took a bath, trimmed his toenails, and was getting dressed."

"One of the groomsmen said, 'If you don't hurry you're going to be late to your wedding.'"

"'Waal,' said John, 'they can't do no business till I get there.'"

"So I guess," SAM wound up, "that the doctors will just have to wait."

Mr. SAM was also annoyed by inactivity. When he could think of nothing else to do at home in Bonham he would get out all his shoes and polish them. He dreaded holidays and Sundays because visitors were few. One Saturday early this year RAYBURN restlessly roamed his Capitol offices. Finally he lay down to take a nap. In a few minutes he emerged, grinning.

"If this keeps up," he said, "I'll be like old Howard, down south of Bonham. Every day he dressed up and stood around on the courthouse square all morning, just talking. One day a fellow asked an old colored man, 'Say, what does that fellow do?' He replied, 'Well, sir, he don't do nothing all morning and he rests all afternoon.'"

Despite his need to keep occupied, RAYBURN was a cautious, patient man. He never rushed into a decision. He carefully planned his words and actions. He used to remind us, "One of the smartest things anybody ever said was 'Wait a minute.'" And he adopted for his own a maxim attributed to President Calvin Coolidge: "You never have to explain something you didn't say." He admired brevity and clarity in the House. A freshman Congressman once asked him if he was talking too much on the floor.

"Yes," RAYBURN said.

"Well, what should I do about it?"

"Quit it," RAYBURN said.

The Speaker was a Democrat by deep conviction. He believed that his party knew

best how to run the Government of the United States. Two months after he arrived in Washington in 1913 he wrote his first speech for Congress. In it were the principles—and hopes—that would serve him the rest of his life: "It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should and will be, and that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that knows no east, no west, no north, no south, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous, with its lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn."

In political campaigns SAM was a fierce opponent. Yet he was held in affection by most Republicans because, while he fought hard, he never fought unfairly. "The greatest ambition a man can have is to be a just man," he often said.

A newspaperman once asked, "Mr. Speaker, you see probably a hundred people a day. You tell each one 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Maybe.' You never seem to make notes on what you have told them, but I never heard of your forgetting anything you have promised them. What is your secret?"

RAYBURN's hot, brown eyes flashed: "If you tell the truth the first time," he replied, "you don't have to remember."

(A series of articles written for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Dallas Times Herald, and Houston Chronicle)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

PART 1

For a good many years now I have thought of SAM RAYBURN as indomitable, indestructible, and imperishable.

I came to regard him as indomitable in the early days of our friendship when he came to Washington a stockily built, dark wavy-haired young man just 2 months past his 31st birthday to take the oath as Representative from the Fourth Texas Congressional District.

I came to think of him as indestructible and imperishable as in his long congressional service he went on to break record after record. First it was Henry Clay's tenure as Speaker, and which he then more than doubled. Then he surpassed by more than 2 years the longest previous continuous service in the House of Representatives of any man in the constitutional history of the United States.

When he entered a hospital at Dallas in his critical illness RAYBURN had been a Member of Congress 48 years, 6 months, and 3 days.

He set other marks, too, such as being the Democrat to preside as permanent chairman over the most national presidential nomination conventions of his party. There have been 12 presidential elections and 8 Presidents of the United States since he came to Washington. He was to be the colleague of an aggregate of more than 3,000 Members of the House of Representatives. Close to a majority of the present Members of the Senate served with him in the House.

As a lawmaker he has seen three wars—World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and except only for Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, who came to Washington only a few months prior to RAYBURN's arrival no person remains in public life who was here when the Texan came on the National Capital scene in 1913.

The annual expenditures of the Federal Government in RAYBURN's first year in Congress were \$724,511,963. They will be more

than 100 times that this fiscal year. The receipts of the Federal Government that fiscal year were \$724,111,230 and there was a deficit of \$400,733.

I preceded SAM RAYBURN to Washington by 8 months. My first big assignment as a Washington newspaperman, however, was to cover the first inauguration of Woodrow Wilson on March 4, 1913. It was RAYBURN's first big day, too, for he sat in the inaugural stand to see a Democrat inaugurated President after 16 years of Republican occupancy of the White House.

Marching with the West Point cadets that day was young Cpl. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was to become the first native-born Texan ever to be President of the United States. I shared with Eisenhower and RAYBURN at least one thing—we came from adjoining north Texas counties. RAYBURN was from Fannin County, Eisenhower was born in Grayson, and I in Collin County.

RAYBURN did not take the oath of office until April 7 when President Wilson convened the New Freedom session of the 63d Congress which remained in continuous session until October 24, 1914.

Speaker Champ Clark administered the oath to RAYBURN as he entered a House in which there were men who would furnish headlines for the next four decades and more.

The parade of future congressional celebrities which accompanied RAYBURN over the threshold of history that day and the sitting Members already there had the makings of:

Two future Vice Presidents: Garner and Barkley.

Five future Speakers: Gillette, Garner, Rainey, Byrnes of Tennessee, and Rayburn.

Six Cabinet members: Bursleson, Glass, Good, Shackelford, Palmer, and Hull.

Four tariff-bill authors: Payne, Underwood, Fordney, and Hawley.

An antitrust-law author: Clayton.

An 8-hour-day creator: Adamson.

The prohibition amendment and enforcement act writer: Volstead.

The Federal Reserve Act architect: Glass.

The writer of the largest number of Roosevelt New Deal laws: RAYBURN.

A Supreme Court Justice: Byrnes, of South Carolina.

A future Democratic presidential nominee: Davis.

There were also in Congress the last Representatives of the Civil War: General Issac Sherwood, Ohio, Union, and Maj. Charles M. Stedman, North Carolina, Confederate.

There were orators, such as Finis Garrett, of Tennessee, and Daniel E. Garrett, of Texas, and J. Thomas Heflin, of Alabama, and great legislative writers such as Lenroot and Esch, of Wisconsin, and Mann, of Illinois, and Sherley, of Kentucky. "Big Tim" Sullivan, of Tammany, New York, sat on the Democratic side and Boss William Vare of Pennsylvania, on the Republican side.

Two alltime Republican congressional greats had gone down to defeat in the Republican split which elected Wilson: Ex-Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, and Speaker-to-be Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio. But both were returned for the 64th Congress and RAYBURN, ardent Democrat, though he was, cherished his personal friendship with Cannon and Longworth as among the most valued things of his life.

In after years RAYBURN was to say of the men he found in the House of Representatives when he arrived:

"There were a great many people far ahead of me, and I wasn't jealous of them. I didn't envy them their positions. I was willing to await my turn."

As a Washington correspondent I watched RAYBURN get ready for his turn. He was fortunate that John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, who had been in Congress for 10 years, took a special liking to him. Garner was colorful, popular with both Democrats and Republicans, and no man was in a bet-

ter position to obtain favors from the leadership.

He told RAYBURN that as the House was organized at that time the most powerful committees were (1) Ways and Means; (2) Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Representative Choice B. Randell, who RAYBURN succeeded in Congress, had been a Ways and Means Committee member and Garner himself wanted that post. He set about to help RAYBURN get Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was Representative William C. Adamson, of Georgia. Adamson became very fond of RAYBURN and another rookie Member of Congress, Representative Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky. He assigned to RAYBURN a great deal of work on the Adamson 8-hour law which averted a nationwide railroad strike in 1916.

Although Barkley was a notch higher in seniority on the committee than RAYBURN, Adamson made more use of the hard-working RAYBURN who began to get a reputation in the House as an advocate. RAYBURN never had a committee assignment other than Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

He served on the committee under the chairmanships of John J. Esch, of Wisconsin, Samuel E. Winslow, of Massachusetts, and James S. Parker, of New York, and although he opposed them on most measures, he was the warm personal friend of each and enhanced his reputation through the years of GOP congressional control. He became the committee chairman in the last 2 years of the Hoover administration and in the Roosevelt administration, authored much of the regulatory legislation put on the statute books.

His colleagues of his early days in Congress did not regard him as brilliant. But he was friendly, able, honest, industrious, serious, unhurried, and calm. He was regarded as a possessor of all the solid rural virtues in a Congress in which nearly all the leaders were of rural origin.

RAYBURN made his first speech in the House on May 6, 1913, when he lacked 1 day of having served a month in that body. He spoke in favor of the low Underwood tariff bill, which was to go on the statute books repealing the high Payne-Aldrich tariff law. An amendment to the Underwood bill provided for an income tax in accordance with the recently adopted 16th amendment.

"As a new Member of this body, I, of course, feel that I should have regard for the long-established custom of the House, which in a measure demands that discussion of questions shall be left to the more mature Members," RAYBURN said. "But I feel that as a Representative of more than 200,000 citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, I should be allowed to break in a measure whatever of this custom remains, and exercise my constitutional right to speak my sentiment on this floor and refuse to be relegated to that lockjawed ostracism typical of the dead past."

In the course of his speech, RAYBURN said: "I came to this body a few weeks ago with childlike enthusiasm and confidence. It has always been my ambition to live such a life that one day my fellow citizens would call me to membership in this popular branch of the greatest lawmaking body in the world. Out of their partiality and confidence they have done this. It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be and will be, one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion or prejudice, and a country that shall know no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous, with lawmakers having no other purpose than to

write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn."

PART 2

Two rookie Texas Representatives in Congress, SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, and Hatton W. Sumners, of Dallas, came to Congress together and for years were the closest of friends. Both got good committee assignments—RAYBURN on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Sumners on Judiciary and both eventually became chairmen of their committees.

RAYBURN and Sumners took adjoining offices 543 and 542 in the old House Office Building, which had been built when Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker. Each had one room, which he shared with a secretary.

RAYBURN got a Congressman's pay—\$7,500 per year, and the Federal income tax had not yet become effective. He got the going Congressional allowance for office help of \$1,500 per year and hired one person at \$125 per month. He represented a five-county District with a population of a little over 200,000. It was largely rural and made few demands on him.

He had won over an eight-man field in the primary and his majority, as I recollect it, was only 405. He was a bachelor, almost a teetotaler. Two of his Texas colleagues, John Nance Garner and James P. Buchanan were the two most accomplished poker players in Washington. RAYBURN was not a cardplayer. He played dominoes at night with Representative Cordell Hull of Tennessee and other colleagues in the homey lobby of old Cochran Hotel. He introduced Hull to the lady who eventually became the wife of the future Secretary of State.

He seemed little interested in women and had few dates with them. He took no junkets, went home when Congress adjourned and fixed political fences. He insisted that he did not feel well entrenched in his district and "always ran scared." Yet when he had opponents he put them away handily.

RAYBURN in our early acquaintance told me a great deal about his closely knit family.

RAYBURN's father, William Marlon Rayburn, had been a Confederate soldier who came home to Roane County, Tennessee, near the present great Norris Dam on the Tennessee River, and married Martha Waller.

Ten children were born to them in Tennessee. In 1887 the father, mother, and 10 children, 7 boys and 3 girls, moved to Texas and settled near Windom in Fannin County, where the elder Rayburn used all his resources to buy a 40-acre blackland cotton farm.

The 11th child, a son, was born in Texas. SAM, the eighth child, was christened SAMUEL TALIAFERRO, which he had shortened to SAM long before he appeared on the Washington scene.

The Rayburn family had rough going in their first years in Texas. They lived for 30 years in the little frame house where they first settled in Texas. In his early years in Congress RAYBURN was building the new family home which became a showplace in Texas. It originally cost, I think he told me, \$2,800 in the low building costs of those days, but it was modernized and added to. RAYBURN also added to his land holdings and eventually developed the purebred stock farm which became his great pride.

RAYBURN had got what education he could at the little school near Windom, attended Mayo College at Commerce (predecessor of East Texas Normal) and after 2 years of college taught school for 4 years. He ran for a seat in the legislature at 23, served 6 years in Austin, the last 2 as speaker, the youngest Texas ever had, then in 1912 made his winning campaign for Congress.

RAYBURN told me that his desire to come to Congress was whetted by a speech of the great Texas orator, Representative Joseph

Weldon Bailey, who represented the Fourth District which RAYBURN later was to represent. RAYBURN rode horseback in mud and rain 11 miles to Bonham to hear the speech by Bailey, who later became a controversial U.S. Senator from Texas. Bailey was always RAYBURN's political idol.

His ambition, RAYBURN said, always was to come to Congress and become its Speaker; that he never had any ambition to be a Governor, a Senator, a President, or a Vice President. Years afterward, in 1940, he did wish to be Franklin D. Roosevelt's vice-presidential running mate, but Roosevelt tabbed Henry A. Wallace to go on the ticket with him.

In the latter days of the Wilson administration and early days of the Harding administration RAYBURN with Hatton W. Sumners and Marvin Jones, Texas Representatives in Congress, and later Silliman Evans, a newspaperman, established bachelor quarters and acquired a famous cook, but RAYBURN himself was an accomplished cook, specializing in fried chicken.

He had become an ardent fisherman and it was his principal recreation. He had a hobby of collecting pocket watches, the most prized of which was one given to him by his colleagues when he was speaker of the Texas house. He was also for a long time a collector of Robert E. Lee books and photographs.

While a member of the Texas Legislature RAYBURN studied law and graduated from the University of Texas Law School. More than 30 years ago he moved to the kitchenless bachelor quarters at the Anchorage Apartment, where he continued to live in Washington, leaving it this year for the first time before congressional adjournment.

One day in 1916, when RAYBURN had been a Member of Congress for 3 years, Speaker Champ Clark beckoned to the Texan to take a seat beside him in the private corridor outside the House Chamber.

Clark told RAYBURN he had been watching him, was convinced he could attain any place in Congress, including the speakership, but that he ought to enlarge his horizon. Clark asked RAYBURN to jot down a course of reading. It included some writing of Thomas Jefferson, the biographies and writing of Presidents John Adams and John Quincy Adams, President Andrew Jackson, and Senator Thomas H. Benton.

Clark also told the Texan to do certain reading on Presidents James K. Polk and William McKinley, and to learn all he could about the legislative methods of both Polk and McKinley, who had been distinguished Members of the House of Representatives.

RAYBURN did all of the prescribed reading. Many times he, a convinced partisan Democrat, surprised me by admiring references to McKinley, an arch conservative Republican. RAYBURN told me McKinley came close to being the ideal legislator and was a much underrated President.

There is little doubt that of all the Presidents who were in office during his long Congress tenure RAYBURN had the greatest admiration for Woodrow Wilson. In the first Wilson inaugural address, which he had heard as a freshman Congressman, he had found the principles by which he was to live, and the course he thought his party ought to follow.

Yet it was to Wilson that he revealed his qualities of independence. He went to the White House one day in 1915 to discuss with the President a bill pending in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Wilson asked him to hold up action on the bill.

RAYBURN told the President he would continue to press for action on the measure, despite the White House opposition.

"I'm sorry I can't go along with you, Mr. President," he said brusquely as he picked up his hat and left Wilson's presence.

The purpose of the bill was to control the issuance of railroad stocks and bonds. The bill did finally become law by Wilson's signature but it was passed by a Republican Congress in 1919 and RAYBURN got help in its passage from Committee Chairman Samuel E. Winslow, a Massachusetts Republican.

In after years when he had become a master at placation RAYBURN would recall the brush with Wilson as an evidence of his tactlessness when he was a fledgling legislator.

PART 3

My closest association with SAM RAYBURN were in the two decades of the 1920's and 1930's. This, I think, was because these were years in which we both had considerable leisure. For RAYBURN that period of time saw his emergence as an important voice in his party and a very effective legislator.

RAYBURN by the end of the Wilson administration had won his fifth straight congressional term and, although he had nearly always had primary opponents, the Fourth Congressional District was electing him more or less automatically.

He had won his spurs as a party wheel in World War I and his congressional advancement was checked by his party's political fortunes which were not as propitious as his personal ones.

In 1918, midway in Wilson's second term, the Republicans won the House of Representatives and held a tight grip on it for 12 years. The Harding landslide in 1920 swept even into the South to strike down such shining Democratic lights as Representative Cordell Hull, of Tennessee.

RAYBURN moved far up in overall House seniority and became the top Democratic member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Representative John Nance Garner had become the big figure in the Texas delegation and during the 1920's Garner was also to become the choice of the Democrats for their House floor leader.

Garner bypassed some of the senior House Members and formed a young strategical and tactical group of his own, of which RAYBURN was the senior one. Others in the group were Representative Fred Vinson, of Kentucky, later Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; and Representatives John McDuffie, of Alabama; Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina; John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, and John F. Carew, of New York.

Frequently Garner would ask me to sit in on their planning sessions, of which they had relatively few. Mostly each of his high lieutenants worked directly with Garner. One of RAYBURN's duties was to keep up a close liaison with Representative Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York, an irregular Republican. Sometimes (notably in the Mellon tax bills fights) the Democrats were able to draw to their side enough Republicans to win important amendments to legislation.

RAYBURN also took part in the fights against the Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley tariff bills. Of the three Republican Presidents who followed Wilson, RAYBURN's relations were cordial with Harding and Hoover and especially good with Coolidge.

On his visits to the White House, sometimes for Coolidge breakfasts, he said he found that "Coolidge talked enough." RAYBURN frequently quoted with approval Coolidge's reply to a criticism of his silence. Coolidge said: "Well, I found out early in life that you didn't have to explain something you hadn't said." Hoover, RAYBURN called "a grand man, a hard-working President. I doubt if anybody who might have been President could have prevented the debacle of 1929, which took him down with it."

RAYBURN had less dealing with Harding than with any of the Presidents who served after he came to Washington, but found Harding "gracious" the few times he did

have business with him. Of Harding's ill-starred Presidency, including the Teapot Dome scandals, RAYBURN said:

"I never thought Mr. Harding was a dishonest man. I don't think there has ever been a President of the United States who was a dishonest man. I think Harding was trusting. Some people who were not honest imposed upon him."

The Republicans won their seventh straight Congressional election in 1930. But it was so close that before the beginning of the session of Congress in December 1931 (this was before the lame-duck amendment to the Constitution advancing the beginning of Congressional and Presidential terms) deaths had so thinned the Republican ranks and augmented the Democrats that John Nance Garner was elected Speaker by three votes. RAYBURN became chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the last 2 years of the Hoover administration.

With Democratic control of Congress in 1931 began the era of RAYBURN's ever-increasing importance in party councils. Garner as Speaker became the highest ranking Democrat in the Nation and almost automatically an available candidate for the 1932 Presidential nomination.

The Democratic State Convention, meeting in San Antonio, instructed for Garner and elected RAYBURN his campaign manager, and chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago. Garner in a three-way primary contest won the California delegates, defeating Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt. His fellow Texan's campaign was not too easy for RAYBURN to manage, as Garner showed scant interest in it.

At Chicago Garner's strength never exceeded the 46 delegates from Texas, the 44 from California, and a few scattering from other States. But RAYBURN made the Garner candidacy a very important factor in the final outcome.

Roosevelt was far from assured of the two-thirds majority then necessary to nominate. Garner had told RAYBURN before the latter's departure for Chicago that he would not be a party to deadlocking the Democratic convention as it had been deadlocked in 1924 at Madison Square Garden.

The third ballot—all three taken at an all-night session—had found Roosevelt short of the nomination, but the Texas and California delegations of Garner could be enough to put him over. How to get them was a question. RAYBURN was for Roosevelt as his second choice after Garner, but it was doubtful if he could carry the Texas delegation, in which there was strong sentiment for Newton D. Baker, along with him.

From Washington Garner called RAYBURN and said curtly, "I think this thing has gone far enough." Rayburn thought so, too, but he faced the fact that if he could not win Texas for Roosevelt, the forces of the New York Governor would begin to disintegrate on the fourth ballot and a long deadlock would undoubtedly ensue.

"Do you authorize me to release the Texas delegation from voting for you for the Presidential nomination?" RAYBURN asked.

"Yes," Garner replied.

RAYBURN was now on his own and the key man in the convention. If he could switch Texas to Roosevelt, California would follow suit and Roosevelt would be in. If he could not it appeared the jig was up with Roosevelt and a long stalemate was in prospect.

RAYBURN, who always valued an 8-hour sleep, did not go to bed when the convention, after an all-night session, adjourned at 9:15 Friday morning. His soundings convinced him that it was nip-and-tuck between Roosevelt and Baker in the Texas delegation, and with many delegates determined to go on voting for Garner even in the face of his withdrawal.

It appeared to RAYBURN that the surest way to get a majority of the Texans for Roosevelt was for Garner to go on the ticket as Vice President. A conference between RAYBURN and James A. Farley, the Roosevelt manager, agreed that Garner could have second place. Roosevelt from Albany gave enthusiastic approval. But it still was doubtful Texas could be won for Roosevelt.

The San Antonio convention had done things in a big Texas way. It sent 180 men and women to Chicago to cast 46 votes in the national convention, each delegate having only a fractional vote. They were all for Garner, but where they would land with Garner out of it was unpredictable.

Late Friday afternoon RAYBURN decided to take his big gamble. He suddenly called a caucus of the delegation. The call was so sudden that only 105 of the 180 persons in the delegation showed up at the caucus. It soon developed into a howling mob scene. RAYBURN finally got a semblance of order and took a vote. The tally showed 54 for going to Roosevelt, 51 against. What would have happened if the other 75 Texans had arrived RAYBURN himself often speculated, but the 3-vote margin was enough to give Roosevelt Texas under the unit rule, and California followed Texas into the Roosevelt camp to give him the nomination on the fourth ballot.

Garner had told RAYBURN and Senator Tom Connally during the day: "I don't think I should give up the speakership for the Vice-Presidency." He never did say he would take it, but the convention gave it to him anyway.

RAYBURN, who had stuck so closely to his congressional job in Washington and devoted himself so exclusively to his own congressional district that his voice had hardly been a potent one in Texas party councils came out of the 1932 Democratic National Convention a very important figure in Texas and in the Nation. Thereafter his shadow was to continue to lengthen.

Garner's reluctance to give up the speakership was because he had won it only 2 years before, satisfying a long ambition. Garner was 62 years old, from a district where he was entrenched, and thought he could hold the speakership as long as he wanted to do so, and his party stayed in power. He thought the speakership second only to the Presidency in importance. The Vice Presidency he considered as "an office of little importance."

Garner's departure from the House opened up the way to advancement for ambitious Democrats. RAYBURN and the other Garner lieutenants failed narrowly in their effort to elect Representative John McDuffie as Speaker to succeed Garner. Instead the top House post went to Representative Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, with Representative Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, as majority leader.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee RAYBURN pushed through more New Deal legislation than any other Member of Congress. He authored the Federal Communications Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act and the Rural Electrification Act, among others.

PART 4

SAM RAYBURN's election as Democratic leader in the House of Representatives on January 4, 1937, marked the high-water mark of his eminence to that date. It was in the nature of a handsome early birthday present. RAYBURN was within 2 days of his 55th birthday.

He was in the excellent health he had always enjoyed and continued to enjoy for many more years. Robust and virile, he was capable of working long hours. He was heavier and blockier than when he came to the House 24 years before, and the black hair he brought with him to Washington had en-

tirely vanished and he was the baldest man on Capitol Hill.

A movement for RAYBURN for the Speakership had been started by his House friends in December 1934 following the death of Speaker Henry T. Rainey before the Roosevelt administration was 2 years old.

Representative Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, had been the majority leader since the beginning of the Roosevelt administration. Moreover, Byrns had been chairman of the congressional campaign committee which directed the 1934 congressional campaign and had been instrumental in helping many Members to be elected, and these Members felt under obligations to the Tennessean.

RAYBURN got out of the race in a characteristic statement of just 19 words, at which he asked me to look before he issued it. It could not have been improved upon. He wrote:

"I am no longer a candidate for Speaker. There are no alibis. Under the circumstances I cannot be elected."

Byrns won the Speakership and Representative William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, was chosen majority leader. RAYBURN evinced no interest in the latter post at the time. Pending before his powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at the time were three important pieces of legislation: reorganization of the National Recovery Administration (the Supreme Court later ruled NRA unconstitutional); railroad rehabilitation, and the future Federal policy on oil control, the latter being of prime importance to Texas.

Speaker Byrns died on June 4, 1936. Bankhead was elected Speaker on the same day, but as Congress was adjourning in 2 weeks no majority leader was elected, Representative John J. O'Connor, of New York, chairman of the Rules Committee, filling in.

RAYBURN managed the Speaker's committee of the Democratic National Committee in 1936 when the Roosevelt-Garner ticket carried all the States except Maine and Vermont. He returned to Washington and formally announced his candidacy for the majority leadership, and soon found that he was the apparent underdog in the race.

O'Connor had been conducting an intensive campaign and President Roosevelt seemed to be in his corner. RAYBURN could not believe this for O'Connor, as chairman of the Rules Committee, had blocked some New Deal legislation dear to Roosevelt's heart. But he was a brother of Basil O'Connor, who had been Roosevelt's law partner.

RAYBURN's campaign was managed by Representative Fred Vinson of Kentucky, later Chief Justice of the United States, and by CARL VINSON, of Georgia, who came to Congress in a special election only a few months after RAYBURN did.

When it looked dark for RAYBURN, Vice President Garner arrived in Washington and went to work in his behalf. When Garner was criticized for intruding in House affairs he retorted:

"I'm for RAYBURN 200 percent and I am going to keep working for his selection."

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, announced his support of RAYBURN and brought him important eastern seaboard support. Pennsylvania swung to him and with his almost solid southern backing he had pulled up even with O'Connor in early December. The White House did not make the expected fight for O'Connor, even seemed to be on RAYBURN's side. He quickly won other northern and eastern support.

It was a bitter fight but when Representative Hatton W. Summers on January 4 arose to nominate RAYBURN in the Democratic caucus it was only a question of the size of the RAYBURN majority. On the rollcall RAYBURN had 184 votes, O'Connor 127.

RAYBURN's first year as majority leader was a turbulent one. The Republican

membership had shrunk so low that it could not be an effective minority. There was, consequently, little incentive for party solidarity among the huge and unwieldy Democratic majority. It was a job-hungry Congress and all the choice patronage of the Roosevelt administration had been dispensed.

RAYBURN had been in office only a few weeks when President Roosevelt sent up his bill to enlarge the Supreme Court. Democrats split wide open. Representative Hatton W. Summers, RAYBURN's closest friend, and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, refused to introduce the bill, calling it court packing. Representative Maury Maverick, of San Antonio, introduced it.

RAYBURN made known his determination to attempt to put the bill to passage if he could get it out of committee, but it remained lodged there. Relations between RAYBURN and Summers cooled.

On the Senate side, Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, was one of the most vociferous opponents of the legislation. When it was apparent that the bill was doomed in the Senate, President Roosevelt asked Vice President Garner to liquidate the fight in the interest of party harmony. The bill ended up dealing only with procedural reforms in Federal district and circuit courts, with the Supreme Court section entirely eliminated.

There were administration reversals on the House side. The man who was later to be acclaimed as a great leader and great Speaker had not got off to an auspicious start. There was criticism that he was too mild. Even his mentor, John Nance Garner, told him: "You've got to get your knuckles bloody once in a while, SAM."

But RAYBURN was patiently practicing the arts of persuasive personal appeal which later he used so effectively.

RAYBURN had other troubles. Speaker Bankhead was in uncertain health, and had to be absent for long periods, and RAYBURN carried a double load. On July 5, 1939, RAYBURN was elected Speaker pro tempore to serve until Bankhead's return to a semblance of health. With Garner presiding in the Senate, Texas, for the first time, had the presiding officers of the two branches of Congress.

In 1938 RAYBURN was unable to consummate a project of immense importance to the entire Red River watershed, but especially to his own congressional district. A combined flood control and hydroelectric installation on the Red River had long been a cherished dream.

On June 1938, he got through legislation providing for the \$75 million Denison Dam, which at present costs would have cost millions of dollars more. The dam was built under the supervision of Colonel (now Lieutenant General) Lucius Clay, now President Kennedy's personal representative in Berlin.

For the past several years, it had an annual electric power production of 270 million kilowatts, and is sold to both private distributing companies and cooperatives in the area.

Lake Texhoma, which resulted from the building of the dam, has a shoreline of 580 miles. Approximately 6,700,000 persons visited it for recreational purposes last year, and the total will go around 7 million this year.

On the Texas side of the lake, the Fish and Wildlife Service has established the Hageman natural wildlife refuge consisting of 11,427 acres. On the Oklahoma side, a similar refuge called Tishomingo has been established with 16,620 acres.

PART 5

The efforts of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to purge in the 1938 Democratic primaries Senators and Representatives who

had opposed administration policies and measures certainly was not calculated to make SAM RAYBURN's life as House Democratic leader more serene.

RAYBURN himself at the end of the session had sent out letters to all the House Members, praising them for their work in Congress, regardless of their stand on controversial administration measures.

RAYBURN said he favored the reelection of all House Democratic Members, adding that the party was broad enough to tolerate a few "fractious" Members. He made it clear that he thought it had policy for Democratic leaders to be throwing their influence against Democrats seeking reelection in the impending primaries.

But Roosevelt went ahead with his purge efforts. One of those chosen for ousting was Representative John J. O'Connor, of New York, whom RAYBURN had defeated for the leadership. And of all the Democratic Senators and Representatives who Roosevelt sought to drive out of Congress he was successful only against O'Connor.

RAYBURN put through the wage-hour law, relief measures, the amendment of the neutrality act and various bills to begin building up defense for a threatened World War II.

By early 1939 it became evident that basic disagreements on administration policies were developing between President Roosevelt and Vice President Garner. It was also coming to be believed that Roosevelt desired a third term as President. On one of the regular Sunday night gatherings in Garner's hotel apartment, which RAYBURN, I and others regularly attended, Garner said:

"If Roosevelt runs I will oppose his nomination in every way I can. I would be against a third term on principle even if I approved every act of Roosevelt's two terms. If my own brother were President and wanted to run for a third term I would oppose him. The rule against the third term for a President of the United States has the sanction of history and has been supported by an overwhelming majority of the people."

RAYBURN did not express an opinion on a third term for Roosevelt. Garner fully intended to go back to private life. RAYBURN expected to continue as Democratic leader of the House whoever might be President after January 20, 1941.

Early in August, 1939, RAYBURN announced he favored Garner for President in 1940. RAYBURN did not then believe Roosevelt would want a third term.

On August 23, 1939, homefolk gathered for a Sam Rayburn Day at Denison in a demonstration of "thanks" for the Denison Dam project. RAYBURN in an address to the gathering said "history will place President Roosevelt and his accomplishments on the same plane with Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson."

In January 1940, Garner at Uvalde in a 44-word penciled statement said:

"I will accept the nomination for President. I will make no effort to control any delegates. The people should decide. A candidate should be selected in the primaries and conventions as provided by law, and I sincerely trust that all Democrats will participate in them."

There still was no announcement of Roosevelt's intentions regarding a third term when the Texas State Democratic Convention met at Waco in May.

The State convention instructed its delegates for Garner. The convention named RAYBURN as chairman of the Garner delegation to Chicago. I was a delegate-at-large. Just before I left for Chicago, he told me he wished me to serve as his proxy on the Democratic National Committee and to be his spokesman at Chicago if any occasion arose for it. He said I was to take whatever action I thought best without any consultation with him.

There had recently been some talk and Garner had been felt out—he did not know how authoritatively—on whether he would be receptive to “making it the same old team,” meaning a Roosevelt-Garner national ticket for a third time. Garner gave me a letter with the understanding that if at any stage it became a convention floor matter I was to go to the chairman’s stand and read the letter telling the convention Mr. Garner would not again take the nomination for Vice President under any circumstances.

President Roosevelt had still made no announcement on his attitude toward a third term when the national convention delegates assembled in Chicago, but it was now certain that he would be nominated, as he was, on the first ballot. The names of Garner and James A. Farley, however, had been formally presented as presidential candidates but except for the solid support of Texas, Garner received only a few other convention votes.

Following the nomination of Roosevelt, RAYBURN sought and obtained from a caucus endorsement of his candidacy for Vice President. Later President Roosevelt telephoned RAYBURN that he wished Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace as his vice-presidential ticket mate.

Roosevelt asked RAYBURN to second Wallace’s nomination as Vice President. This RAYBURN agreed to do, withdrawing his own vice-presidential candidacy.

A considerable portion of the convention rebelled against the choice of Wallace. Efforts were made to bring Federal Loan Administrator Jesse H. Jones, of Texas, Gov. Paul C. McNutt, of Indiana, and others into the race but all declined.

Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, however, did enter the race and sought RAYBURN’s backing. RAYBURN could never understand why Bankhead with his uncertain health wished the nomination. Moreover, RAYBURN had already pledged his support of Wallace.

RAYBURN also moved to have a Texas caucus endorse Wallace, but instead the Texans by a majority vote went for Bankhead under the unit rule.

At a bitter, howling night session of the convention on July 18, Wallace was chosen over Bankhead, 626 to 329.

RAYBURN came back to Washington to resume his duties for the session of Congress which was to continue for the remainder of the year. There was a heavy program of national defense measures to be considered including the controversial extension of the drafting of men for military service.

Less than 2 months later Bankhead was dead and RAYBURN was Speaker.

SAM RAYBURN became the 42d Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives on September 16, 1940.

A solemn and saddened body of men elected him to be their presiding officer without a dissenting vote and in a transaction that lasted less than 2 minutes.

With the casket bearing the body of his predecessor, William B. Bankhead, in front of the Speaker’s dais, RAYBURN held up his right hand and quietly said “I do” as the oath was administered by Representative Adolph Sabbath, of Illinois, the oldest Member of the House in years of service.

RAYBURN’s name was placed in nomination by Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, who explained that it would be necessary to elect a Speaker at the time in order that the House might continue to function properly and that the election was being held “with profound respect for the memory of the beloved Speaker who has just left us.”

No other name was placed in nomination and Republicans as well as Democrats joined in the chorus of “ayes” that made RAYBURN Speaker.

RAYBURN made no acceptance speech. His only remarks as the oath was completed were

the usual “the House will be in order.” The House immediately held a state funeral for Bankhead who had died on Sunday, after his most recent illness had lasted only 2 or 3 days.

Three Speakers—Rainey, Byrns, and Bankhead—had died in the 6 years before the election of RAYBURN, whose ascendancy to that post a few days more than 21 years ago, was to be marked by an incumbency far exceeding that of any of his 41 predecessors.

It was written of RAYBURN at the time, that he once had a head of hair and a middle name, but had dropped both; that he had one of the baldest and most level heads in Congress.

He was the fourth man from west of the Mississippi to be elected Speaker, the others being Garner, Champ Clark, of Missouri, and D. B. Henderson, of Iowa.

When I saw RAYBURN for the first time after his election to what had always been his ultimate goal he had just returned from the funeral of the late Speaker Bankhead in Alabama.

“Well,” he said, “it’s a fur piece from Flag Springs.”

“Fur piece” was a favorite RAYBURN colloquialism for “great distance” and Flag Springs was the little one-room schoolhouse in the Texas blacklands which RAYBURN had attended.

“And,” he continued, “I still can’t realize I’m Speaker.”

The Speaker of the House of Representatives is a powerful figure in the Federal Government.

He is the real leader of the majority party in the House if he is a strong man, a policy consultant and legislative chieftain for the President, and the next official after the Vice President in the Presidential succession. It is only in protocol and presidential succession that a Speaker ranks behind the Vice President. The powers of the speakership are second only to those exercised by the President.

He, too, as the titular leader of the most numerous branch of Congress, is its spokesman and by tradition is expected to uphold the dignity and independence of the House of Representatives against all comers. The House must have felt strongly that RAYBURN did not fall in there, for it became the custom twice a year—on his birthday and the anniversary of his elevation to the speakership—for party lines to vanish as Republicans and Democrats showered encomiums on him.

Only twice in the 21 years after he ascended the Speaker’s rostrum did RAYBURN surrender the gavel. In 2 years each in the 80th and 82d Congress JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, RAYBURN’s close personal friend, presided over Republican Houses.

In that long period RAYBURN was many times the center of momentous happenings. RAYBURN himself said that the day he probably felt his responsibility the most deeply was on August 12, 1941.

On that day the question of extending the Selective Service Act was up for a vote in the House. Most of the thousands of soldiers who had entered the Army had done so with the understanding their service and training would be for only 1 year. There was war in Europe, but this country had stayed out of it.

The pleas of the War Department was that it would be catastrophic if the Army was allowed to disband were met by a demand of thousands of parents that the Government keep its contract to let their sons out of the service.

Flag-carrying mothers in groups called on individual House Members as the Draft Act was debated, asking them to oppose extension. The galleries were filled as the roll-call began. It was nip and tuck all the way.

Those of us in the Press Gallery found our tally sheets in disagreement. Even RAYBURN did not know which side had won.

The tally clerk turned and handed him a slip of paper.

“On this vote,” the Speaker announced, “203 Members have voted ‘aye,’ 202 Members have voted ‘no,’ and the bill is passed.” By his quick action RAYBURN had frozen the situation, for no Member can change his vote after the result of a rollcall is announced.

There was one other maneuver remaining for opponents of draft extension—to ask for a recapitulation. This Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri, demanded and, because the vote had been so close, RAYBURN allowed it. Again the roll was called. As it was finished RAYBURN quickly announced: “No correction in the vote; the vote stands, and the bill is passed, and without objection a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.”

Again Short arose and demanded reconsideration. That move was estopped by RAYBURN’s announcement that “without objection the motion is laid upon the table.”

Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, got the floor to say: “I beg to differ with the Speaker. The Speaker did not announce that a motion to reconsider had been tabled.”

“The Chair has twice stated that he did make the statement,” the Speaker replied.

“I beg to differ with you—” the Minnesotan began. RAYBURN cut him short, with:

“The Chair does not intend to have his word questioned by the gentleman from Minnesota or anyone else.”

By the one vote the House had kept the Selective Service Act operating. Less than 4 months later the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. But for the retention of the draft law the Army would have been demobilizing instead of mobilizing when the United States went into a world war for the second time in a quarter of a century.

Heads of state and world statesmen came to the Halls of Congress for addresses during RAYBURN’s long tenure as Speaker. Returning war heroes came there, too.

RAYBURN presided over such occasions. The most moving were the wartime address of Winston Churchill, the return of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, after being relieved by President Truman of his Far East command, and the return of the hero of Corregidor, Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

Of the \$350 billion we spent in fighting World War II, much of it was for secret purposes, and RAYBURN would go before Appropriation committees to ask for the funds. A case in point was the atom bomb. RAYBURN himself at first did not know what the money was for. Many Members of Congress did not know of the atom bomb development until the first one had been dropped in Japan.

Among the other measures to carry on the war and prepare the Nation before it was directly in war which RAYBURN guided through the House were the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the arming of merchant ships, the laws granting war powers to the President, and the price control bills.

Until after World War II RAYBURN attended few Washington dinners or social affairs. He once said:

“One reason I don’t go to these society dinners is that they don’t serve chill.”

He liked to give chill and tamale dinners for small groups of congenial people.

There are some social functions in Washington that a Speaker of the House is forced to attend, and others that he cannot gracefully avoid.

The Speaker’s dinner at the White House is a fixed state event. During her lifetime his spinster sister Lucinda (Miss Lou) would go with him to these dinners. After her death his widowed sisters, Mrs. Thomas, and Mrs. Bartley, would go with him.

His annual birthday party on January 6 was another ritual. He gave a few big parties himself.

At the end of a social season during Miss Lou's lifetime he would say he was pining for some "crumbin'."

"Crumbin'" was a Lone Star species of corn-bread that Miss Lou was especially skilled in baking.

RAYBURN had never crossed either ocean, a record he still held when he entered Baylor Hospital at Dallas in early October 1961. He made one trip to Panama, his first year in Congress. He also once spent a vacation in Mexico City. But year after year when his colleagues scattered toward the Parisian boulevards, Waikiki Beach or other faraway places with strange sounding names RAYBURN headed back to his Texas farm.

"When I get away from here I don't want to go anywhere in the world but home to see my lovely country, to see what little possessions I have, and to associate with brothers and sisters and my other blood and my old friends," he once said.

RAYBURN was slow to take up air travel. Asked one day in the 1940's if he was going to fly down to his Texas home for Christmas, he said: "I am going, but I won't fly. I like to travel by train. Takes two nights and a day to get home that way, and the best rest I ever get is during that time. I spend most of it reading a wild west magazine. I went up in an airplane once, back in 1935. Made up my mind never to do it again."

"But, Mr. Speaker," a friend protested, "you've no idea how air travel has improved since then. Why if you took a trip to Texas by plane now, you'd never go any other way."

"That," answered RAYBURN with a twinkle, "is exactly what I am afraid of."

During the 80th Congress when he was not Speaker he made the trips in a big, long, black 1947 Cadillac, which constituted a very sincere compliment to him. Early in 1947 every Democrat in the House contributed \$25 to buy the automobile for their leader.

In his latter years he began to use airplanes exclusively for his trips home.

PART 7

SAM RAYBURN's rank among the Speakers of the House of Representatives will be for history and not his own contemporaries to fix.

The two who prior to him got the highest ranking were Thomas Brackett Reed and Joseph G. Cannon. Henry Clay, who before RAYBURN had served longest, was never ranked as a great House presiding officer.

Reed, a fin de siècle figure, served a broken 6 years—two in the administration of Benjamin Harrison, two in the administration of Grover Cleveland and two in the administration of William McKinley.

A huge mountain of a man, a downeaster from Maine, Reed, a brilliant lawyer, was the possessor of a devastating tongue, and could wither an opponent with a word, or with a sentence at most.

Cannon, an Illinois man, although born in North Carolina and of southern stock, served 8 years in the Theodore Roosevelt-William Howard Taft administrations. He was undoubtedly the most colorful Speaker in history.

I, of course, never saw Reed. With Uncle Joe Cannon I had a delightful friendship when he was no longer Speaker and a very old man. He was then no longer the gladiator he had been. He was lefthanded and did wonderful things with his southpaw when he spoke and those gestures alone would fill the Press Gallery when he arose to speak.

Both Reed and Cannon were Republicans and arch conservatives—"stand-patters" in the idiom of their day. Both ruled the House with a tight rein. Garner was somewhat in the Reed and Cannon image, but Garner was Speaker for only 2 years.

There was no doubt RAYBURN was the leader of the House, but he had a method of his own, which had the appearance of

being a leader among and not of the House Members. It worked exceedingly well for him.

Reed constantly clashed with Presidents. Uncle Joe Cannon could tell Theodore Roosevelt, as he did, that the House can take care of its reputation and its dignity in its own way. RAYBURN had good relations with the four Presidents who served while he was Speaker.

"The best way to get along is to go along," is a widely quoted piece of advice given by RAYBURN to young Members of the House. The inference might be that they should bend gently to leadership orders.

RAYBURN stated it better when 400 Texans in Washington turned out to honor him at a dinner when he was elected majority leader: "I expect to tell the President my convictions and at times may argue with him, but when he and the leaders of Congress have agreed upon a definite program, I will be for it 100 percent," he said.

John Nance Garner long before had said: "In party government you have to take some things you do not like. Party policy is the composite judgment of the party obtained in elections, conventions, caucuses and conferences. There must be discipline and responsibility and when a program is decided on everybody has to fall into line."

On another occasion RAYBURN said: "I have never asked a man to cast a vote which would violate his conscience or wreck him politically. In an overwhelming majority of the cases the Members in the House of Representatives vote for what they think is the best interest of the country."

RAYBURN got credit for running the House with a firm but fair hand—a man who used the arts of persuasion rather than coercion. He once said: "The greatest ambition a man can have is to be known as a just man." Richard M. Nixon, when he was Vice President, said: "There has never been a better or a greater Speaker than SAM RAYBURN."

Nixon made that statement on March 12, 1959, when he and 46 Senators who got their legislative feet wet in the House of Representatives presented RAYBURN with a silver tray bearing their inscribed signatures to be placed in the Rayburn Memorial Library at Bonham.

It is a novel experience to see a contemporary live to become a patriarch as RAYBURN did during my time in Washington. In that time also he became a legend, a Washington institution, and a pillar of Congress.

The most valuable thing RAYBURN got from Garner was "savvy"—an understanding of the House and the men and women who compose its membership, of which there is no greater cross-section of human nature. Most of them have fierce personal ambitions and nearly all of them feel they themselves have all the attributes and qualifications of leadership. All are elected and have constituencies. Year after year RAYBURN became more and more the counselor and father-confessor of House Members. He saw nearly all of them privately at some time each session in his big ornate formal office across the corridor from the House Chamber.

There was also the smaller back office near the middle of the Capitol where he relaxed with friends. Vice President Harry S. Truman was there in this little hideaway with RAYBURN and a kindred group when he was summoned to the White House to be told that Franklin D. Roosevelt was dead and he was President of the United States.

There are persons of all professions in Congress. RAYBURN, a lawyer, said it made no difference what their calling had been, if they had character and commonsense.

"When a person has commonsense, he has got all the sense there is," he said. "It all depends upon what is done with it."

Into this office daily also came prominent private citizens, Cabinet officers, committee chairmen, and party leaders, large and small.

Some slightly eccentric characters at times got through the portals.

"Every few days," RAYBURN said, "some fellow comes in here and says: 'Here is the biggest question that confronts the human race.' I say: 'Yes, the fellow who passed you in the door going out, he had the biggest one, too.'"

A rather sad faced man, some visitors got the idea RAYBURN was a worrier. He said he wasn't, that when he went to bed he went right to sleep: "If I can't do my job standing on my feet, I sure can't do it lying in bed worrying."

An aid once told how RAYBURN managed to see so many people and do so many things in a day. A telephone call took him 3 minutes, even if it was with the President of the United States. Five or ten minutes was enough for a conference, even on a complicated problem. He never wrote letters longer than a page. He was never prodigal with words.

He became affectionately known to the nation as "Mr. SAM." That happy designation came about in this way: There were still at home in Bonham a rather large Rayburn family. There was unmarried Lucinda. SAM always called this sister, "Miss Lou," even when he was speaking to her. The neighbors took to designating the brothers as "Mr. Tom," "Mr. Jim," "Mr. Sam," and "Mr. Dick."

The custom spread over his congressional district as far as "Mr. SAM" was concerned. Hope Ridings Miller, a young woman from Sherman, came to Washington and became the writer of a social column. She began to refer to the Speaker as "Mr. SAM" as she had always heard him referred to in her Texas home.

Then suddenly, a decade or so ago, everyone seemed suddenly to realize how felicitous the appellation was. Henceforth he was to be "Mr. SAM."

When an effort was made to boom RAYBURN for Vice President in 1944, he showed no desire to change from the speakership which he by then held, although most persons believed that if Franklin D. Roosevelt were reelected in that year he would not live out his fourth term. The nomination went to Harry S. Truman, who did quickly succeed to the Presidency.

There was a move among Texans and in other States to offer him for President in 1952, and he gave no assistance to it. In 1956 and 1960 he strongly backed the presidential candidacy of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

He refused the offer of permanent chairman of the 1960 Los Angeles Democratic National Convention to work for JOHNSON's nomination and to make the speech placing his fellow Texan in nomination.

Although RAYBURN never admitted it he became convinced soon after he reached Los Angeles that Kennedy had the nomination sewed up. He sat in his seat, second from the aisle, among Texas delegates, when JOHNSON was defeated by Kennedy. The next day JOHNSON was chosen as Kennedy's vice-presidential ticketmate.

The one native Texan he saw elected to the Presidency was Dwight D. Eisenhower, a Republican, and RAYBURN, as a Democrat, naturally did not like that, although Eisenhower always referred to himself as RAYBURN's "constituent."

On RAYBURN's 79th birthday Eisenhower sent him a telegram saying:

"I am happy to have been born in your congressional district (at Denison) because I prize your friendship and respect your many years of outstanding service to our country."

RAYBURN recently scoffed at a statement that this country has lost many of its ancient liberties.

"What liberties have we lost?" he asked. "The American boy and girl today can say what he pleases, think what he pleases, and

choose his way of life freely as long as he does not trespass on someone else.

"We have amended our Federal Constitution 23 times, but we have every single liberty we had when the Constitution was written in 1787."

One of RAYBURN's greatest prides is the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, his Red River Valley hometown. RAYBURN started it back in 1948 with \$10,000 which a magazine gave him as an award for outstanding public service.

Friends took over and contributions came from nearly every State in the Union. More than \$400,000 was contributed. It was dedicated and opened in 1957. Into it have gone, or will go, his books, his official and personal papers, and all the treasured mementos he has collected in his lifetime. It is operated by the Sam Rayburn Foundation.

His love for the Capitol Building has been well known and from the beginning of his speakership he exhibited a proprietary interest in it. He fought for years against formidable and vocal opposition to effect changes in the east front he thought necessary and advisable.

The RAYBURN-directed extension of the Capitol's east front, which moved the familiar east exterior of the building 32½ feet east of its original location, will be fully completed January 1 at a cost of \$15 million.

The east front has been called the Texas front by some because Vice President JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN each were to have had a handsome suite of offices there—JOHNSON's office to the right of the rotunda and RAYBURN's to the left.

An \$86 million New House Office Building, rising to the west of the present two House Office Buildings, will owe its construction mostly to RAYBURN. It is to be completed by late 1963. Representative WALTER JUND, Republican, of Minnesota, has introduced a bill to name it the Rayburn Office Building and this will probably come about.

Speaker RAYBURN came back for the opening of Congress in January peppery and vigorous. At the start of the session he succeeded in enlarging the Rules Committee as a means of easing the way for Administration bills.

But the House rebelled at some of the Kennedy bills and it was a thorny session for RAYBURN; by the end of the session after he had gone back to Texas ill the administration was taking a steady beating in the House.

RAYBURN thought his ailment was lumbago and to most of Washington it was inconceivable that he would not come bouncing back for the 1962 session of Congress. Then came the unhappy tidings of his serious illness.

The National Capital misses him.

"Speaker RAYBURN will always live in the history of a grateful Republic as one of the greatest public servants we have ever had," said Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio.

That, I think, is the way most of RAYBURN's contemporaries feel.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]
MR. SPEAKER—MR. DEMOCRAT—SAM RAYBURN
LOVED PEOPLE, EVEN ABOVE CHERISHED
PARTY

(By Jim Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—A whole political era passed with House Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

He was Mr. SAM to generations of Texans; Mr. Democrat to legions of Democrats and Republicans, and Mr. Speaker to thousands of Congressmen with whom he served for half a century.

He served as a Member of Congress under eight Presidents. To four of them—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—he was confidant, adviser, instructor, friend, and at times, savior.

And although a giant in his country's Government in an age of organization, RAYBURN was until the last the hip pocket politician who learned solely upon hard-earned personal prestige and simple rules of conduct. The ways of highly geared and detailed operations with polished assistants were not his. He dealt man to man. He built solidly upon truth, kindness, good reasons, honor, and fair play.

In the course of an ordinary day as presiding officer of the House of Representatives, RAYBURN would see and talk with up to 100 persons, from the President to east Texas constituents. He took no notes, had no secretary or recording equipment standing by.

"How do you keep all this straight?" he was asked recently.

It was really simple, replied RAYBURN: "You tell them the truth the first time, and you don't have to remember. You just tell them the same thing the second time."

The length of service recorded by RAYBURN is historical. He went to Congress on March 4, 1913, at the beginning of the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

After 27 years, he became Speaker at the age of 58. On June 12, 1961, he doubled the 3,056 days Henry Clay served as Speaker.

His 48 years and 8 months in the House far exceeded the 45 years, 8 months and 2 days of consecutive service by Adolph Joseph Sabath, of Illinois. In 1958, he quietly passed the 46 years of nonconsecutive service set by Joseph Cannon of Missouri.

Only Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, who came to Congress with his State's entry into the Union in 1912, has served longer in Congress.

But RAYBURN looked upon these records with distant pride. His close interest lay with what he accomplished in the day by day, year by year, and decade by decade march of events through Congress.

He was an ardent supporter of Woodrow Wilson, and as a freshman Congressman, wrote an early part of the Wilson program to regulate railroads. In 1917, it was RAYBURN who sponsored the first act to give insurance for soldiers and sailors, the first allotments to families, the first disability payments to wounded servicemen.

When the great depression rolled in, and brought Franklin D. Roosevelt with it, RAYBURN was chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The veteran RAYBURN fathered in the next few years the really enduring works of the Roosevelt New Deal. He wrote the Truth-in-Securities Act; the Railroad Holding Company Act; the bills creating the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission; the Public Utility Holding Company Act, and the Rural Electrification Act.

Democrats chose RAYBURN in 1937 as their majority leader. In this capacity, he guided the controversial Roosevelt legislation through bitter fights in the House.

On September 16, 1940, he was sworn in as Speaker to finish a term of Representative William Bankhead. Below the rostrum where he took his oath, Bankhead's body lay in state. RAYBURN was already a gray-beard in service, readied by time and experience for the role of leader in Congress in the war years just ahead.

To him, on August 12, 1941, fell the awful responsibility of preserving the Selective Service Act that was to keep this country preparing for the fateful blow at Pearl Harbor.

He did so by one vote, coupling this narrow margin with determined rapping of his gavel which prevented reconsideration. Only a man of strong convictions and strong will could have faced down the uproarious Members of the House that day; only a persuasive leader could have gotten the bare margin from reluctant Members. But he saved the draft, and perhaps the country.

In postwar years, through the Truman administration and that of Mr. Eisenhower, RAYBURN often carried the brunt of efforts to extend aid around the world to stem communism. He and Mr. Truman were close personal friends—Mr. Truman was with RAYBURN when word came of Mr. Roosevelt's death.

Until Mr. Truman served out the Roosevelt fourth term, RAYBURN was second in succession to the Presidency.

With the sweep of the Republican Party and Mr. Eisenhower in 1952, RAYBURN was confronted along with other Democrats with the job of picking up the pieces of their shattered party. His wise counsel, followed by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, then majority leader in the Senate, kept Democrats from unreasoning opposition. The responsibility exemplified by RAYBURN, in those days when the true party leaders were in Congress, did more than anything else to rebuild confidence in the Democratic Party.

It has often been written that the House speakership was the pinnacle of RAYBURN's ambitions.

He is quoted correctly in saying that he had "rather be Speaker than any 10 Senators." There is no question but that he loved the House, in the simplest and truest meaning of the word love. But ambitions are not so easily circumscribed.

There was a time when he looked with quiet longing and the barest of admissions to close friends at the Presidency. He knew the powers and potentials which rest in the White House. But Roosevelt chose a third term, and then a fourth. The Presidency rolled beyond RAYBURN's grasp as age mounted.

Even so, fate would have ruled RAYBURN President, had he chosen right. He could have had the nomination for the Vice Presidency in 1944, but asked that his name be withdrawn.

Mr. Truman accepted the offer from Roosevelt and went on to the Presidency. Characteristically, RAYBURN shrugged off the loss and stumped the South for Mr. Truman in 1948. He may have meant the difference for the beleaguered Truman.

And so RAYBURN came to be wholly satisfied with the speakership, the second most powerful position in Washington. In later years, he was to direct his efforts at placing his prize protege, Vice President JOHNSON, in the White House.

RAYBURN is one who followed his own advice on leadership—be a follower first. From his years of comparative obscurity, he absorbed and refined his own thinking on leadership to some simple precepts.

Where possible, he worked quietly behind the scenes in shaping legislation, with a word here, a whispered consultation there, or a meeting over bourbon and water in his side room, called the board of education. He preferred persuasion, but could lace recalcitrant Members with some pungent directives if necessary.

"SAM always said 'we've got to get the hell out of here' just when I got in fights over appropriations," fierce old Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, has said.

But wherever he could, RAYBURN liked to work with kindness and good reasons. He sought the possible, seldom insisting on all he wanted or using all his powers as Speaker. He liked to label his give-a-little, take-a-little attitude as "applied Christianity."

RAYBURN had advice based upon his own formula for success and longevity for new Members of Congress. The average turnover in Congress is 150 seats every 2 years, and in RAYBURN's time, he served with more than 3,000 Members. He told his new charges to work hard, listen and not talk too much, master the issues, learn the rules of the House, and to follow the party leadership

unless there were overwhelming reasons to do otherwise.

He summed up this portion of his advice in one sentence: "The way to get along is to go along."

His additional advice was for Members to consider their folks at home, but not forget the other Members of the House; to go home every chance they got, but not while big legislation was up, and to go easy on the Washington social whirl.

For new Members from Texas he had similar paternal advice, but added one positive order; no 10-gallon white hats and boots while in the House. One present Member can still remember the scorching he got for breaking the Speaker's rule against home State ostentation.

RAYBURN was a stickler for the dignity of his House, and believed in its collective commonsense to an unusual degree for a man so close so long. He looked upon the Members as a cross section of the best America had.

"They are the best jury I ever saw a man tried before," RAYBURN once said.

Occasionally, RAYBURN would hold his own trial—and once he found a man wanting, that man was relegated to obscurity, or at best, to talkative impotence. The Speaker was more likely to do this to uncooperative Texans.

In later years, RAYBURN mellowed in attitude toward opposition, personal or party. Not long ago, he said that there was no longer a man alive for whom he felt enmity. He had gotten, RAYBURN said, all hatred out of his soul, even for those who had spoken most unkindly of him.

Publicly grumpy—some newsmen always referred to him with a mixture of fear and admiration as a "crusty old warhorse"—RAYBURN was in reality a much more complex personality. If he seemed a hard, tough driver in the Congress, in his personal dealings he was often sentimental, melancholy, lonely, and seeking companionship. He had a dignity that stayed any excessive familiarity, but he could be deeply kind and warm-hearted.

Children moved him easily. He kept a close watch on the families of Texas Congressmen, and frequently appeared unannounced at birthday parties.

Perhaps the most illustrative of how he could react with unexpected kindness amidst the harshness of Washington is this story told by a reporter, now a top executive for a large Northeastern business concern:

"One of our daughters died. The next morning SAM RAYBURN was at our front door. He said he had just come to help out in any way he could. Understand, I was fairly new in the bureau and wasn't important to my paper, and I certainly wasn't important to SAM in any political way.

"But there he was. He helped me make coffee and told our two little girls stories about Texas. I knew he was supposed to go have breakfast with the President at the White House that morning, and at one point I asked him about it.

"He said: 'Yes, but I called the President and told him I had a friend in trouble.'"

This was the same rugged fighter who could tell Roosevelt, who once left his attention wander during a talk to RAYBURN, in an unmistakable tone: "Looky here, Mr. President, by God, I'm talking to you. You listen."

And cooperative or not in legislation affecting the Nation, RAYBURN could quietly take the hide off a Republican. He did it in one paragraph to President Eisenhower at the 1956 Democratic convention, despite his awareness of how the folks back home went for "Ike." Said RAYBURN in a speech telecast nationwide:

"Personally, I like President Eisenhower. He was born in the district which I represent and everybody down there who remembers him says he was a good baby. (Laughter). Then he moved off to Kansas, and

after he was 60 years of age he decided he would be a Republican, and I feel sure that, with his troubles with these Republicans in Congress, he regrets every day that fatal decision was made."

Here was another facet of the RAYBURN personality—his fierce party loyalty. Reasonable in the legislative halls—one of his best friends was former Republican Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN—RAYBURN could be most unforgiving on the campaign trail. He could like Republicans personally, as he did Mr. Eisenhower, but he could never undersand why they were Republicans.

Paradoxically, he deeply resented charges that he put his party before his country, and had a difficult time forgiving those who dared utter such statements. In reckoning back over his record, it would seem he had reason to be angry.

Former President Truman, describing RAYBURN's fairness, had this to say:

"SAM RAYBURN is the only man I know who doesn't have to die to become a statesman."

Mr. Eisenhower recognized the unstinting cooperation of RAYBURN off the campaign trail, too. Once, before an embarrassed but proud RAYBURN, Mr. Eisenhower paused in a state of the Union message to give birthday congratulations.

Probably RAYBURN's happiest moments came at the national conventions of his party. When he stood as chairman in the glare of the lights, enveloped in the physical animal noise from the floor, gaveling his beloved party along another search for a candidate, RAYBURN appeared in his zenith. His nod was fortune to those below, and the cold unseeing glance passing a delegate could mean ruin to the most carefully laid plans. And he could freeze a wandering, playful delegate with one look.

For three consecutive Democratic conventions—1948, 1952, and 1956—RAYBURN served as permanent chairman. No other man in the history of the party presided over so many. He stepped aside in 1960 to push the fortunes of Vice President JOHNSON.

The fact that no convention ever followed his advice about its candidate after Mr. Truman didn't seem to dim the Speaker's pleasure in the rough contact of convention politics.

He ignored lobbyist pressure, but was quick to respond to the scrawled, sometimes semi-illiterate letters from farmers in his district.

RAYBURN had been solidly shaped by his early contact with hard working, Bible-reading people who make up his immediate family and the voters in much of his home counties. His liberal attitude toward any legislation designed to help the people, and a positive suspicion of giant business, were cornerstones of his political philosophy. He was, in final quality, a product of America's democratic processes, drawn from poor and hardy stock and molded over an expanse of 50 years in a decidedly Democratic cast.

SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN was born of Scot-Irish parents in the mountains of East Tennessee on the banks of the Clinch River in Roane County on January 6, 1882.

His father was William Marion Rayburn, a onetime Confederate cavalryman who lost everything, including his horse, in the course of the war and died years later still hating Yankees. The mother was Martha Waller Rayburn, of a Virginia family. SAM RAYBURN was the 8th of 11 children.

When the future Speaker was five, the father sold his Tennessee farm and went to Texas. There he bought 40 acres of land in Fannin County and renewed his struggle against poverty. There was food enough, but everybody had to work for it, and the work was from can't, or from dawn to dark.

RAYBURN remembered the bleakness of that early childhood as long as he lived. His sense of loneliness flowed from it. He once told friends:

"Many a time when I was a child and lived way out in the country, I'd sit on the fence and wish to God that somebody would ride by on a horse or drive by in a buggy—just anything to relieve my loneliness. Loneliness consumes people. It kills 'em eventually. God help the lonely."

His interest in politics stemmed from age 10. That year he rode the family horse 12 miles to Bonham to hear Senator Joseph Weldon Bailey, his hero, speak. By 13, his mind was made up on a political career. At 17, he accepted the \$25 his father had to offer and entered East Texas Normal College in Commerce. For the rest of his living while in school, he swept floors, milked cows, and rang the college bell. He dropped out after a year to teach, returned after a year, then quit to mix teaching and politics.

RAYBURN was 24 when he decided to run for the State legislature. His entire family dropped everything to campaign for him, a practice they followed until it was no longer needed. The Rayburns were a strong force for any local politician. Their man won easily.

In Austin, during the sessions, he attended the University of Texas and passed the bar examination. He was reelected twice, and in his third term at only 29 years of age he was elected speaker of the Texas house. His age record was to stand for 40 years, although RAYBURN later admitted he got through the session "by God, by desperation, and by ignorance."

A year later, he was elected to Congress from the district in which he grew up, and his last career began. Although he had some mean opposition, in later campaigns he never was seriously threatened.

Here in Washington, RAYBURN had lived since 1928 in a modest second-floor apartment as a bachelor. He was married and divorced early in life. He never remarried.

The Speaker brought only close friends to his apartment for long evenings of talk. His meals were usually sent in from a nearby restaurant, but occasionally RAYBURN opened a can of tamales sent to him from Texas. He did not cook chili.

Sometimes he sat at the table on a small wooden bench, much the same kind of bench rural people used in his childhood.

RAYBURN could have lived in much fancier surroundings. His pay as Speaker was \$35,000 a year, and he got another \$10,000 for expenses. His benefits of office also included an official limousine and a driver. But outward trappings did not impress him. He saw too much of them in the swirl of high-level Washington society to feel enchanted.

RAYBURN made courtesy calls to many social events, but much preferred to spend an evening at home with his friends or with one of his sisters who were frequent guests in Washington.

For years he bypassed expensive parties planned for his birthday for a quiet dinner with a couple from his hometown.

His free time was filled with books, usually history or western novels, and some quick fishing trips. One of the strange sights of the city was RAYBURN loading his plain fishing gear into the long limousine for a day out.

His heart was always in Texas, there in the black farming land, in his white frame home, with his family, among neighbors, with his white-faced Herefords, the turnip greens, and the trees.

One day in Washington, he looked down from Capitol plaza where he liked to stroll, across the grassy mat that rolls westward to the Washington Monument, and remarked:

"It's beautiful down there in Texas, too. Not many hills, but rolling prairie land. And that black land is 40 feet deep. There doesn't seem to be any bottom to it."

Hardly had his gavel fallen for the adjournment of a session before RAYBURN was on his way to Bonham. For years he went

only by train, scorning the airplane. But one day he went with President Eisenhower to Texas by plane, and once he tasted the speed, only a jet would move him homeward fast enough.

Back in Bonham, RAYBURN could be seen beating about the countryside in a pickup truck, or until he got too old, aboard a high-priced cutting horse misnamed Pansy.

He kept in shape by cutting wood with double-bitted ax, but never, his friends said, enough "to get calluses on his hands." He was notoriously inept about things mechanical, and had trouble backing up his truck.

RAYBURN never traveled abroad, except for one early trip to Panama.

His health held up for years. His first trouble, the first sign of age, came in his 79th year in the form of backaches. He seemed to wither rapidly thereafter.

He was a stocky man, seldom straying far one way or the other from his 175-pound level. He stood 5 feet and 10 inches, and was quite aware of his shortness.

His face had set in a heavy saturnine pattern. In later years, all that was left of his once heavy brown hair was a thin fringe that rimmed his bald head under his hat brim. Finally, even that hair disappeared. He was most solicitous of the bare head in the cold winds of Washington.

A few years back, his eyes dimmed and he could not read. His assistants read what he could not hear. He had trouble recognizing people at short distances.

One step in the process of awareness of age—like that of ridding the soul of hate—was the link he formed at 74 with the church of his father. He was quietly baptized into the Primitive Baptist Church of Tioga, Tex., in 1956.

He had never before found the time for formal ties with a church, although a professed God-fearing man.

From that point, RAYBURN seemed to have come almost the full circle—from the people of East Texas and back to his folks. He completed it.

[From the Pecos Daily News, Oct. 11, 1961]

PROUD SAGA OF SAM RAYBURN BEGAN WITH LONELY YOUTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—William F. Arbogast, chief of the AP staff covering the House of Representatives, takes a long look at SAM RAYBURN, who has made an indelible imprint on U.S. politics. In discussing the RAYBURN saga, Arbogast writes not only as a close observer, but also as a friend of the Speaker.)

(By William F. Arbogast)

WASHINGTON.—The political saga of SAM RAYBURN nears its tragic end today.

The end isn't likely to find that hero of the SAM RAYBURN story proudly and authoritatively wielding the gavel of the highest office he ever sought. Instead, physicians have decreed for "Mr. Democrat" a less majestic fadeout, a victim of cancer.

But if the end comes soon—as doctors say it must—it will find SAM RAYBURN still officially holding the title of Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. The House is in recess. It won't meet again until January 10.

The story of SAM RAYBURN is the story of a lonely little boy helping grub a living out of Texas cotton land and dreaming of a future in politics.

It is the story of a dream come true in the face of adversity and obstacles which would have discouraged a less determined man.

SAM RAYBURN wasn't born to be Speaker of the House. He got there on his own.

He was born to be a farmer and at farming he spent his early life, first in his native Tennessee and then in Texas, which his father adopted as a permanent home for the Rayburn family of 11 children.

As a boy, SAM RAYBURN's life was one of toil and monotony.

"When I was a boy," he once said, "I would sit on a fence on Sundays and wish that somebody would ride by on a horse—just anything to relieve the monotony."

He surprised almost everyone by seeking election to the Texas House of Representatives at the politically tender age of 24.

He won, and became at the age of 29, the youngest speaker in the history of the Texas Legislature.

In 1912, at the age of 30, RAYBURN achieved a burning ambition—election to the U.S. House of Representatives. He has been there ever since.

He rose to the chairmanship of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees and to the floor leadership of his party. Then in 1940, when the speakership was vacated by the death of William Bankhead, of Alabama, he won the job.

Except for 4 interrupted years when Republicans were in control, RAYBURN has held it ever since. His tenure as Speaker set a record.

If RAYBURN ever aspired to higher public office, he never disclosed his aspirations. He loved the House.

He brought to the speakership a mixture of "the stern guidance and loving care" which he said his parents gave to him. Between the two courses, he sought compromise.

RAYBURN left no doubt about who was boss of the House when he held the gavel. He believed that "if you lose control for even a split second, you are in serious trouble." He never lost control. When gavel-tapping failed to produce results, gavel-banging did. RAYBURN broke more gavels than did any of his predecessors.

Presidents addressed him as "Mr. Speaker." Without his help; they were in trouble on Capitol Hill and most of the eight under whom he served knew it. He did not hesitate to "tell them off" in plain English.

RAYBURN brooked no meddling in the affairs of the House. To him it is the greatest deliberative body in the world. He was jealous of its powers and prerogatives. He respected the Senate but often gave the impression that he considered it bush league compared with the House.

As Speaker, RAYBURN was a backroom operator. When he needed votes, he went after them. By personal persuasion, cajolery or threats if necessary, he frequently snatched victory from seeming defeat.

But he never asked a colleague to vote against personal conviction. He put loyalty to conscience, country and party in that order.

He called himself a Democrat without any ifs, ands or buts.

To the chairmanship of three Democratic National Conventions, RAYBURN carried the same vigor and at times seeming arbitrariness which marked his rule over the House.

Television viewers will long remember the scowls and defiant glares with which he nipped convention uprisings. He was the boss and he left no doubt about it.

RAYBURN enjoyed few things more than a good fight. He won more than he lost.

He failed to win presidential nominations for two fellow Texans, John Nance Garner in 1932 and 1940, and LYNDON B. JOHNSON in 1960.

He laid his personal prestige on the line last January when he championed enlargement of the House Rules Committee. He had his way by a slim edge, but whether he actually won is debatable. The Rules Committee still doesn't jump every time the House leaders crack the whip.

On the subject of leadership, RAYBURN had a homespun saying: "A man doesn't learn his job in the House until he's had his head damn near well bloodied a couple of times,

but a leader may as well quit if his head is bloodied too often."

Opponents complained at times that he was harsh, arbitrary, dictatorial. But in the same voice they conceded fairness.

RAYBURN insisted on respect for the office of Speaker, if not for the man who held the office.

To him the title "Mr. Speaker" was honor and glory enough for any man.

Last June 12, when RAYBURN doubled Henry Clay's record of almost 8½ years as Speaker, colleagues poured forth tribute to RAYBURN.

Fighting back tears, "Mr. Speaker" acknowledged them with these words: "My career is crowned. I have achieved every thing I ever hoped or desired. When I leave here I will leave without any regrets."

Less than 3 months later he left at the insistence of his doctors.

[From the Austin Statesman, Nov. 17, 1961]

RAYBURN GAINED POLITICAL GREATNESS

(By Frank Eleazer)

SAM RAYBURN never was seen slapping a back. He didn't smile much. He seldom made speeches. He disliked and was disliked by photographers. He kissed beauty queens but rarely a baby. Despite these and other departures from the established tradition he attained political success, world renown, and even love and affection beyond the wildest dreams of most politicians.

RAYBURN not only served in the House longer than any man. He served as House Speaker more than twice as long as his nearest competitor. In his years of splintering gavels he built the job into the Nation's second most powerful, outranked only by the Presidency. He saw made and helped make more history than any of the eight Presidents he served with ("never say 'served under,'" he chided reporters).

This was pretty good going for a poor country boy, born the eighth child of 11 in the Tennessee hills and raised on 40 acres in Texas. With nothing to do but chop cotton and read history books, young RAYBURN had picked his career before he was 10. He built it on \$25, hard work, and the will to succeed.

The money was an unexpected assist from his dad, shoved into SAM's pocket as he climbed aboard a hot, cindery coach on his way to enroll in East Texas Normal. From that day, SAM was on his own. Among his jobs was sweeping floors at the college, for which he earned \$3 a month.

EARNED \$45,000

As Speaker he earned \$45,000 a year. He rode to his fishing holes in an air-conditioned \$11,000 limousine, and fished with his chauffeur. He mingled with, and was one of, the great. He was trusted adviser to three Presidents (Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy) and had plenty to say, one way or another, about the administration of a fourth (Eisenhower) who preferred to take his advice somewhere else.

If all this went to Mr. SAM's head, it didn't show. And his was a head not built for concealment. RAYBURN was bald as long ago as anybody could remember, and his glistening skull, although sometimes a sensitive subject with RAYBURN, was his trademark. With his Texas-type hat on him. Bare-headed, he was recognized anywhere.

BAROMETER

RAYBURN's scalp served as a barometer of the mood he was in. Normally it displayed a cool, calm gleam, slightly tanned and somewhat freckly. When he was mad, the flush climbed up the back of his neck and encompassed his head. Nobody in his right mind took up any business with RAYBURN when this storm warning was showing.

President Kennedy—who went to the House as a youngster at a time when Speak-

er RAYBURN had long been a fixture—told of the time when as President, he was in Canada, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON in Asia, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk at Geneva. A high-level call came into the White House switchboard for each of the three in his turn.

"Then who is keeping the store?" Kennedy said the frustrated caller demanded.

"The same man who's always kept it—SAM RAYBURN," the operator was supposed to have answered.

SAM RAYBURN was elected head storekeeper on Capitol Hill on September 16, 1940, on the death of Speaker William B. Bankhead. He had been helping keep it, and learning the trade, as a lawmaker from the Fourth District of Texas since his election in 1912 at age 30.

He took office with President Wilson, who became one of his heroes. From childhood, all RAYBURN's heroes were statesmen. Politics was the only career he ever considered, and he claimed to have decided at age 8, 9, or thereabouts he would run for the House and sooner or later be elected its Speaker. He liked politicians and thought House Members, especially, were the greatest people on earth. He knew the House was the greatest legislative body on earth, and anybody who in his presence used the term "upper body" to refer to the Senate simply didn't know much about getting along with SAM RAYBURN.

Although his friendship crossed party lines, RAYBURN was a Democrat first, last, and always. Unlike some other members of his party—especially some from the South—RAYBURN always stayed hitched. "Democrats just naturally seem to know better than Republicans how to keep the country runnin' right," was the way he sometimes sized up to political difference.

RAYBURN presided over the Democratic National Conventions of 1948, 1952, and 1956. Through the sheer force of his personality and firm grip on the rules, Mr. SAM from time to time saved them from what appeared to be imminent chaos. One Democratic convention he didn't run was held at Los Angeles in 1960. He stayed on the sidelines then to manage the campaign of his close friend LYNDON JOHNSON. He thought a Johnson-Kennedy ticket would be great. It turned out vice versa, but only after JOHNSON cleared with RAYBURN Kennedy's invitation to serve in the second spot on the ticket.

CONTRADICTION

As long ago as April 16, 1955, RAYBURN had become such an institution that more than 3,000 of the Democratic faithful, including Truman, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, gathered at a \$100 per plate Rayburn dinner on an occasion which in previous years had honored Jefferson and Jackson. He had lived 73 years at the time. In all those years few people had seen RAYBURN cry. But this time, he couldn't quite hold back the tears.

Some observers claimed to be baffled by the apparent contradiction of RAYBURN's conservative nature and background and his liberal career at the side of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy. Those who knew him better said this was easy to fathom. RAYBURN had seen want; he also knew the value of hard work in overcoming it. He did not think the Government should pamper the people. He believed, however, it was necessary sometimes for the Government to step in and give people a chance to get ahead on their own.

It was not out of character therefore that RAYBURN did more than any other man to help Roosevelt push through "New Deal" legislation then considered radical. Later he helped Truman with his Fair Deal. And when Kennedy's New Frontier came along, with its accent on youth, RAYBURN, by then 79, engineered legislative accomplishments about which even young administration men had despaired.

Yet RAYBURN was nobody's rubberstamp. When he couldn't go along with a Democratic President's legislative request he usually didn't raise any public fuss about it. He just did not push, and as likely as not, nothing happened. Truman once handed him a civil rights bill which RAYBURN thought was ahead of its time. He carried the bill back to Capitol Hill and forgot it. Yet some years later (with the help of JOHNSON, then Senate leader) he was instrumental in putting a civil rights law on the books. When Kennedy asked Federal help for teachers' salaries in 1961 RAYBURN said he would try, but he didn't think much of the idea himself and didn't think the chances were good. The House later proved him right.

As Speaker, RAYBURN developed influence and power far exceeding those nominally prescribed for the job. From his election in 1940, he held the job continuously except for the 4 years of the 80th and 83d Republican Congresses, when he served as minority leader. In his conduct of the office he was scrupulously nonpartisan. As his Party's leader he sought from fellow Democrats the same kind of party loyalty he practiced himself.

RARELY INTENSE

His leadership was only rarely intense. On most matters House Democrats under his reign didn't get even guidance. Some of them complained about this. Only on the relatively few issues deemed important either as party matters or as vital to the national interest did RAYBURN, through "whips," lay down a party position. In some cases, even here, he failed to apply the many pressures that are easily available to a speaker. As a result he found himself sometimes assailed simultaneously for lack of leadership and legislative tyranny.

Overall, even his critics had to admit that RAYBURN's performance was good. His friends called it great. They explained that he didn't scatter his shots or waste ammunition on minor matters. It was the same way with his House speeches. He did not make them often. When he did, the members listened. There were better orators in the House, but none who spoke with as much influence.

RAYBURN apparently grew up lonely, as some children do in big families, and lived, essentially, the same way. His early marriage lasted only 3 months. In Washington he lived alone for more than 30 years in the same one-bedroom bachelor apartment. Such meals as he wasn't taking with presidents, kings, prime ministers and lucky Washington hostesses he had sent in from a restaurant across the street. His most noted failing in later years lay in the fact that new, younger members thought him formidable, stern and beyond approach. As old men do, he scowled a lot. Actually, his friends said, what RAYBURN lacked was small talk.

READY TO HELP

He was elected speaker 10 times and on each occasion told the new Congress his office just off the House floor was always open to Members. Those who took him up on this found that it was, too. They soon learned in their dealings with Mr. SAM that he had a sympathetic ear for their problems and was always ready to help those with a reasonable case.

"The way to get along is to go along," he often advised newcomers to Congress who sought his advice.

By that he meant don't bother tilting with windmills. RAYBURN never fought lost causes, if he knew they were lost. Some of the more dedicated liberals disliked him for this. In later years they grumbled that RAYBURN no longer was leading, and began to talk about a possible successor.

In the end, though, he bailed them out of their worst predicament and in the process

opened the way for Kennedy to put into law some of the social and economic programs he had promised in the 1960 election campaign. Kennedy had squeaked into office himself and the Democratic majority in the House had been trimmed by 19 votes. Mathematically it was easy to prove that Kennedy couldn't put his liberal program across in the House. Besides, there stood in the way the traffic cop committee on rules dominated, as it had been for years, by conservatives.

RAYBURN had learned the hard way he no longer could count on his old friend, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, the Rules chairman, for a Rules clearance in matters where Judge SMITH's conservative conscience took charge. Liberals for years had been pressing RAYBURN to break the Rules roadblock that from time to time had stopped liberal measures.

He had resisted their demands for two reasons: First, he thought in a pinch he could always do business with SMITH. Second—and the fact was a little-known one—RAYBURN himself had enjoyed the Rules Committee shelter sometimes when the heat was on for a bill that he did not like but did not want to oppose openly.

A STRUGGLE

This time RAYBURN acted. In a struggle that rocked organization of the House for almost the month of January 1961, he finally whipped SMITH, by a House vote of 216 to 212, and to use SMITH's term, "packed" the Rules group to give the leadership a majority of one. That got the legislative machinery rolling and before it had quit for the year it had ground out a minimum wage boost, higher social security payments, extended pay for the jobless, a multibillion-dollar housing bill and much of the other social and economic legislation on which the Democratic campaign of 1960 had been run.

RAYBURN was born near Kingston, Tenn., January 6, 1882. His father had been a Confederate soldier. When SAM was 5 the family moved to Texas and settled near Bonham. He grew up in the usual country pattern, and in later years liked to marvel at what roads, cars, electricity and the telephone had done to relieve the loneliness of rural living. Came college age and there was no money for college. SAM said he would make his own way. Except for his dad's parting gift of \$25, that's what he did.

He got a B.S. degree, a teacher's certificate, and in 1906 at age 24 ran for the State legislature and made it. While at Austin he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1908. At 29 he became the youngest speaker of the Texas House. In 1912 he was elected to Congress.

John N. Garner, then a House Member and later Vice President, showed him the ropes, and RAYBURN moved along fast. In 1931 he became chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee. Two years later he steered through the House such New Deal legislation as to the holding company death sentence, regulation of securities and the stock market.

WORKED HARD

But he always claimed as his proudest accomplishments passage of the Rural Electrification Act and inclusion of farm-to-market roads in Federal highway aid, both of which he said benefited the real people—the formerly isolated farmers.

His sure-footed performance, and his growing popularity led to his selection as party leader in the House, and then as Speaker in 1940.

RAYBURN worked hard and long during sessions of Congress. Along about 5:30 or 6 p.m. when the business was done he liked to relax in a hideaway just below the House Chamber which others called the board of education but which Mr. SAM referred to simply as "downstairs." There his intimates, mostly Texans, and an occasional newspaperman were privileged to drop in for a chat and

maybe a drink. It was there that Vice President Truman was visiting on the afternoon of April 12, 1945, when the momentous call came that meant Truman was President.

Between sessions, while other lawmakers toured the world, RAYBURN wasted no time returning to Bonham. He left the country but once, early in his career in the House, when he joined a group inspecting the Panama Canal. At home RAYBURN liked to ride over his farm, inspecting the corn and the cotton, then to sit rocking on the porch of his big colonial farmhouse, receiving a steady stream of constituents, come to pay their respects. He had a ranch nearby where he raised Herefords.

RAYBURN was Speaker so long, and stood up so well under the job, that as the birthdays rolled by Members got to thinking that Mr. SAM was one of those institutions that continue forever. Few House Members had been around long enough to remember his predecessor. Many could not even remember the four Republican years that marked RAYBURN'S only breaks in the chair.

At noon on June 12, 1961, RAYBURN had served as Speaker 16 years and 237 days, twice as long as Henry Clay, his nearest competitor. He was 79, said he had never been sick in his life, that he weighed the same 176 pounds he had weighed for 40 years, and that he figured to be around for quite a spell yet.

The tributes that were laid on the Speaker that day, by Members on both sides of the aisle, were such that the standard flowery, fulsome, melodious eulogies common in exchanges between Members on ceremonial occasions were reduced by comparison to mere awkward backhanded compliments. Members at last ran out of superlatives. RAYBURN, who had sat through it all glum and silent, took back his gavel, quieted the ovation, and said that if the things his friends had said about him were true, his life had indeed been a rich one.

"I am satisfied," he told the hushed House. "My political career has climaxed everything I ever hoped or trusted it might be. So that when I leave here I will leave without any regrets."

[From the U.S. News & World Report,
Oct. 9, 1961]

**SAM RAYBURN TAKES A LOOK AT THE WORLD—
INTERVIEW WITH THE SPEAKER OF THE
HOUSE**

(With the first congressional session of the Kennedy administration now history how does the record look to one of the most powerful men in Congress—the 79-year-old Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN? And how does "Mr. SAM" measure the pulse of the country, and the world? Drawing on his years of experience, what does he feel about the critical present, the uncertain future? To find out, W. B. Ragsdale, of the national staff of U.S. News & World Report, went to Bonham, Tex., to get this exclusive interview with the dean of the House of Representatives, a personal acquaintance since the 1920's.)

Question. Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous times. Do you think that enough of the national effort is being turned toward strengthening this Nation? In other words, could people do more?

Answer. It is just a question of how much the people know, how much they are called upon to do. And that is what I have been trying to do—to bring them face to face with their responsibilities as citizens, or as a part of a group of citizens, or as a party, and let them know that their responsibility right now is terrific.

Question. Do you think most Americans are aware of that responsibility and realize what it means?

Answer. If this generation doesn't live up to its responsibilities, then what of the next generation, or the next?

I try to say to people that we are all in this thing together, we all go up and stay up, or we all go down together. There is no room now for selfishness. There is no place for hate and distrust. We must set out on the broad highway together and keep going.

Question. Most of the world's troubles seem to stem from Nikita Khrushchev. Have you formed any personal impression of him as a man or as a leader?

Answer. I met him once at a dinner at the White House. I sat some distance away from him. After dinner, President Eisenhower said, "Come in here, SAM, and talk to this man." So I got up close to him so I could look at him.

I wouldn't say that he had a face I liked, at all. My impression was that he had a cruel face, and I still think of that. I wasn't in his presence long enough to form much of an opinion of him, except that I have looked in the faces of a lot of men and I have judged them by their looks. And that is how I judged him.

Question. Did he impress you as a man who would dare drop a nuclear bomb on this country?

Answer. Well, if we were in that business—big war—yes. Now, whether he is reckless enough to drop the first hydrogen bomb, I don't know. He would have to be a pretty reckless man, because he knows other people have agencies of destruction just like he has. And I imagine he wants to live.

I would think that his scientists have acquainted him with all the destructive elements in these things—how far reaching would be the effects. I think he hesitates to drop the first one.

Question. Let's look at it from the U.S. standpoint. Do you feel that this still is a great and powerful nation?

Answer. Yes, the greatest and most powerful. And when called upon to exert its strength, it will do it now as it always has. I do not lose confidence in the fortitude and valor, patriotism and bravery of the average American. I think they are as high now as they have always been.

A great many people are standing on the corner criticizing this, that and the other, but when the supreme test comes, they usually come through, too.

Question. Are you saying that the people are just as self-reliant as ever? Is that what you think?

Answer. I do. I would hate to live in a country if I didn't have faith and confidence in the people. I think the American people are the best jury I ever saw an accused tried before, when they know all the facts.

Question. One hears a great deal of talk that people are getting more selfish than they used to be. What about that?

Answer. Well, a great many of them have more to be selfish about. They own more property, they have more income, and they want to keep it.

But selfishness has always been and always will be. Nearly everybody is going to be a little selfish about what they have to provide for their family. But when it comes down to the point of my saying that anything like the majority of the American people are selfish to the extent that they wouldn't support their Government in a crisis, I just don't believe it.

Question. Coming down to specifics, Mr. Speaker, does the level of Federal spending disturb you?

Answer. Well, of course, any spending disturbs people. Any payment of taxes disturbs people. But we must look the world in the face, and this is not a very happy world we are living in. It is a dangerous world, more dangerous to the civilization we know and love than people ever sought to exist in.

But, as long as the world is in an arms race, and as long as reckless people have

hold of weapons that are totally destructive, we must spend.

We must keep ahead in that race so that we can defend ourselves. This takes a lot of money. We are spending \$40 billion a year for defense. Now, that is one thing that we can't cut down on if we have any judgment. We just have to have the money to produce the things that are necessary to defend ourselves.

The national debt is big and is going to remain big.

Taxes are high, and they are going to remain high until the world settles down.

Unless we can have what President Kennedy spoke about in his speech at the United Nations—disarmament, real disarmament—we must go on spending. This arms race is what is costing the money, and we have to stay in it as long as it lasts.

I admired the President very much for the bold, frank statement he made to the people at the Assembly, and to the whole world.

Question. There are some people who say we are spending too much on social welfare and things of that kind—

Answer. And they don't know what they're talking about, a great many of them. A lot of people talk about social welfare and this, that and the other, and don't know much about it.

Every time you say something about social welfare, people go to yelling socialism and welfare state and all this. We don't have any welfare state. We haven't lost our grip on our domestic problems, and we aren't going to.

But there are just so many people who are going to jump up and accuse the other fellow of spending, spending, spending. And when those people are in power, they keep right on spending, spending, spending.

It is kind of ridiculous at times.

GOVERNMENT HAD TO GROW

Question. Are you disturbed by the growth of Government?

Answer. If I answered that question flatly, I would have to say that I am not—Government had to grow.

Talk about the simple Government of Jefferson—of course it was simple. There were just a few more than 3 million people, and there were no communications. There was not a hard-surfaced road in the United States, and there was no such thing as a monopoly at that time, because the Nation just wasn't big enough.

As these things grew and developed, the Government had to grow. At that time there weren't any railroads to regulate, no rates to fix, no bonds to be issued. But, as business grew, then trust laws had to be enacted and enforced, and it took a lot of people to do that. The same thing about the railroads—they started little, but they became big, and it went on and on.

Rural electrification came. That was the greatest boon to the farmer that I have ever seen.

And then, take Federal aid to highways. In 1944 I had them put into the bill for aid to highways a provision that 30 percent of every dollar that was spent by the Federal Government for highways must be spent on farm-to-market roads.

As we grow, the Government must grow. It is one thing to pass the law, and it is another thing to enforce it. I don't shrink from the proposition that the Government has grown, because where the Government has grown, it has been adding something that was in the interest of the public.

Question. You said earlier that defense and these other things cost a lot of money. Do you think that taxes are now about as high as people can stand?

Answer. You never know what people can stand. They are carrying a great burden now, of course. And we are hoping that we don't have to increase that burden, but, if the time should come when we needed more

money—if we just had to have more money—I don't think there would be anything that would prevent Congress from raising taxes in certain places.

I think the people would go along if they had the information and knew the taxes were needed.

Question. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about you, personally, for a moment. How long have you been in public life?

Answer. I first ran for the Texas Legislature in 1906, and went into the legislative session of 1907. I went to Congress in 1913.

Question. You must have seen amazing changes in all those years—

Answer. Well, you would need to write a book, and even then that wouldn't be able to tell all of them.

Question. By and large, do you feel the changes have been for the better?

Answer. I think Government—both State and Federal—is more responsive now to the wishes and the needs of the people than it has been at any time during my legislative experience.

I know the changes have been for the better. We couldn't have gone on like we have if they were not.

Question. Have you noticed many changes in the role of Congress in that period?

Answer. Not too many—we have the same number of men and women in the House as they had then.

As far as I am individually concerned, I think that the character and ability of the men and women who are in Congress have not deteriorated, and I think that the caliber in education, experience and so forth for the Members of the House of Representatives today is probably higher than it was when I went there.

I am not one of those who say that we don't have as big men in Congress as we used to have. I think that is nonsense. I think we have more men and women of real ability in the Congress of the United States than I have ever known, and I think they have demonstrated it on many occasions.

When something that has affected the national interest has come up, a big majority of them—not all, but a big majority—has laid partisanship aside and moved ahead in the right direction.

HOW STRONG A PRESIDENT

Question. What about the White House? Do you think the Presidency has gained in power over the years?

Answer. The President, of course, has always had vast powers. He executes the law as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and in those fields, of course, the President has maintained power.

The question is always: Who is the strong man? During my time we have had eight Presidents. Most of them have been strong men, some stronger than others.

The Congress of the United States wants the President to exercise his powers, and it wants to exercise its own powers—and it does. It does this every time a bill advocated by the administration comes up in the House. It exercises its power. It follows the President's recommendations, or it goes along its own line, takes another approach.

Sometimes this is better than the original approach made by the President, and the Presidents are always willing to agree that, if the Congress passes a better bill than they advocated, they are happy about it if they are the right kind of President—and most of them are.

Question. What about the present administration? How did Mr. Kennedy make out in the session of Congress just closed?

Answer. I think President Kennedy had one of the most successful sessions of Congress that I have ever served in. In his state of the Union message he laid down quite a program. Much of it was controversial.

The Congress passed on every one of his proposals in some way, and the vast majority of them have been enacted into law.

Therefore, I think that this 1st term of the 87th Congress, working with Mr. Kennedy, has done a real job. It has responded to his suggestions, and has enacted a very fine program.

Question. The President didn't get everything he wanted, though, did he?

Answer. No, not everything. But he got most of what he had asked for except the school business, and we did continue two very essential parts of that program.

Question. Would you say the record of the session is as good as you had expected?

Answer. It certainly is. I thought there would be more controversy about a great many legislative proposals.

And I will say this, also: There has been very little backbiting in the House of Representatives. Very few Republicans have been against something simply because a Democratic President wanted it.

There has been such a small amount of partisanship that it has been very pleasing to me.

Question. How would you list the credit side—the principal accomplishments—of the session just ended?

Answer. This divides into several parts. First—to fight the depression and start the country to moving again—there were, among the most important things, measures for area redevelopment, for housing—the most comprehensive program in history—an increase in minimum wages, a new farm bill, a strengthening of the whole fabric of defense, several important foreign-affairs measures. This Congress was one of the most productive in our history.

WHEN CONGRESS MEETS NEXT

Question. Now that this session is over, what are some of the problems that will have to be dealt with next session?

Answer. There are always new ones. Of course, this school thing will have to be faced again, and I would imagine there will be some kind of solution, or compromise.

Foreign aid will be up again. There will be a row over that again. Some people don't believe there should be any aid.

And reciprocal trade will be up again. There are some people who would like to do away with reciprocal-trade agreements and go back to setting up tariff walls. But I think our American industry has got to adjust itself to a great many things.

Question. In what way?

Answer. There is a complaint about Japanese textiles. Now, we are a nation with many surpluses. We have a surplus in cotton. How much of a squeeze can we put on Japanese goods and still sell Japan several million bales of cotton? There are a lot of places where you can buy cotton, you know. And those new factories in Japan are up to date. A great deal of our American machinery is not up to date, and our industry is going to have to adjust itself.

We cannot afford—this greatest surplus-producing country in the world cannot afford—to settle down behind a tariff wall. If we enact tariff laws against other nations, they will enact tariff laws against us.

Money doesn't cross the ocean to balance trade. It's surplus goods for surplus goods. We must stay with some kind of arrangement whereby we can take their surplus goods and they can take ours, or our trade is bogged down. That's all there is to it.

Question. Speaking of industry, there are reports that the administration is opposed to business. Will you comment on that?

Answer. That is utter nonsense. No administration that had any sense would be against business. We want business to be prosperous. In order to carry on, we have to

have people prosper and make profits whereby they pay taxes.

Question. Does business continue to have a fair hearing in Congress?

Answer. Yes, it certainly does, and always has had.

Question. What about the strength of union labor in Congress? Is that growing?

Answer. Union labor has a lot of strength, of course, because it has these millions of people. How much power labor has in Congress, I don't know.

TAKING THE PUBLIC'S PULSE

Question. There sometimes have been complaints that Congress is slow to respond to public wishes. Do you think that perhaps too much power may have been concentrated in the hands of minorities in some of the key committees?

Answer. No, I do not. Now, this thing of responding to public wishes—well, sometimes it takes a long time to find out what the public wishes are.

The big storm for or against measures comes from a small minority, and Congress wants to wait around and see not only whether these changes are necessary, but whether they are wise, whether they would be in the public interest. Congress must determine by legislative procedure what it thinks is in the public interest, after hearings in committees, debates on the floor, and so forth.

But on this thing of responding to public wishes—sometimes we find out that what seems to be a public wish really is only that of a small minority. We determine that it is not in the public interest, so we don't enact it.

Question. Do you mean that first you have to find out what the public wish really is?

Answer. And on top of that, what is the wise thing to do? Sometimes the public might wish a thing this year and find out, next year, that if it had been enacted it would have been a mistake.

Congress just doesn't like to be rushed. And it shouldn't be on these vast questions. Great deliberation should be had, and many times it takes time.

Taking time sometimes is not really a loss of time.

Question. In the end, would you say that the will of Congress generally is the will of the people?

Answer. Generally, yes. It might not be the apparent will of the people at that moment, but wise people—and the people of the United States are wise when they know the facts—finally determine what is the right thing to do.

Question. There are those who say that Members of Congress think first of their home district, then of the national interest. How do you feel about that?

Answer. The man who comes to Congress has received the endorsement of his people. He thinks he is sent there to represent them, to get justice and fair play for them.

The people at home have shown faith and confidence in him that he will do the right thing in representing them: the projects in their district, how friendly they are to agriculture, if there is a lot of labor in the district, how friendly they are to labor and how fair they are to enterprise, too.

Then, if he or she has energy along with ability—and ability isn't much unless it has energy with it, because it doesn't go into operation—then I think they will say, "This is my country; this whole country is mine."

I think the average Member of the House of Representatives is a patriotic person who really, in the last analysis, wants to do the best for the whole country that he is capable of doing.

Question. When it comes to expressing the will of the people, do you feel it would

be better if the Members of the House were elected every 4 years, rather than 2?

Answer. There are some people who say House Members ought to be able to serve during the whole term of the President.

Well, suppose at the middle of the term the people back home became dissatisfied with what was going on, and justifiably so? I think the people should be allowed to change. And, therefore, I am for continuing 2-year elections of Members of the House of Representatives.

Question. Looking closely at Congress, geographically, would you say that the South is losing power?

Answer. I would not. They have the chairmanships of a great many of the committees, and I think inside those committees nearly everybody is pretty reasonable.

When it comes to the floor of the House, some people have always wanted to build up this Republican-Southern bloc. Well, if they tried to organize this bloc against the Kennedy program, they didn't get very far this past session. I think that thing has been blown up, and blown up beyond what its influence really is.

I think a great many of men from the South are getting tired of being put into that lineup. And probably, too, some from the North are hearing their people say, "Well, this fellow has joined up with the Dixiecrats."

I never was for blocs—never joined one. I wanted to be a free, independent legislator; to vote my sentiment. And, of course, my sentiments are usually on the side the Democrats take, because I have had a part in making up that program.

ABSOLUTE FAITH IN UNITED STATES

Question. Mr. RAYBURN, almost all the pressures building in the country are exerted upon you in the Speaker's office. As you watch these pressures, and feel them, what crosses your mind about the American people—their present and their future; the future of the world?

Answer. I have absolute faith in the American people. I believe that more than 95 percent of the American people have more good in them than bad. And, when properly appealed to, they will respond—now as they have in the past.

The American people have never failed to respond to the best interests of the country when this country was in danger and in a crisis. I just know that they will do it again if they are called upon.

The great body of the American people is sound, patriotic, and willing to sacrifice to the limit to preserve, protect and to perpetuate the great future of this great country.

I have never doubted the patriotism of the willingness of the American people to sacrifice and do the right thing. I think we will come through in a fashion that will make us all proud.

So I look forward to living in this country at peace, I hope, and in friendliness for all good peoples of the world. We want other people to have their real life, and we want ours.

We do not want to interfere with the affairs of other governments.

And we want to stay at home and attend to our own business, and to build our own structure without interference from anybody else.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

GOLD MEDAL FOR MR. SAM?—YARBOROUGH RENEWS PLAN TO HONOR HOUSE SPEAKER

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, took the initiative Thursday in planning to pay tangible tribute to Texas' beloved Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

YARBOROUGH announced soon after hearing of the Speaker's death that he will renew his effort to have a gold medal coined in honor

of Speaker RAYBURN—an honor the man known as "Mr. Democrat" would not stand for while alive.

YARBOROUGH said he will attempt to make his resolution providing for coinage of the medal "the first order of business" when Congress reconvenes January 10.

YARBOROUGH began trying to honor RAYBURN with a gold medal last September 7.

At that time the Senator introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to provide for coinage of a single gold medal including the words "For Services Rendered to the People of the United States," to be presented to RAYBURN. The resolution would have provided \$2,500 for the purpose, and it would have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to cause bronze duplicates to be cast for sale.

RAYBURN had gone home to Bonham on August 31.

YARBOROUGH urged speed in paying tribute, saying RAYBURN knew nothing about the effort to honor him, and it should be done before he could return.

Fifty other Senators quickly signed YARBOROUGH'S resolution as cosponsors.

Then, 1 day after YARBOROUGH introduced the resolution, Speaker RAYBURN put his foot down on it without even returning.

In a telegram, he told YARBOROUGH he appreciated the friendly generosity but the medal would embarrass him, and he asked YARBOROUGH to lay off.

RAYBURN, YARBOROUGH said, felt such a tribute should not be given to the living.

YARBOROUGH reluctantly had a hearing on his resolution called off and had his resolution entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thursday, when RAYBURN could earn no more honors, YARBOROUGH said:

"Of all the officials of our Government of our generation who are deserving of a gold medal, SAM RAYBURN has earned it most of all."

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

SAM RAYBURN, STATESMAN, LEFT ENDURING IMPRINT ON AMERICA

Few men are called statesmen while they live, but one such man was SAM RAYBURN, who served the Nation as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives more than twice as long as any other who ever held the office. The wisdom which is the mark of a statesman was RAYBURN'S in abundance.

Speaker RAYBURN'S more than 48 years in Congress spanned an era of revolutionary changes in American social and economic life and saw the emergence of this country as the leader of the free world. He played a major role in these historic events. He was, in fact, the sponsor of much of the legislation which brought them about.

During his many years as Speaker, SAM RAYBURN held power second only to that of the President. He was in the tradition of the "Iron" Speakers. He was the boss. But he was always scrupulously fair.

His frequently repeated advice to new Members was: "Be reasonable. Be fair." He followed his own advice to the letter. He was a master at giving a little and taking a little. He called it "applied Christianity."

His was the American story, success achieved by ability and hard work. He was born on a farm in Roane County, Tenn., in 1882. He was christened SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN, but, like another Tennessean who became one of Texas' great sons, he shortened his first name to SAM and dropped the second one. In Who's Who and the Congressional Directory he listed himself simply as SAM RAYBURN.

The Rayburn family moved to a farm near Bonham when young SAM was 5. The father, a Confederate veteran, the mother, and the 11 children worked together in the cottonfields, barely making a living.

SAM RAYBURN worked his way through East Texas Normal College at Commerce and then taught school for several years to pay his

debts. At 24 years of age he ran for the Texas Legislature and was elected. While in the legislature he studied law at the University of Texas and was admitted to the bar. During his third term he became the youngest speaker of the house in Texas history up to that time.

In 1912, he was elected to Congress. He was sworn in the day that Woodrow Wilson became President. He was never defeated for reelection. He became Speaker September 16, 1940. At the time of his death he had served longer in the House than any other man.

RAYBURN'S genius as a presiding officer, both in Congress and as permanent chairman of three Democratic National Conventions, long will be remembered, but his most enduring monument will be the legislation he sponsored and worked for as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and as majority leader.

The Truth in Securities Act, the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Public Utility Holding Company Act, the Rural Electrification Act, and the bills creating the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission were largely RAYBURN'S work. Most of them evoked great storms of controversy, but RAYBURN was convinced of the need for them and time has proved him to be right.

As an orator, he shunned the bombastic and the flowery idiom which once were characteristic of public speakers. He spoke simply, softly, and his sincerity was evident to all who listened. At the times when he took the floor of the House to speak for or against a proposal, the cloakrooms emptied as the Members hastened in to hear him. On many issues on which the House was closely divided, a talk by RAYBURN tipped the balance.

He believed in and lived by the simple virtues. He had passionate zeal for the truth. He carried himself with dignity. He was loved by all who knew him well.

"Mr. SAM," who seemed as indestructible as the Washington Monument, is going to be missed on Capitol Hill.

[From the Houston Post, Oct. 16, 1961]

MARTIN SAYS RAYBURN IS "SENTIMENTAL," CREDITS HIM FOR "SO MANY THINGS"

(By J. F. terHorst)

WASHINGTON.—In this town, SAM RAYBURN is frequently called the only national monument that speaks. It's an irreverent truth, but also a testimonial to the man who has been in Congress 48 years, has served under 8 Presidents and has been Speaker of the House twice as long as anyone else.

They don't make greater Democrats than RAYBURN—yet it was to a favorite Republican that the cancer-stricken Speaker entrusted a secret before he left Washington.

"He called me to his office to have our picture taken as the only two living Speakers," said veteran Republican JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts. "He told me he was going home to Texas to rest his back. It was the day before the House was notified.

"SAM didn't have to tell me, but that's the kind of man SAM is."

Such is the friendship that exists between 79-year-old RAYBURN, the country's Mr. Democrat, and 77-year-old MARTIN, the man they used to call Mr. Republican.

And it's one reason why Democrats, Republicans, the President and the policeman outside RAYBURN'S office door are taking so hard the same news from Texas.

In choked words over the telephone from his newspaper in North Attleboro, Mass., MARTIN reflected his abiding affection for RAYBURN.

"Everybody thinks of SAM as a grumpy man to get along with," said MARTIN. "You know, he is really very sentimental underneath that old Texas hide. He did so many things for me."

It's not usual to hear anyone talk of RAYBURN as "SAM." He is Mr. Speaker to the Members of the House. A few Democratic leaders call him Mr. SAM to his face. Almost everybody does it out of RAYBURN's presence. But between Mr. Democrat and Mr. Republican, it is simply "SAM" and "JOE."

Between them they ran the House of Representatives for almost 20 years, playing a game of musical chairs with the speaker'ship, third most powerful office in the land. Between them, they chaired their parties' national conventions every 4 years.

RAYBURN has been Speaker 17 years. MARTIN was Republican minority leader for most of that time, except for 4 years when he was Speaker. They got along famously.

In fact, it was MARTIN's relationship with RAYBURN as well as his own ill health and age that caused House Republicans to dump him as floor leader in 1959 in favor of Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana.

"There were some who resented my long and close friendship with Speaker SAM RAYBURN," MARTIN said in his book, "My First 50 Years in Politics."

"My young Republican associates forgot that my friendship with RAYBURN enabled me to obtain for our side a good deal more patronage, such as jobs around the Capitol, than we, as the minority, ever would have got otherwise."

MARTIN has a dozen ready illustrations of RAYBURN's fair play in the political arena of the House—where the fighting can get as rough as a battle between Roman gladiators.

"Take 1953—Ike's first year," said MARTIN. "We Republicans were able to pass 73 percent of what the President wanted. But whenever SAM backed the bills, they were easier to pass."

"He never compromised his principles, either. Both of us knew that neither party has a monopoly on good ideas."

MARTIN credits his demotion to the rear ranks with a remarkable improvement in health. In his private meeting with RAYBURN, MARTIN urged the Speaker to stay in Texas until the next session of Congress and "get a good rest."

"Of course, I didn't know that he was dying of cancer," MARTIN added. "If SAM isn't coming back, we're really going to miss him. I mean the whole country. The House never had a better Speaker."

But that's the kind of man Mr. SAM is.

[From the Brown County (Tex.) Gazette, Nov. 23, 1961]

A TRIBUTE TO A FRIEND: "I SHALL MISS HIM"
(By Forrest Kyle)

Last Friday morning about 11 o'clock I left Bangs for Bonham, Tex., to attend funeral services for a great Texas statesman and a warm personal friend. Hon. SAM RAYBURN, who had been Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States for longer than any other man, had given up the struggle against cancer. The news was broadcast over radio and television, bringing sorrow to friends, not only in Texas but throughout the Nation.

Arriving in Bonham around 6 p.m. I found it impossible to find hotel accommodations, so great was the crowd that had traveled from great distances to attend the funeral. First, I went to the Rayburn Library where the body lay in state. There, from among the better than 3 million people which constitutes the population of Texas, 30,000 people passed in review before the bier of the man for whom friends had contributed and built the library as a living memorial to his name.

Unable to get a meal in the town of Bonham, my friend and I traveled 26 miles to Sherman for our supper. We came back just after 8 o'clock and, driving by the library again, we were amazed to see that the line of people passing through the building to view the body had not diminished.

I thought to myself, as I stood there watching this evidence of loyalty of friends and acquaintances, "What endeared this man to so many people?" And the answer came to mind almost before the question was asked: Loyalty begets loyalty. Mr. SAM's loyalty was never lightly given; it was strong, and sure, and enduring. Other factors, too, contributed to the magnetism of his great popularity, such as honesty, unselfishness, love of people, and the desire to help his fellow man.

Almost every town, village, or hamlet in this great State, regardless of political affiliations, were indebted to Mr. SAM in some way or other for favors rendered by him during his many years as Speaker of the House. Our own community of Bangs was no less indebted than the others; it owes a deep sincere gratitude to him for his efforts on behalf of the water projects here, which enabled the town to have good, pure drinking water piped from Lake Brownwood. Repeated efforts through other channels had failed; four consecutive times the project was turned down. Then Mr. SAM entered the picture, and today Bangs has water. Bangs also owes a debt of thanks to the Speaker for enabling the Bangs School Board to purchase the land and building which is now the Bangs High School. These are just a few of many such acts that made him the friend of Bangs.

But all Texas was his home; and he showed no more partiality to his own hometown than to the smallest village in the State. For this all Texas loved him—and all Texas is equally indebted to him.

This generosity was not limited to Texas alone. He loved America, too. This was evidenced in the number of high official dignitaries who came from many miles away to attend his funeral. For although Mr. SAM was a politician, it was not in the sense that many politicians use politics today. He used it, of course, but he did not misuse it. This was the reason that politicians of both parties loved and respected him.

His faith in people was a characteristic that remained with him throughout all the days of his life. Faith, in this day of mistrust, is a gem of great price, and in this respect Mr. SAM was a rich man.

He was honest. That statement said of any man is the highest prize on the shelf of human attainment, more worthy than riches, more desirable than fame. Mr. SAM's honesty was not hidden; it shone forth with a brightness that highlighted his life and drew friends like moths to a flame. And, in spite of the bluntness which honesty often gives, they remained as loyal to him, as he to them. They loved his straightforward, blunt manner, that left no doubt as to where he stood on any question.

Yet he was gentle; no man, possessed greater sympathies than Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

I admired and respected him as did everyone else. He was a man whose character I would emulate, and which, should I succeed in a small way in doing, I would feel that I had accomplished a goal toward which all men should strive.

I shall miss him.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

STORY OF SAM RAYBURN—"MR. DEMOCRAT" IN WASHINGTON, JUST AS "MR. SAM" TO HOME-FOLKS

(By Allen Duckworth)

SAM RAYBURN was both statesman and country squire.

In Washington, he was "Mr. Democrat," a fiercely loyal party man, idolized by his friends and feared but respected by the opposition.

He was also plain "Mr. SAM" when he came home from the marble halls to sit on

the front porch of his farm home and talk things over with the folks of Fannin County.

SAM RAYBURN never forgot his humble start: From a 40-acre farm to a half-century public career that took him as close as a heartbeat to the Presidency.

He was born SAMUEL TALLIAFERRO RAYBURN on January 6, 1882, in Roane County, Tenn., the 8th of 11 children.

RAYBURN's father was a Yankee hater. He rode with Lee as a Confederate soldier. Under surrender terms, the southerners were told they could keep their horses, but at Knoxville his horse was taken from him.

The RAYBURN family drove to Texas in a wagon when he was 5 years old, settling on a little farm near Bonham. There, RAYBURN recalled, he experienced the "loneliness that breaks men's hearts."

"I'd sit on the fence on Sundays and wish that somebody would ride by on a horse—just to relieve the monotony."

After attending a two-teacher school in the area, RAYBURN decided to seek a college education.

His dad was hard pressed financially, but managed to give young SAM \$25 when he boarded the train for Commerce to enroll at East Texas Normal School (now East Texas State College). After that, he was on his own. To pay expenses, SAM rang the school bell and swept the buildings. He taught school for a year to earn enough for another year of college.

RAYBURN's public career started in 1907, when he was elected to the house of representatives of the State legislature. While a legislator, he studied law at the University of Texas and opened a law office in Bonham.

During his third term, RAYBURN was elected speaker of the house. He was only 29 years old and was the youngest man, up to that time, to serve as Presiding Officer of the house.

RAYBURN ran for Congress and won in 1912. He had some tough reelection fights, but always won. Only death could and did remove him from the House, which he said "has always been my life and it has been my love."

While he loved the House, he also loved the black lands of his farm near Bonham.

One day in Washington, he was looking out a window at the Mall that leads from the Capitol to the Washington Monument.

"It's beautiful down there in Texas," he said. "Not many hills, but rolling prairie land. And that black land is 40 feet deep. There doesn't seem to be any bottom to it."

RAYBURN often was called a bachelor. Actually, he was married for a brief time to Miss Metzger Jones of Valley View in 1927. The marriage was dissolved after a few months.

His legislative career, from Texas House through congressional service, added up to 54 years.

When he opened the session in June of this year, RAYBURN had been Speaker twice as long as any other man in history, 16 years and 273 days. Ten years before, he had passed the record set a century before by Henry Clay, who held the speakership for 8 years, 136 days.

The Texan had been in the House for 27 years before he was elected in 1940. At that time, he was Democratic majority leader. His career was interrupted during the sessions of 1947-48 and 1953-54 when Republicans were in the majority. During those interims, he was minority leader.

"I'd rather be Speaker than 10 Senators," RAYBURN said when asked why he never ran for the Senate. "I love the House."

During World War II, RAYBURN kept a tight rein on the House and supported all the Roosevelt administration measures. Four months before Pearl Harbor, a fast gavel saved the Selective Service Act and prevented depletion of Armed Forces.

RAYBURN was first in line to succeed to the Presidency after Roosevelt died. Vice President Harry Truman became President. There being no Vice President, the Speaker would have become President if Truman had vacated the Office.

RAYBURN also might have become President if there had not been troubles in his delegation from Texas at the 1944 Democratic Convention. He might well have become the nominee for Vice President instead of Harry Truman and would have become President upon Roosevelt's death.

It is said that RAYBURN liked many Republicans personally but never could understand their being Republicans.

Of Eisenhower, he said: "Now personally I like President Eisenhower. He was born in the district I represent. And everybody down there that remembers him says he was a good baby. Then he moved to Kansas. And after he was 60 years of age, he decided he'd be a Republican."

RAYBURN presided at three national conventions of his party—1948, 1952, 1956. He ran the conventions as he ran the House; no monkey business.

"You can't lose control of a national convention for a moment," he recalled. "If you do, you're sunk."

He declined the gavel at last year's convention to help LYNDON B. JOHNSON's bid for presidential nomination. After JOHNSON lost to John F. Kennedy, RAYBURN was in on the hurried conferences that led to JOHNSON's accepting the vice-presidential nomination.

RAYBURN always told Members of Congress that his office was always open to them. But he had a semisecret hideaway in the Capitol basement where only intimates were allowed. There, RAYBURN and his friends would "strike a blow for liberty," which meant having a drink.

Truman and RAYBURN were together when they received the news of President Roosevelt's death at Warm Springs, Ga.

RAYBURN was never a backslapper, never a joiner. He belonged to none of the fraternal societies.

Five years ago, with no advance publicity, RAYBURN went to Tloga and was baptized in the Primitive Baptist Church there at the age of 74. It was his first formal affiliation with any church, although he previously had listed the Baptist denomination as his preference.

RAYBURN served for more than a quarter of the House's existence.

He served with eight Presidents, four Democrats and four Republicans—Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. He insisted on saying he served with Presidents and not under them.

It is estimated that he had seen 3,000 Members of Congress come and go.

RAYBURN left his own monument when he died—the \$492,000 Sam Rayburn Memorial Library at Bonham.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Nov. 17, 1961]

BONHAM: FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS END LENGTHY VIGIL

(By Eddie Hughes)

BONHAM, TEX.—The newspaper tossed out by the paperboy Thursday afternoon was left untouched at the big white house with the pillars.

The big black headlines told why:

"Mr. SAM Is Gone."

"Mr. SAM" was the principal product of Bonham. These people had seen him grow to greatness in national and world prominence.

When SAM RAYBURN, 79, died in his sleep here at 6:20 a.m. Thursday, a sad sentiment

was voiced by the friends and neighbors of the famed House Speaker.

Bonham Mayor Jess C. Magouirk (fc) had known Mr. SAM personally for 55 years.

"It's like losing the courthouse," he said. Like many others, Mayor Magouirk felt anything he might try to say wouldn't nearly express how he felt about RAYBURN's death.

"I feel I am a member of the family. It is a tremendous loss. But the Nation's loss is greater."

Ray Peller Jr., 32, local lawyer and a staunch Democrat, said even the town's Republicans "always voted for Mr. RAYBURN, personally."

He felt Bonham "is going to miss SAM RAYBURN, and not the Speaker of the House."

His death, Peller said, came not unexpectedly. "We knew he was going to die; yet, it did little to soften the blow when we learned he did."

"He loved people, and people loved him."

First National Bank President Dick Saunders recalled RAYBURN would come to town to go to the barbershop. He would visit with people, joke with the man on the corner, give advice to the youngsters.

"We all revered him," Saunders said. "I voted for him for Congress all 25 times. I didn't always agree with him, though. But it is quite a loss to our little town."

Joe Kincaid, a postman, hadn't seen Mr. RAYBURN since Easter when the House Speaker came home for the holidays.

"I went fishing with him some," he said. "As a fisherman, I'd say he was pretty good. As a man, he was as good as they come."

RAYBURN's attorney, Robert (Buster) Cole, felt "it is not often that ordinary people have an opportunity to be associated with a figure of history, and to know a man intimately."

"I always thought his was the securest hand that led the Nation," he said of his own feeling.

Aubrey McAlister, publisher of the Bonham Daily Favorite, said of RAYBURN:

"We've always leaned on him for everything. But we have never worked with another man who was more considerate and less demanding for a man in his position."

"We're going to miss him. This is probably felt more keenly here in Bonham, his home since he was a boy, than anywhere else in the world."

Schools are going to be let out early here Friday. Stores will close up entirely Saturday. And Bonham prepares to pay its last respects to its greatest native son.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Nov. 18, 1961]

LONELY GRAVEDIGGER TELLS HOW MR. SAM HELPED HIM

BONHAM, TEX.—H. W. Stevenson was the loneliest man in Bonham as he lifted a spadeful of waxy black earth from the grassy hillside where Speaker RAYBURN will be laid to rest in Willow Wild Cemetery.

Mist clouded his eyes and he turned his head downward as he grubbed with the shovel and talked with effort.

"Right here," he said, emphasizing his words with a lunge of the shovel, "besides Miss Lu (RAYBURN's sister, Lucinda) is where Mr. SAM wanted to be when it had to be. I done the honors for Miss Lu, and this is my last chance ever to do anything for Mr. RAYBURN."

"Did he do me any favors? Lots of 'em. I guess the best thing he did was—what I liked the most—was just being recognized by the man when he'd see me."

"And when I used to drive a truck on the Red River project and they owed me \$600, he saw to it I got it. A poor man don't forget a thing like that."

Then the lonely digger straightened his overall gallus and resumed his work.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Nov. 17, 1961]

KIND WORDS: EIGHT PRESIDENTS EARNED MR. SAM'S ADMIRATION

SAM RAYBURN served in Washington with eight Presidents, and he had kind words for each of them.

Warmest praise, naturally, was for the four Democratic Presidents.

RAYBURN's comments:

Woodrow Wilson: "I've always thought that President Wilson was one of the greatest intellects that ever sat in the White House. He was a great statesman."

Warren G. Harding: "I never thought Mr. Harding was a dishonest man. He was too trusting, and some people that weren't exactly right imposed upon him."

Calvin Coolidge: "I rather liked him. I think Coolidge said one of the smartest things that was ever said: 'I found out early in life you don't have to explain something you hadn't said.'"

Herbert Hoover: "I always thought that Mr. Hoover was a very efficient man. I like him. I think he's a grand man. But I always thought Mr. Hoover was a better man to be on the team than to be a captain."

Franklin D. Roosevelt: "His inaugural address, 1933, was one of the most inspiring things that I think the American people ever had. He had a program and he had the courage to stand by it and give a good reason for it. He had an appeal to the American people that very few men in the history of this country have had."

Harry Truman: "He made some of the biggest decisions that any man made who was ever President. I think history is going to be kind to Mr. Truman. I think it is going to put him way up among our great Presidents."

Dwight D. Eisenhower: "He was a great general * * * is a great patriot. I think he wanted to serve his day and generation well. I think history will be just to him."

John F. Kennedy: "I think he is going to make a good President and really be a man of destiny."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17,
1961]

DRAFT ISSUE: MR. SAM'S FAST GAVEL SAVED BILL

Just 4 months before the United States was plunged into World War II, Speaker SAM RAYBURN used a fast gavel to guarantee the Nation at least a token armed force.

The strength of the Army was 1,400,000. The issue was extension of the Selective Service Act—the draft. Defeat would have released a million trained men from the Army.

Some say that Speaker RAYBURN, single-handedly, saved the Nation's Army.

The draft had been in effect for a year and the administration sought to extend it. There was terrific pressure from back home on Congressmen; let Europe fight its war, send Johnny back home.

Shortly before rollcall, Speaker RAYBURN did what he did rarely: he stepped down and made a speech in favor of draft extension.

The bill squeezed through by a single vote, 203 to 202.

Before any Member could announce a change of vote, RAYBURN banged the gavel and announced the result. A few seconds of delay could have been fatal to the bill. And, fatal to America.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 18,
1961]

RAYBURN: BONHAM FOLK PAY THEIR RESPECTS

BONHAM, TEX.—The old man had obviously shined his weatherworn shoes, but he tugged

at his tattered farm clothes in front of the Rayburn Memorial Library.

Lawrence Whitt, 73, had just taken a last look at the man he had known most all of his life—SAM RAYBURN.

"If you went out to his house with clothes like this, you'd be just as welcome as the President of the United States," Whitt declared.

The retired farmer and ginneeer shook his head and his eyes became moist once again. "He was once so strong * * * so very strong."

Whitt, after a few moments of reflection, smiled and recalled seeing SAM RAYBURN working on his (RAYBURN'S) ranch not over a year ago.

"He was out working with his hired hands * * * caring not that the sun was breaking sweat down the back of his neck.

"Ninety percent of his cattle he raised himself, you know," Whitt added.

Like Whitt, there were many farmers who came into town Friday to take a last look at the man who had many times greeted them in the fields as he passed by their farms.

Women came with children in their swaddling clothes; other children came, barely able to peer over the side of the casket.

School classes were let out early and students filed past the flower-decked casket in the majestically marble foyer of Mr. SAM'S library. Even husky boys that wore football jackets could not hold back the tears.

The entire student bodies of three rural schools near Bonham paid their respects. Almost every head was still bowed when they reappeared outside again.

At noon, some of Speaker SAM'S relatives, including his sister-in-law, Mrs. Dick Rayburn, and nieces and great-nieces, spent a few minutes inside—alone.

When they left, their faces reflected a similar feeling of sadness that marked the thousands of other mourners.

Mr. RAYBURN'S body will be in state until 9 a.m. Saturday.

Thousands more visitors are expected Saturday morning before funeral services at the First Baptist Church here at 1:30 p.m.

Those attending funeral services are expected to include many from Washington. Perrin Air Force Base in nearby Sherman has already set up 400 beds to take care of the incoming Congressmen.

It was not known whether President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON would be able to visit the Rayburn Library before it closes Saturday.

"I'm sure that these doors will open for them—closed or not," remarked one oldtimer.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Nov. 17, 1961]

**RAYBURN'S COUNTRY: BELOVED SOIL TO BE
RESTING PLACE**
(By Larry Grove)

BONHAM, Tex.—Speaker SAM RAYBURN will be laid to rest Saturday on a rolling hillside where the song of birds comes at sundown from high old elms and cattle graze a meadow below.

He never would have thought of any other place than beside members of his family in Willow Wild Cemetery. Not even the full honors of Arlington National Cemetery could have rivaled this place for Mr. RAYBURN.

"He was a good man—never lost the common touch—never forgot where he came from—that's what made him great." Those were often repeated words in Bonham Thursday from shopkeepers, policemen, widows, farmers, everyone.

By the hundreds they drove by the stately white columned house, their hearts with the grieving relatives inside. But the visitors only stood under the elms outside, chilled by afternoon winds. They showed their sense of sorrow and departed.

Miss Alla Clary, associated with the Speaker during 42 of his 48 years in Washington, embraced RAYBURN'S only living brother, Dick Rayburn of Ector, as he arrived to join the family inside.

Miss Clary said Elder H. G. Ball of Tioga Primitive Baptist Church who will conduct the funeral service, baptized the Speaker not so many years ago.

RAYBURN said at the time: "It was the faith of my father—and I've always believed in it."

The First Baptist Church, which will be the scene of what will be one of the largest funerals for a national figure since President Franklin D. Roosevelt's, is a modernistic spired pink brick building that occupies an entire block just north of Bonham's business district. Even so, its 1,200 seats won't come near to holding the expected funeral crowd, to be headed by President John F. Kennedy.

The church is, along with RAYBURN'S treasured memorial library, the most impressive building in Bonham. Bonham's houses are of substantial but modest frame, on streets shaded by leaf-shedding trees that hold a riot of autumn color.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17,
1961]

**TEXANS IN WASHINGTON FEEL LOSS AS
PERSONAL**

WASHINGTON.—Texans in Washington felt a deep personal loss Thursday in the death of Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON was on his way to a speaking engagement in the Middle West when he heard the news and immediately left for Texas.

"The Capitol is a very lonely place without him. The good people of the world have lost a companion and an ally," the Vice President said in a statement.

"He was always there when needed. His voice and his judgment were heard and respected. In the end it all added up to one thing: He did what was right."

Secretary of the Navy John B. Connally, who like JOHNSON visited RAYBURN twice during his losing battle with cancer, said the speaker would stand alongside the "revered statesmen in our history."

"His passing is an immeasurable personal loss. I will deeply miss his wise counsel and will cherish the memory of the many times we shared together over the years," Connally said.

Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark of Dallas said RAYBURN was a true patriot—"teaching us that though one may be partisan in politics, he must, as did he, place devotion to country first."

"In the passing of Speaker RAYBURN, Mary (Mrs. Clark) and I have lost one of our dearest friends," Justice Clark said.

From Texas congressmen in Washington came these tributes:

JOE KILGORE of McAllen: "The whole world mourns the loss of a great leader. We will all miss him greatly."

BOB CASEY of Houston: "I have lost a close personal friend. I know the country and the State of Texas feel the same way. We've not lost just a man, but a great institution."

FRANK IKARD of Wichita Falls: "I think Speaker RAYBURN was one of the truly great men of this generation. He has been a balance wheel, a great reservoir of common sense. His passing leaves a great vacuum."

Gov. Bill Daniel of Guam, in Washington for a territorial Governors' meeting when word of RAYBURN'S death arrived, said the loss was serious to the United States and the entire free world.

Daniel said when he left Guam he asked that the Texas flag be flown at half-staff on the Governor's grounds when RAYBURN died.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry Holleman of Austin said RAYBURN'S greatness rose above party label.

"The United States and the free world will miss his leadership," Holleman said. "His passing leaves a place in our hearts that will never be filled."

Assistant Attorney General Ramsey Clark of Dallas said the strength of the free world would feel RAYBURN'S absence.

"He's one of the great men America has produced, in my opinion," Clark said.

[From the Baylor Lariat, Nov. 17, 1961]

DEATH UNSEATS TEXAS' MR. SAM

The flag in front of Baylor's Pat Neff Hall was at half-staff Thursday for the Grim Reaper had unseated the Speaker of our Nation's House of Representatives.

Regardless of their politics, Texans can be grateful for the life of SAM RAYBURN.

The 79-year-old native of Bonham, Tex., served in Congress for over 40 years.

He served as Speaker of the House for 17 years, more than twice the tenure of any other House leader.

While in Washington RAYBURN came to be called Mr. Democrat because of his strong and powerful leadership in Democratic Party politics.

He was an iron-willed partisan but was known and thought by members of both parties to be a fair man.

SAM RAYBURN is dead.

But from the Permian basin of west Texas to the gulf coast, from the deep east pine country to the Mexican border there can be found monuments to his efforts.

The epitaphs on the monuments might read: Government funds for Federal highways, dam and reservoir projects, conservation study, water-basin projects, flood study, disaster relief, salt-water conversion, Federal buildings and military installations.

RAYBURN was instrumental in the passage of legislation that yielded these benefits to Texas.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, himself a veteran of 24 years in Congress, said of RAYBURN, "He was the greatest friend I ever had."

Texans may well say the same.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

**SPEAKER MOURNED: "COUNTRY HAS LOST
DEVOTED SERVANT"**

Leading Americans in Texas and across the Nation mourned the death of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN Thursday and commented on the many contributions he made to his country.

The White House issued this statement by President Kennedy after the President departed from the Capital by plane for Seattle:

"Mrs. Kennedy and I join the Nation in mourning the death of Speaker RAYBURN. His public service stretched from the administration of Woodrow Wilson to the present day. But it was the quality of that service more than its length that was so distinctive.

"A strong defender of constitutional responsibilities of the Congress, he had an instinctive understanding of the American system and was a loyal counselor and friend of Presidents of both parties on the great matters which affected our national interest and security.

"I had singular opportunity as a young Congressman, and now more recently as President, to appreciate his temperament and his character; both were bedded in rock and remained unchanged by circumstance.

"This country has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country, an unflinching friend."

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who learned of RAYBURN'S death while on his way

to the National Airport in the Capital to catch a plane for Seattle, where he planned to attend a dinner for Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, issued this statement:

"The Capital is a lonely place without him and the good people of the world have lost a companion and an ally. He was always there when he was needed. His voice and his judgment were heard and respected. In the end it all added up to one thing: He did what was right."

JOHNSON quickly arranged to go to Bonham and left by airplane from Andrews Air Force Base to fly to Ferrin Air Force Base, near Sherman. The plane left Washington about noon.

RALPH YARBOROUGH, Texas' senior U.S. Senator, was flying from Austin to Seattle, to attend the dinner honoring MAGNUSON when he heard of Speaker RAYBURN's death. He left the plane at Dallas and with Barefoot Sanders, U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas, proceeded to Bonham.

YARBOROUGH said:

"SAM RAYBURN will live in the hearts of them all. As such he will stand in histories of the 20th century world he helped so much to shape.

"More extensively than any man of his time, SAM RAYBURN wrote his record with legislation that made the world we know today. The cause of democracy has lost a great and valiant leader. Texas has lost one of its good men and true.

"SAM RAYBURN will live in the hearts of all who knew him and will be remembered so long as our democracy lives.

YARBOROUGH said he will ask that the first order of business when Congress reconvenes in January be a resolution to strike a gold medal in honor of RAYBURN.

RAYBURN declined the resolution when it was introduced by YARBOROUGH and coauthored by 50 other Senators in the last session.

Former Gov. W. P. Hobby, chairman of the board of The Houston Post:

"SAM RAYBURN's greatness of mind and spirit were evident to all who knew him. Probably only a few persons fully realize the vast scope of his contributions toward making the United States the foremost Nation of the world.

"In these perilous times, his wisdom and his leadership will be sorely missed."

Oveta Culp Hobby, president and editor of the Houston Post and former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"To know SAM RAYBURN was a privilege forever to be cherished. His counsel was always wise and his devotion to the cause of truth was inspiring.

"The Nation which he served so long and so ably has suffered a great loss, for he was indeed a leader without peer."

Representative ALBERT THOMAS of Houston, on an inspection trip on the west coast for the House Appropriations Committee, released this statement through his office in Washington:

"He was a great American, and the entire country owes him a great debt. He was a middle of the roader in every respect. His contributions to the growth and history of this country will long be remembered."

Representative BOB CASEY of Houston said:

"History has claimed SAM RAYBURN, and this great American now belongs to the ages.

"Texas and our Nation have suffered a great loss, and I can see no one on the horizon to fill the void left by the passing from the scene of one of the world's great law-makers and statesmen.

"While we did not always agree on matters of legislation, I know that he spent every ounce of his strength and his courage for what he believed to be the best interests of his district, his State and his country.

"I mourn his death as a friend and shall cherish forever the few warm moments of comradeship we had together. As a Member of the House of Representatives, I shall always regret that death has stilled forever the gavel of the greatest Speaker this Nation will ever know."

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower termed the death of RAYBURN a grievous loss to every citizen.

Mr. Eisenhower, vacationing at the Augusta National Golf Club, issued the following statement:

"Speaker RAYBURN's legislative leadership was unmatched. It will long inspire all who seek important positions in public service. On international affairs he was a tower of strength for four Presidents. An outspoken partisan, I found him also equally bipartisan in all matters affecting the security of our country.

"To know Mr. SAM was to admire and like him. Throughout my presidential years we met frequently, privately and publicly. Because I was born in his congressional district, he often referred to me as his 'vicarious constituent.' I took pride in calling him my 'first Congressman'."

"As his friend of many years I mourn his passing. It is a grievous loss to every citizen of the United States."

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon said, "SAM RAYBURN was one of the most effective political leaders the Nation has produced. While he always fought hard for his party, on issues involving national security he was always an American first and a Democrat second. Mrs. Nixon and I have sent a personal message to Mr. RAYBURN's sisters, expressing our deepest sympathy."

Former Vice President John Nance Garner said, "One of the greatest men in the Nation has died" when informed at Uvalde of the death of Speaker RAYBURN.

In a statement issued from his home later in the morning, the 92-year-old Garner, who also served as Speaker of the House said:

"He was one of the finest men in the United States and one of the best Presiding Officers the House of Representatives ever had. I was proud to claim his friendship."

Former President Herbert Hoover said in New York that RAYBURN was one of America's great leaders, who "commanded both affection and respect irrespective of political affiliation."

"Our country is better for his life among us," Hoover said.

Harry S. Truman, who made a special trip to Texas to visit his old friend RAYBURN a few weeks ago, was at home in Independence, Mo.

"I'm just as sorry as I can be to hear of SAM's passing," Mr. Truman said. "He was one of the great men of our time, one of our greatest statesmen."

Associate Justice Tom C. Clark of the U.S. Supreme Court, a Texan, said:

"In the passing of Speaker RAYBURN, Mary (Mrs. Clark) and I have lost one of our dearest friends. He was a true patriot—teaching us that though one may be partisan in politics he must, as did he, place devotion to country first. Along with his family, we mourn his passing and shall sorely miss him."

Secretary of the Navy John B. Connally, a Texan and longtime friend and hunting companion of RAYBURN's, said:

"Our Nation has lost one of its greatest leaders. Speaker RAYBURN was of the breed that made the United States strong, and he will take his place alongside the revered statesmen of history. His passing is an immeasurable personal loss. I will deeply miss his wise counsel and will cherish the memory of each of the many times we shared together over the years."

U.S. District Judge Allen B. Hannay of Houston: "I was in the gallery when RAYBURN was sworn in as speaker of the Texas House of Representatives. His election to the Congress occurred the following year.

"I was a very close friend and a tremendous admirer of his. I thought his patriotism, his courage and his intelligence a tremendous asset to the American people. I think his loss is irreplaceable."

Houston Mayor Lewis Cutrer: "We mourn this great loss with the rest of the Nation and the world. This is a great loss not only to the Nation but to Texas.

"He was undoubtedly one of the greatest statesmen the State ever sent to serve its country in Congress. SAM RAYBURN was a great humanitarian and through his outstanding leadership was able to become a champion of the rights of the people of all of the free world.

"He made one of the greatest contributions to his fellow men through his outstanding public service."

W. L. Clayton of Houston, chairman of the board of Anderson Clayton & Co.: "I knew him intimately and considered him one of my really great friends. His passing fills me with real grief.

"I saw him about a year ago and he looked wonderful. I told him I was so glad. He said, 'Well, I've never been sick a day in my life. I've never even had a headache.'

"Then, 6 months later, he looked very bad. It's a loss to the world."

Herman Brown, president of Brown & Root, Inc.: "SAM RAYBURN was an old personal friend but thousands of people who knew him will feel his loss just as keenly.

"He was a great steadying influence in Washington and had been a wise counselor to literally hundreds of Members of Congress during his long service. His strength lay in his uncanny ability to understand human beings."

George R. Brown, executive vice president of Brown & Root: "Mr. RAYBURN was a dedicated public servant not only to his State but to his party and his Nation. He had helped make the Texas delegation a responsible one and the envy of most of the other States."

Woodrow Seals of Houston, U.S. district attorney for this section of the State: "Although history teaches us that no one is indispensable, I do feel that in my lifetime I will not see his like again."

Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, president of Rice University: "He was certainly one of the great figures of American Government in the past many years and his loss will be felt keenly by many Americans."

Dr. Philip G. Hoffman, president of the University of Houston: "In the death of Mr. RAYBURN we have suffered the loss of one of the great public figures of our national history.

"We must find our consolation in the knowledge that he leaves a wealth of contributions to his State and Nation and a splendid example for those who aspire to become the public figures of tomorrow."

John T. Jones, Jr., president of the Houston Chronicle: "In the death of Speaker SAM RAYBURN the people of Texas have lost a friend and an able representative. But the loss sustained by the entire citizenship of our Nation is even greater, for SAM RAYBURN was a stalwart in the thinly-manned ranks of our dedicated professional politicians.

In uninformed mouths professional politician may sound like a dirty word, but in actual fact these people who dedicate their lives to the national welfare through the practice of politics are to be applauded and cherished.

"The good ones are few and far between, and we mourn the passing of the foremost of the number."

Dr. Charles L. Allen, pastor of the First Methodist Church in Houston: "I am deeply shocked and sorry. I feel he made a great contribution to the United States. I think he was one of the great statesmen of all times."

Bishop John E. Hines, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Texas: "I certainly regarded him as a very effective servant of the whole Democratic order.

"He was a loyal party man but his ultimate loyalties transcended the party. He was a dedicated servant of his country. He will certainly be missed."

The Reverend K. Owen White, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Houston: "I've regarded him as an outstanding American and a great leader. I'm sure it's a loss for everybody."

Former Congressman Lloyd Bentsen of Houston: "He was a dear friend. I believe he had more influence on the legislative course of the Nation in the past 20 years than any other man. Few men become an institution in their time, but SAM RAYBURN did."

Governor Price Daniel: "I am deeply grieved to learn of the death of SAM RAYBURN. In more than half a century of public service Mr. RAYBURN brought great honor and distinction to our State and made lasting contributions to welfare of the Nation and the free world. His strong leadership will be missed greatly not only by our own country but by all the peaceful nations of the world."

J. E. Connally, chairman, State Democratic executive committee: "Mr. SAM was very close to me—in fact, almost like a father—so his death is a great personal loss; and I am deeply saddened.

"Speaker RAYBURN was truly the great living American. He now joins the ranks of the greatest of all great Americans.

"The people of this Nation have lost their most distinguished and devoted public servant. No other man has done more for his country.

"We shall, indeed, miss Mr. SAM."

Byron Skelton, Texas Democratic national committeeman: "SAM RAYBURN was one of America's great men of all without a peer. He walked and talked with the mighty but never forgot the little man or those needing help or protection. * * * His passing is mourned by every responsible American. The hearts of Texans are filled with sadness and personal tragedy, because in losing SAM RAYBURN they have truly lost a part of Texas."

Attorney General Will Wilson said:

"I am greatly saddened by news of the death of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN. His passing is a profound loss to Americans everywhere. The legacy he leaves behind is one of great devotion to the Nation he served, to the principles upon which it was founded and to the cause of peace. History will make a place for Mr. SAM among the great statesmen of our time."

Texas Supreme Court Justice Robert W. Calvert, whose first contact with Mr. SAM was in Washington, had this to say:

"All of those who appreciate the true art of government under the American system will mourn the death of SAM RAYBURN. As Texas as the soil of Fannin County, he was unyielding in placing the welfare of his country above all local clamor. More than anything else, when he set a course, he was firm. And he didn't let a few people hollering at him deter him from that course. He will be missed."

Texas Commissioner of Agriculture John C. White said:

"This is a deep personal loss to me and my family, a loss that we could never really be prepared to accept. My one thought and hope is that the Rayburn Library might now have as many friends as Mr. RAYBURN had and helped and guided during his lifetime. I know that is what he would wish for."

Read Granberry, a page boy in the Texas House of Representatives when RAYBURN was speaker of the Texas House and who is now executive director of the Legislative Council, said:

"He didn't have much of a smile but he had an interesting personality. Everybody liked him and had great respect for him."

U.S. District Judge R. Ewing Thomason, El Paso, who served in Congress with RAYBURN from 1930 to 1947 and who was reared in Gainesville, only a short distance from the home of his close friend, termed Mr. SAM "one of the greatest public officials of this generation."

"He was a great American. He had a long and distinguished record in public service. He was a man of high principle or he couldn't have represented the Blackland territory in east Texas for so many years. He will have his place in history."

Former Lieutenant Governor and now Railroad Commissioner Ben Ramsey paid tribute in this statement:

"Texas is fortunate to have had the counsel, guidance, and political judgment of SAM RAYBURN for 50 years. His passing is sad but the heritage he left is permanent."

R. B. (Bonna) Ridgeway, a roommate of RAYBURN's when both were members of the 31st Texas legislative session, said no one questioned Mr. SAM even in those days.

"He was nearer being 100-percent honest than anyone I ever knew. His three most outstanding attributes were honesty, loyalty to his friends, and loyalty to the Democratic Party. SAM RAYBURN's purpose in service was to do what was best for the people," said the former Texas lawmaker.

Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives James Turman, who represents RAYBURN's home county, said:

"Texas, the Nation and the entire free world today suffered a profound loss. Mr. RAYBURN's contributions to human dignity will live as long as the ideals of democracy.

"Mr. SAM was a beloved friend of the Turman family in Fannin County. As such, I shall never forget the encouragement and personal help he gave me in my political endeavors. More than this, his noble examples of statesmanship, justice, and concern for humanity will remain an inspiration to young men everywhere."

Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations: "The Democratic Party has lost one of the most colorful figures of this century and the Nation one of its most useful servants" with the death of Speaker RAYBURN.

"I have lost a beloved friend and ally in many battles," he added.

Representative OMAR BURLISON, Democrat, of Texas, serving as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, said:

"Speaker RAYBURN was a man who possessed tremendous power and influence. His power and influence did not entirely emanate from the high position he held as Speaker of the House of Representatives as powerful as that position is, but from a personal leadership based on strength of character and a personal integrity."

Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Dallas, the only Republican member of the Texas delegation in the House, said:

"I join with the rest of the Nation in expressing sorrow at the passing of SAM RAYBURN. His long and eventful tenure in the House of Representatives is certain to leave its mark on the history of our country. My deepest sympathy goes to his sisters and other members of his family."

Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of College Station, who was in Hillsboro for a speech Thursday night, planned to stay in Texas and attend the RAYBURN funeral. He said:

"I think that America and the world have lost one of the greatest humans that ever lived. He was one of the most honest, honorable, and patriotic men I ever expect to know."

Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, labeled Speaker RAYBURN the greatest man of this century and said his death "leaves a void which no other person can adequately fill."

WRIGHT, a Democrat and longtime friend of the House Speaker, said, "The United States and indeed the entire free world will miss him sorely."

Representative WALTER ROGERS, of Pampa, said:

"The United States and Texas have lost one of their great children. A man who never lost the common touch, and whose monument will live forever in his deeds and accomplishments for his fellow man. The entire world can be in sorrow at this moment, and I am sure that all who knew SAM RAYBURN will be."

Former House Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, longtime Republican counterpart of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, said when advised of RAYBURN's death:

"Few men have had a greater influence in recent years on our national life than Speaker SAM RAYBURN. He was an outstanding legislator, Speaker longer than any other man in history, and a tower of strength for sound representative government.

"A man of great ability, high integrity and intensely patriotic, his death at this crucial period is a calamity. His uncanny ability to keep the Democrats in Congress working in unison will be sorely missed. His death comes as a blow to President Kennedy and the country in these critical months ahead. Personally, I mourn the loss of an intimate friend and associate of many years."

House Minority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, a Member of Congress since 1935, House majority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses and minority leader in this Congress and the last one, said:

"I have always counted Speaker SAM RAYBURN as one of my closest friends—as I have been his friend. Ours was a close personal relationship that far transcended party considerations. SAM RAYBURN was one of the great men of our time. He was a patriot of outstanding accomplishment. In these critical times his passing is a great loss to the Congress and the country. His was always a steadying hand in matters of great consequence to the Nation."

National Democratic Chairman John Bailey, who accompanied President Kennedy to the west coast said:

"The career of SAM RAYBURN is more eloquent than words can be in explaining why Democrats are heartsick with grief over the passing of the man all of us affectionately regarded as 'Mr. Democrat.' The career—longest service in the House, longest service as Speaker, three times the chairman of national conventions—demonstrates that SAM RAYBURN was recognized as a man of unusual abilities, integrity, and human understanding."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, Senate majority leader, who was accompanying President Kennedy on his trip to the West, said of RAYBURN's death:

"I feel that I have lost both a father and brother, but I know the Nation's loss is greater still. He is the last of the old frontiersmen and his place will be difficult to fill."

Representative BOB WILSON, of California, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, said:

"SAM RAYBURN's service will always be a bright page in America's history."

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Senate minority leader, attending the funeral of a close personal friend in Peoria, Ill., issued this statement through his Washington office:

"Speaker SAM RAYBURN was one of the great statesmen of our generation. He was a man of consummate courage. I remember him even as chairman of House Commerce Committee when he handled legislation which had a durable impact on the

economy of the entire country. As a Speaker, he was impeccably fair and his respect for the rights of the minority party was a household word."

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]
MR. SAM WOULD HAVE LIKED THIS YELLOW-ROSE TRIBUTE

WASHINGTON.—Joe Bartlett's yellow rose was the kind of a tribute Speaker SAM RAYBURN would have appreciated.

Bartlett, a reading clerk in the House of Representatives, was on his way to work Thursday when he heard of the Speaker's death.

Thinking back over his 20 years in Washington, Bartlett remembered such things as his first day as a page in the House when he was just 14. He remembered how, on that first day, he had broken a glass and spilled water all over RAYBURN. And he recalled the Speaker's graciousness in handling the situation.

There were other memories too—such as his chatting with RAYBURN and having his picture made with him just before the Speaker left Washington for the last time in August.

In all the time he knew the Speaker, Bartlett said, "there was never an unkind word." "And I gave Mr. RAYBURN plenty of excuses too," he added.

So Bartlett stopped at a florist's shop on his way to work Thursday and bought a yellow rose—like the song, "The Yellow Rose of Texas." The florist gave him a black ribbon and he tied it around the stem.

In the House Chamber, Bartlett quietly laid the single flower on the Speaker's desk.

[From the Texas Co-op Power, statewide edition, December 1961]

MR. SAM

Mr. SAM is gone.

SAM RAYBURN, Member and Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives longer than any other man in history, slipped away quietly in the early morning of November 16. But he will long be remembered.

He will be remembered by all as both the shrewdest of politicians and as a great statesman.

He will be remembered by all Texans as one of the greatest men the State has produced.

And the rural electric co-op folks will remember him especially as coauthor of the original Rural Electrification Act and as a staunch friend through all the years since 1936.

His contributions to rural electrification were recognized when he was honored in 1959 by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. A picture of him now hangs in the NRECA building alongside one of Senator George Norris, the other coauthor and leader in getting the rural electrification bill passed.

He was known to millions as "Mr. SAM," "Mr. Speaker," and even "Mr. Democrat."

In the process of earning those titles he had packed a tremendous amount of work into his 79 years of life.

Mr. RAYBURN was the 8th in a family of 11. He was born on a farm in Tennessee, and his family moved to Texas when he was 5. They settled on a 40-acre farm near Bonham.

Young RAYBURN attended a one-room country school at Flag Springs and worked on the farm until he was 18. Then his father gave him \$25 and he went to East Texas Normal at Commerce. He worked his way through by sweeping floors for \$3 a month, and he completed the 3-year course in 2 years.

After 2 years as a country schoolteacher, young SAM was elected to the Texas House of Representatives. He served three 2-year terms, the last as speaker of the house. He

was the youngest speaker of the house in Texas history.

Mr. RAYBURN won a seat in the 63d Congress in 1912 and has been reelected every 2 years since then.

He was first named Speaker of the House in 1940. With the exception of the 80th Congress (1947-49) and the 83d Congress (1953-55), he has held that office ever since.

Mr. SAM served with eight Presidents: Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

And in the latter years of his career his colleagues agreed that he wielded power second only to that of the President.

President Kennedy himself led the Nation in paying tribute to Mr. SAM. He issued a statement that the Nation "has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country an unflinching friend."

The three living ex-Presidents, Truman, Eisenhower, and Hoover all joined in the tribute, along with other political leaders from both parties.

And the rural electric lines stand as another permanent tribute to his service to mankind.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to associate myself with the Senator's remarks, and I am sure that at an appropriate time other Senators will wish to make statements and submit eulogies concerning the life and the works of this great patriot.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the President of the United States has just delivered a great state of the Union message. He has again demonstrated conclusively to the people of the United States the quality of his leadership—great leadership. He has pointed convincingly to the fulfillment to date of the promise his administration held out when it took office a year ago. He has issued a memorable clarion call to the forces of freedom at home and abroad.

The Nation may well be both proud of President John F. Kennedy, and reliant upon his wise and courageous guidance. I am confident that he will prove to be one of our country's greatest Presidents.

WORLD'S DISTANCE RECORD ESTABLISHED BY B-52H PLANE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, a Boeing B-52H heavy bomber took off from Kadena Airbase in Okinawa at 9 a.m. yesterday morning. It passed over Washington, D.C., this morning at 1 a.m., and landed in Madrid this morning at 7:52 eastern standard time.

This spectacular flight of over 12,000 miles established a new record, breaking 11 existing records. The B-52H has broken the world's distance record for all types of aircraft without refueling.

On October 1, 1946, the Navy set the world's distance record in a flight from Perth, Australia, to Columbus, Ohio, a distance of 11,235.6 miles, in a little over 55 hours. The B-52H has just flown over 12,000 miles, at an average speed of 575 miles an hour, in 21 hours and 52 minutes.

This new record clearly affirms the long-range performance of the Boeing B-52 aircraft in combat configuration. Our Nation can well be proud of this achievement.

Every Kansan has just cause for pride in the engineering, assembling, and piloting of this great aircraft.

Boeing B-52H heavy bombers are produced in the Boeing Aircraft plant at Wichita, Kans. Congratulations are due the officers and personnel of the Boeing Aircraft Corp.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is with genuine sorrow that I affirm to the Senate, the death of former Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., on Saturday, January 6, 1962, at Clarksburg, W. Va.

Senator Hoblitzell was my immediate distinguished predecessor in the Senate and also a cherished, personal friend. His sudden passing, attributed to a heart attack, has grieved not only his family, but a host of friends and associates, including his former colleagues in this forum.

Mrs. Randolph and our two sons have joined with me in expressing our sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Charlotte Reed Hoblitzell, and the three children—Patricia, 17, Julia, 16, and John Reed, 12.

Senator Hoblitzell was appointed as a Republican to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, and served from January 25, 1958, to November 4, 1958. During his Senate service he was a member of the District of Columbia Committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee. He was also appointed as an official U.S. delegate to the 1958 Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I shall state some facts of his life and of his public service and my personal observations concerning his eventful career.

"Jack" Hoblitzell, as he was popularly known, was born at Parkersburg, W. Va., December 30, 1912, the son of John D., Sr., and Juliette Smith Hoblitzell. He was educated in the public schools at Parkersburg, and was graduated from West Virginia University in 1934 with a bachelor of arts degree in political science. He was president of his graduating class.

Always interested in the university, he was appointed to its board of governors in 1937 and served two terms.

During World War II he served 46 months in the U.S. Navy and was retired as Lieutenant Senior Grade.

Following the war, he was elected to the Wood County School Board, and in 1954 was elected president of the West Virginia School Board Association.

He gave generously of his time and talent to civic and fraternal groups and contributed to public service by partici-

pating in the activities of many organizations. Some of them were:

Director, West Virginia Chamber of Commerce; executive committee, Little Kanawha Regional Council; appointed to West Virginia University Board of Governors, 1937, served two terms; president, Parkersburg Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1939; director, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1941-42; chairman, Vienna, W. Va., Fire Commission; chairman, Wood County Red Cross, 1948; member, Wood County School Board, 1950-56; member, West Virginia Council for Economic Education; delegate, White House Conference on Education, 1954; president, Parkersburg Chamber of Commerce, 1953; chairman, Governor's West Virginia Commission on State and Local Finance, 1954; vice chairman and trustee, National Citizens Council for Better Schools, 1955; president, West Virginia School Board Association, 1954; member, Citizens Committee To Investigate West Virginia Penal and Parole System, 1954; Citizens Committee on Higher Education, 1955; president, West Virginia Citizens Council for Better Schools; member, American Academy of Political and Social Science; member, reviewing committee, College of Commerce, West Virginia University; past president, Board of Realtors, Parkersburg, W. Va.

His personal awards included:

Outstanding Young Man of Year, Parkersburg, 1947; West Virginia Man of Year, 1956; certificate, activity, and service in behalf of Crusade for Freedom, June 1958; certificate of service in recognition of outstanding service to American education, National Citizens Council for Better Schools, June 1958; citizens award, in behalf of good government, Parkersburg, 1956.

Following his service in the Senate, he resumed his post as executive vice president of the Jackson County Bank in Ravenswood, W. Va., and later moved to Bluefield, W. Va., to become executive vice president of the First National Bank. At the time of his death, he was vice president of Alexander & Alexander, an insurance and investment firm at Clarksburg, W. Va.

Senator Hoblitzell was a member of the Parkersburg Trinity Episcopal Church, where funeral services were conducted by the rector, Rev. Griffin C. Callahan, and Rev. William C. Bowie, of Clarksburg. Burial was in Mount Olivet Cemetery.

Gov. W. W. Barron, of West Virginia, described Senator Hoblitzell as "an outstanding West Virginian who made great contributions to the good of his State and America. He also will be missed as a personal friend. I was very fond of him."

Former Gov. Cecil H. Underwood, in whose campaign Hoblitzell performed a key role in 1956, said:

His strong voice and zealous leadership will be greatly missed in West Virginia. I am shocked to see such a young man leave our scene.

Representative **KEN HECHLER** commented:

Hoblitzell was one of the most dedicated and public-spirited men I have ever known.

Representative **ARCH A. MOORE, JR.**, said:

West Virginia has lost one of its truly good men.

Significant tribute was expressed by a member of his former Senate staff, Mrs. Margaret Gallagher, who is now in the employment of Senator FONG, of Hawaii:

The Senator was one of the most considerate and thoughtful persons that I have ever met. It was a real pleasure and privilege to be associated with him. His concern for the citizens of West Virginia was very great and sincere.

The Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, in a meaningful editorial, set forth the value of his splendid service, as follows:

HE LEFT WEST VIRGINIA IN HIS DEBT

Jack Hoblitzell did not have to go into politics. His background, his interests, and his abilities prepared him admirably for a successful life well above the partisan exchange. And having decided upon politics Jack Hoblitzell did not have to cast his lot with the Republican Party, which in West Virginia at least is scarcely the way to fame and fortune.

But Mr. Hoblitzell was not interested in the easy or the opportune way. He believed devotedly that West Virginia needed a Republican Party if the two-party system was to function properly, and he gave himself fully and unselfishly to making it the best party he could. To this task he brought a clear and ranging mind, a wholesome and refreshing interest in public affairs and a conviction that, win or lose, it is the business of politics to make sense by the standard of better government.

His untimely death is a loss to his party and a misfortune for his State. Both have profited by his disinterested service, and both would be farther along the road if there were more men like Jack Hoblitzell to put their public responsibilities above their private concerns.

I have a letter which Senator Hoblitzell wrote to me on January 4, 2 days before his untimely passing, in which he indicated he was the spokesman for a group of West Virginians who were formulating a program whereby we would appropriately celebrate the centennial of West Virginia in the year of 1963.

Mr. President, Jack Hoblitzell was a man of courage and of conviction—yet withal a sense of compassion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my esteemed colleague.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn that on Saturday, January 6, a former Member of this body, and a fine citizen of the State of West Virginia, the Honorable John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., fell victim to a heart attack. A prominent political and civic leader, he was appointed by former Gov. Cecil H. Underwood to the U.S. Senate in January 1958 after the death of veteran Senator Matthew M. Neely. I liked "Jack" and I shall remember him as a pleasant and cheerful friend.

I join with my colleague in expressing sorrow at his passing, and I extend my sympathy to his family and loved ones.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I was shocked to learn of the untimely death of the man whom we affectionately knew in the Senate as "Jack" Hoblitzell. He was here only a short period of time—10 months, I believe—but those of us who had the opportunity to know him learned to love him, and appreciated his outstanding service to his State and his Nation.

He was a conscientious, hard-working, and able Senator from the great State of West Virginia.

It was my privilege to become closely associated with him on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I know of the personal interest he had in the welfare of our Federal employees during that service, and of the interest he had in all humankind.

I wish to extend my sympathy to Mrs. Hoblitzell and to the other members of the family of the late Senator Hoblitzell.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], he told of their work together on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I recall, as do other Members of the Senate, the articulate, active, and successful effort of my predecessor in reference to the barring from the U.S. mails of obscene literature.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was with profound sorrow that I heard the Senator from West Virginia announce to the Senate the death of the former Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Hoblitzell. It was the privilege of Mrs. Case and myself to become acquainted with both Mr. and Mrs. Hoblitzell during the time of his service in the Senate. We found them to be delightful people personally. Mr. Hoblitzell was exceedingly well informed on fiscal matters and economic affairs affecting the welfare of the Nation. He was a devoted public servant.

To Mrs. Hoblitzell and other members of the family Mrs. Case and I extend our sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the words from two Members of this body who served with the late Senator Hoblitzell are most appreciated.

WEST VIRGINIA'S RISE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, when the Wall Street Journal, a reliable chronicler of our economic life, reports that President Kennedy has been fulfilling his campaign pledge to assist the State of West Virginia in achieving freedom from economic distress, it is time for all Americans to take note that John F. Kennedy is a man of his word.

Candidate Kennedy made no idle promise to the people of my State. Today, as President, he is conscientiously working for an economic renaissance of West Virginia, encouraging defense industries to locate there, and memorializing all Government agencies to think of the State when formulating their various programs.

The slow comeback of the economy of West Virginia, under the strong hand of President Kennedy, is described in an article by Mr. Paul Duke, in the December 28, 1961, edition of the Wall Street Journal. Because I believe this article should be universally read, so that all Americans can appreciate the integrity of our President's campaign pledges, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

WEST VIRGINIA'S RISE—INCREASED FEDERAL AID, NATIONAL RECOVERY HELP LIFT STATE'S ECONOMY—ADMINISTRATION FUNNELS MORE DEFENSE WORK INTO AREA; LOCAL DRIVE LURES INDUSTRY—FULFILLING A CAMPAIGN PLEDGE

(By Paul Duke)

CHARLESTON, W. Va.—With an assist from Old Friend John F. Kennedy, this most depressed State in the Union is slowly beginning to emerge from its long dark siege of economic distress.

The chronic slump which has afflicted West Virginia since 1958 is easing under the impact of Federal, State, and self-help measures. Unemployment, in many respects worse here than in any other State in the land, is down to around 10 percent of the working force from over 11 percent a year ago and from a high of 15 percent early this year. Stepped-up business expansion has resulted in 5,000 new jobs since July 1; even the downtrodden coal industry is enjoying a mild pickup in employment.

"The sun is rising again over West Virginia," exults one top State official, expressing a widespread revival of confidence.

There's a general recognition, of course, that part of the State's upturn is traceable to a national recovery from recession—a recovery that was bound to affect even the most depressed areas. Steel mills, for example, are demanding more West Virginia coal to stoke fired-up furnaces.

But Uncle Sam's role in the budding renaissance also is large. Federal funds are flowing into the State in record volume; by some estimates an additional \$350 million has been allocated under various assistance programs since the Kennedy administration assumed power in January 1960. The Democratic regime in Washington is striving to funnel Government contracts to West Virginia industry and it's helping to lure in new plants as well.

A PENTAGON PROUD

Thus, the Pentagon is encouraging defense contractors to consider locating in West Virginia. Implicit is the suggestion they may benefit through increased orders. One result: Lockheed Aircraft Corp., after being prodded by Air Force Secretary Zuckert, decided to open a plant at Clarksburg that will employ 250 to make parts for the C-130 transport plane.

While it's eminently logical that this special trouble spot should qualify for special Federal help, political as well as economic motives underlie Washington's efforts. President Kennedy obviously is following through on his campaign pledge to help West Virginia get back on its feet. Understandably, he has a warm spot in his heart for this State of 1.8 million. For it was, after all, his surprise triumph over Minnesota's Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in the May 1960 Democratic primary here that put Mr. Kennedy on the road to the Democratic nomination and the Presidency.

State officials report Washington doors are always open to them. "All we have to do is call and they come running to help," declares

a State relief aid, finding that Federal agencies are bending over backward to assist the State Democratic administration of Gov. Wallace W. Barron. Governor Barron, who took office last January himself, asserts: "I don't know of any way the new administration could be more helpful."

Indeed, the President is keeping tabs on much of the rehabilitation effort and has a personal watchdog on the scene in State Democratic Chairman Robert McDonough, a prime backer in last year's primary. Several times Mr. Kennedy has met with State leaders to discuss State economic problems. Once, during a visit of local citizens interested in converting an unused Government ordnance plant at Morgantown to an industrial operation, the President picked up the telephone and requested the Government's General Services Administration to give speedier consideration to the matter.

SOME REPUBLICANS BELITTLE AID

West Virginia's praise for the President's help is not unanimous, to be sure. Some Republicans maintain that the Federal largess is a mere drop in the economic bucket, that the State remains a long way from real recovery. "Kennedy has not by any means fulfilled his campaign promise to lift West Virginia out of the doldrums," contends former GOP Mayor David Francis, of Huntington.

At best, the present rate of improvement in this State may not be maintained indefinitely; at worst, a steel strike next summer could drastically reduce purchases of coal. "A steel strike would knock us flat on our faces again," reasons a Republican leader. "If coal doesn't move, West Virginia doesn't move."

Certainly the recovery period will be prolonged and painful. No overnight booms are in prospect. Unemployment is expected to continue high in the southern tier of coal-producing counties for a long time; nearly one of every four workers still is without a job in Boone and Logan Counties.

While the State is beginning to attract more industry, it desperately needs a few major concerns that would employ thousands and not just hundreds. But rough terrain and inadequate water supplies hinder prospects in many localities. In others, the flight of young people out of the State has reduced the bulk of the remaining labor force to unskilled older men little sought by modern industry.

"We're not so sick as we were, but we still have lots of bedsores," sums up a veteran Charleston newspaperman.

PUSHING ON SEVERAL FRONTS

Whatever the final outcome, the evidence so far suggests Mr. Kennedy is trying hard on several fronts to keep his pledge of help. His first Executive order last winter had the effect of doubling the amount of free Federal surplus food distributed to the State's needy; lesser increases went to other States. This was soon followed by establishment in hard-hit McDowell County of the administration's first pilot project for helping the poor buy their staples directly from groceries with Federal food stamps. More than 250,000 West Virginians are now getting free surplus food, and some 17,000 are getting food stamps.

Under relief measures proposed by the administration and approved by Congress, West Virginia is receiving an extra \$30 million this year in extended unemployment benefits and aid to dependent children of jobless parents. Money from the new \$394 million program to help depressed areas rebuild their economies is beginning to roll in, with the go-ahead already given for construction of a furniture factory in Mingo County and for job retraining projects in Mingo, Grant, Cabell, and Wayne Counties. Just last week

Federal approval was given to a general re-development plan drawn up by Jackson County.

By far the biggest bonanza is an "extra" 150-mile interstate highway, 90 percent federally financed, that will cut through rugged mountain country to link the northern area with the somewhat isolated interior. Not only will Route 79 mean an estimated \$225 million in Federal road funds, but it also will provide a badly needed artery for trucking West Virginia products to northern commercial centers. The interior finally will have easy and direct access to the major markets of Pittsburgh and the Lake Erie industrial complex. Within the State, the bonus highway project has been joyously received. "We couldn't build it by ourselves in a thousand years," remarks one State official.

But the award of this plum has also produced a loud cry of payoff from Ohio's Representative SCHERER, ranking Republican on the House Roads Subcommittee on Roads. He and other out-of-State critics have strenuously objected to the allocation method; the Bureau of Public Roads simply dipped into a 343-mile reserve set aside for all 50 States and gave West Virginia nearly half the total. Bureau officials take the view that no injustice is being done the other States; they reason that Congress seems certain to increase the reserve later.

In some cases, the Kennedy regime is finding justification for rendering help that the Eisenhower administration could not, would not, or did not furnish. State Republican leaders tried unsuccessfully to win approval for the new highway in recent years but couldn't budge the Bureau of Public Roads. Somewhat similarly, a bogged-down move to convert an inactivated naval gun factory in South Charleston into a private chemical plant has been given the green light by the new administration.

The Kennedy camp's endeavor to channel more defense contracts into West Virginia, whose share of the national pie is extremely small, faces a big problem; West Virginia industries for the most part are not equipped to handle major defense orders for such things as airplane frames and missiles. But under Defense Department pressure a number of prime contractors are surveying West Virginia firms with an eye toward giving them more subcontract production of component parts for military equipment.

NEW SHIPYARD CONTRACT

As it is, the State is benefiting more than ever. On December 13, for example, the Marietta Manufacturing Co. received a \$5.4 million award to build two Navy oceanographic vessels at its Ohio River shipyard at Point Pleasant, W. Va. The contract will mean an additional 600 jobs.

Some West Virginians feel, however, that State and community efforts are helping every bit as much, if not more, than the Washington assistance. The State is currently teaching new skills to 2,000 of its 63,300 unemployed in training units set up in 32 of the 55 counties. Of 100 recent graduates of a training school at Welch, 69 quickly found jobs in their new pursuits of auto and appliance repair and machine work.

Moreover, the new State commerce department, created by the legislature last winter, is making headway in its attempt to snare new industry. New enterprises coming in include a North American Aviation plant at Princeton for making B-70 bomber parts and a Corning Glass Works overware plant at Martinsburg. Other newcomers will manufacture electronics equipment, aluminum products and textiles. Since September 1, 30 outside industries have dispatched representatives into the State to investigate site possibilities.

In addition, expansion is underway at Du Pont's chemical plant at Belle, FMC Corp.'s chemical works at South Charleston, Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals' synthetic rubber plant at Institute and International Nickel Co.'s tubing factory at Huntington.

Governor Barron is pushing hard, too, to develop a flourishing tourist trade. The State already is preparing an ambitious program to lure outsiders to its 100th birthday in 1963. Another project in the works: an \$800,000 State-sponsored building at the 1964 New York World's Fair to promote West Virginia's attractions.

RECOVERY AND TAXES

Such recovery efforts are not without their cost to West Virginians, of course. A new State income tax was imposed this year and the State sales tax has been boosted to 3 percent from 2 percent bringing a deluge of complaints from merchants along the Virginia border who report losing business to that no-sales-tax State. Total State tax collections are expected to climb to \$280 million in the fiscal year ending next June, from \$243 million in the previous year.

The new mood of hope has spread in various ways. There is even talk about a renaissance in the coal industry through establishment of pipelines into major eastern markets. Governor Barron plans to ask the legislature at its new session in January to authorize land acquisition for the project. The pipelines would permit transport of a coal-water mixture called slurry at rates making coal more competitive with gas and oil. If successful, it's claimed, the move could mean eventual reopening of hundreds of mines.

Even so, West Virginia is rapidly moving away from its old reliance on coal as its economic backbone. Manufacturing now enjoys a greater role nearly everywhere. Beckley, which almost became a ghost town when coal hit the skids, has staged a major comeback by regearing to factory production of plastics, textiles and electrical goods; the Beckley Manufacturing Co., largest in the area, employs 500 making electronics parts. Business leaders predict the Ohio Valley area, now the one oasis of prosperity with its gleaming chemical plants, will be in the van of any new nationwide boom.

Inevitably, the new Federal aid programs have been accompanied by snags and complaints. There is local criticism about red-tape in qualifying for industrial development loans under the Depressed Areas Act. While 44 counties are eligible for assistance, money cannot be obtained unless a locality draws up a full-scale economic development plan. After this is approved, it then must submit additional plans to support individual project requests.

Some labor leaders grumble that not enough is being done to clear up severe pockets of unemployment. "We could stand a lot more help," says a top official of the State labor federation. The continued high flow of residual oil and glass imports, with consequent damage to markets for locally produced coal and glass products, still rankles.

But even critics concede the administration is making West Virginia justify its requests and is showing remarkable, non-partisanship in parceling out assistance.

The administration refused to okay a \$10 million contract to Wheeling's community-sponsored West Virginia Ordnance Co. for production of M-14 Army rifles even though local and State leaders made a strong pitch for the work. Pentagon officials said they felt Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Cleveland, which got the contract, was better qualified. The controversial interstate highway required major changes in rout-

ing and had to be submitted three times before gaining final clearance from the Bureau of Public Roads.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, during the closing days of the last session, there was before the conferees from the House and the Senate H.R. 258, which was the District of Columbia sales tax bill. It was a very important and much needed piece of legislation. During the closing days of the session the conferees were unable to come to an agreement as to the terms of the bill.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate still further insist upon its amendments to the said bill, and agree to the conference asked by the House, and that new conferees be appointed. I may say that the conferees I am asking to be designated are the regular members of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia. They had the hearings. They heard all the testimony in this rather involved, complicated and complex revenue situation which exists in the District of Columbia.

I am hopeful that, as soon as the Senate conferees are appointed, the House will appoint new conferees and that they will meet very quickly and get to some agreement on the bill, which relates to the District of Columbia tax problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

A BLUEPRINT TO SAVE LATIN AMERICA FROM CASTRO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Can Save Latin America From Castro," written by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, which appeared in the December 17 issue of This Week magazine.

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

WE CAN SAVE LATIN AMERICA FROM CASTRO (By Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—Every freedom-loving person in the United States is worried today about how to halt the spread of Cuban-type revolution through Latin America.

Let me make this clear. It's not the fact that there was a revolution in Cuba that has thoughtful people concerned. That revolution was long overdue. Rather it's the way that Fidel Castro has needlessly laid the Cuban revolution at the feet of Soviet totalitarianism. I, for one, was in favor of revolution in Cuba, including social revolution, and I am convinced that even Castro himself could have carried it out in terms of freedom and friendship with the United States and the Western World. It is a tragic and quite unnecessary loss that it did not take that course.

Meanwhile, it is obvious that agents of Havana as well as Moscow are working to-

gether for subversive purposes in every other Latin American nation.

How can Latin America cope with this new kind of revolution?

Not with guns and tanks, let me emphasize. It can only be done by wiping out the evils that prevail in varying degrees in all Latin American countries. Just think:

The per capita income in Peru is \$119 a year. And \$126 in Bolivia. That is less than the average man in the United States earns in 2 weeks.

In Ecuador one-fifth of 1 percent of the people hold over one-third of the land.

Seventy percent of the population of Bolivia is illiterate. And 90 percent in Haiti.

Life expectancy in Guatemala is only 43.8 years. Compare that with the 69 years of the United States.

To sick, hungry people living under conditions of grave injustice, Communist and Fidelista promises of a better life can be tempting. The price is their liberty, of course, but many have never experienced liberty in their own lives.

Fortunately, a determined move is at last underway to improve conditions, to set in movement the peaceful revolution that is the only alternative to a violent one. The "Alliance for Progress" that was signed at Punta del Este, Uruguay, last summer commits the United States and Latin America to an intensive effort toward that goal. It combines the work and ideas of Latin America with United States financial support and technical cooperation.

The main job will have to be done by the Latin American nations themselves. On the basis of our experience in Puerto Rico, I am convinced that they can do it—and in a democratic way with respect for personal freedom. Not many years ago, Puerto Rico could have been a fertile field for subversive activities. Many of our people were hungry. Most were extremely poor. Disease, ignorance and hopelessness were everywhere. "The Poorhouse of the Caribbean," we were called.

Not any more, however. By fresh thinking and hard work, we have raised our standard of living until it is the second highest in all Latin America. We have a fine flourishing democracy and the 2,300,000 citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are solidly behind it.

The last Communist who tried for public office here received precisely 235 votes out of half a million.

To one degree or another, the problems we faced are the same that affect Latin America today. As a result, a number of Latin Americans have come to Puerto Rico to learn which of our experiences could be of help to them. There are many, I think—always remembering that adaptations must be made to meet differing situations.

Operation Bootstrap is the name we have given to the economic part of our effort toward a good life. Throughout, careful planning and a set of thorough priorities have been our rule. I heartily urge both. Poor nations, like poor people, cannot afford to be careless. Every dollar or peso must swing its whole weight.

Here are the points that worked well for us:

1. LAND REFORM

The most important thing of all is to give hope to people, especially to hungry farmers who have been forced to till other men's soil for a few cents a day.

We broke up land-holdings over 500 acres and paid the owners a fair market price in cash. With the land, we set up a special kind of farm cooperatives in which the workers not only drew regular wages but shared in the profits. In addition, we distributed land directly to people for farms of a size suitable for working by a family.

We could not give land to all the landless at once, but tangible results could be seen. So there was hope.

I remember what a man 60 years old who had never owned land said when he received his plot.

"You mean the land is really mine now?" he asked incredulously.

"Yes, it is now yours," he was told. "Not even you can take it away from yourself."

Tears were in his eyes. "You cannot know what it means," he said, "after all these years of belonging to the land to have the land belong to me."

2. TAX REFORM

One of the reasons the rich get richer and the poor get poorer is low taxation of those abundantly able to pay, and the evasion even of that. It is the curse of a great part of Latin America today.

Very early, we undertook a complete reorganization of our tax structure to make certain that everyone bore a fair share of the tax load.

It gave us the money to tackle our reforms. I doubt if the nations of Latin America can ever wipe out poverty unless they remedy their tax inequities.

3. WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER

There are cities in Latin America where patients have died on the operating table because there was not enough power to keep the light going.

There are cities where water is in such short supply that it has to be rationed. There are countries where once rich land is so parched for water that it has become desert.

There was a time when much of Puerto Rico's land was parched, too, and we could not build factories for lack of electric current to run them.

It meant straining our resources, but we borrowed every dollar we could for the construction of vast hydroelectric projects. This gave us water to irrigate our land and the electric power we needed so badly to industrialize.

We ran the powerlines into the hills as well as the cities. The bare light bulb in a farmer's hut may not have added to the decor, but as one of our hill people said, "These wires bring light into our hearts."

I was happy to see the U.S. Government offer to assist Latin America in developing its water resources. I hope very much that the various Latin American countries take advantage of this proposal.

4. HOUSING

Unquestionably, the biggest single social problem in Latin America today, the one that contributes most to a sense of misery and despair, is bad housing. There are slums so dreadful as to be unbelievable. The United Nations made a survey in this connection. It found that Latin America urgently needed a minimum of 25 million decent homes.

The problem can be beaten. It must be beaten.

Governments can do their part by clearing slums and building low-cost housing so far as their budgets allow. In Puerto Rico, we have provided low-rent housing for 133,500 people in the past 10 years.

But the governments do not have to do it all. The people will pitch in. Some years ago, we tried a scheme under which the Government supplied concrete, equipment, and a foreman. Then the people built small houses themselves.

The response was inspiring. In rural community after rural community, neighbors worked together nights and weekends to help each other complete their new homes. That way we were able to put up such houses for just \$400 apiece. To date, over 12,600 of these self-help houses have been built. People pay them off at \$3 a month.

5. INDUSTRIALIZATION

It is the dream of every underdeveloped nation, I suppose, to industrialize—to establish factories that will furnish new jobs at good wages for its hordes of unemployed, and to manufacture the products required to expand its economy. The trouble is that enormous capital is essential, and underdeveloped nations don't have it.

We Puerto Ricans know how desperate this quandary can be. We have lived through it.

Accordingly, we have developed a plan to attract new industry to our towns, cities, and countryside. We have channeled Government funds as well as private capital toward the establishment of new industries. We have given 10 years' tax exemption to companies starting new industries here—and 13 years' exemption if they establish themselves in the countryside or small towns. We have erected factory buildings ourselves for the companies to move into. We have set up courses to train workers in new skills.

More than 700 new plants have now been opened. During the past decade, unemployment has been reduced substantially in spite of a 7-percent rise in population, and real wages have more than doubled. The Puerto Rican gross national product is currently increasing at the rate of 9.4 percent a year.

Some Latin Americans say, "You Puerto Ricans are doing so well because you have free access to U.S. markets."

It is true. But if the Latin American nations would join together to form a common market, removing tariff barriers, they could do even better. They are rich in natural resources, whereas our only real natural resource is people. True, the economic aid provided Puerto Rico by the United States is larger than that which could be given to any other Latin American country of our size. But, again, the vast abundance of unused land, the rich mineral deposits and the unused tax potential in most Latin American countries make up for this.

6. PUBLIC HEALTH

Tuberculosis is an evil companion. So are malaria and dysentery. Latin Americans can testify to that. They have these killers with them 24 hours a day. Millions of their children die of them.

It will demand a tremendous effort to suppress endemic diseases like these, but I have no doubt that it can be done. The establishment of medical clinics, X-ray programs, sanitary drives, and education in hygienic methods can achieve miracles. A better diet would do a great deal by itself toward controlling many diseases that are caused by extreme poverty.

In 1940, Puerto Rico's death rate from tuberculosis was 260 per 100,000. Now, it is down to 29 per 100,000 and still falling. Once malaria was a great scourge. Now, we have not had a malaria death in 6 years. It adds up to this: The death rate in Puerto Rico is now lower than in the United States.

7. EDUCATION

"I cannot read or write, but I will not rest until my children learn how."

This is the feeling all over Latin America. There is a deep, unquenchable thirst for education, and the people will make any sacrifice for it.

It is not a matter of erecting elaborate school buildings. Brick and mortar do not educate children; teachers and books do. Many of our scholastic buildings in Puerto Rico are simple indeed, but the significant fact is that 91 percent of our children go to school.

Education is the largest item in our budget. Almost 30 percent of the Government's revenues are devoted to it.

The charter of the Alliance for Progress calls for at least 6 years of primary schooling for all children. I look forward to the day when it is an actuality.

The charter further calls for a program of adult education, and I subscribe to it. Of all the activities of the Puerto Rican government, few have given me the satisfaction of our community education work.

We dispatch trained men into the most remote rural neighborhoods, not to do things for people, but to teach them to do things for themselves. The residents of one little place near Rio Grande, for example, applied to the Government to build a new road connecting them with a main artery. Under normal circumstances, it would have taken many years for the Government to get the job done. Instead, a Government technician went out and taught the people how they could lay the road themselves.

Every man in the community volunteered to help, and the road was built in a couple of months. The cost was \$6,000—one-quarter of what it ordinarily would have been. Best of all, the people feel it is their road. "We have the finest road around here," they are bragging.

It is wonderful for the people and the Government when the people show self-reliance. It is the antithesis of totalitarianism.

Let me reemphasize. Latin Americans are at the crossroads. One road can lead them to Castroism—mobs crying, "To the wall!", and the end of all their liberties. On the other road, they can lift themselves in a peaceful, democratic way to prosperity, health, and hope.

Upon the outcome of their struggle depends the fate of freedom in this hemisphere for all of us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every Member of this body, every citizen of the United States is most concerned about the Communist takeover in Cuba. Everyone is anxious to find an answer to the question as to how do we stop this kind of Communist advance in Latin America.

In this lucid article Governor Marin spells out what he feels is the way to stop the Communist menace, to advance the economy of the countries, and to promote free and open societies. The Governor's article is "must" reading to all who are concerned over this vital issue. The Governor, of course, does not speak as a theoretician. He has put his blueprint, which he calls Operation Bootstrap, into practice in Puerto Rico and it has been proving successful. Governor Marin in his blueprint calls for land reform, tax reform, development of water and electric power, industrialization, public health programs and education.

From my recent trip to South America, I returned to the United States convinced that the type of program of social reform which Governor Marin spells out in his article is the answer—the only answer—to the Communist menace in Latin America.

It is this type of program that is envisioned in the Alliance for Progress. I am convinced that this program can succeed and that it will succeed. It deserves, in fact, it demands, our all-out support.

The Communists realize what the Alliance for Progress means. That is why they are fighting it tooth and nail.

I read the concluding paragraphs from the Governor's article:

Let me reemphasize. Latin Americans are at the crossroads. One road can lead them to Castroism—mobs crying "To the wall," and the end of all their liberties. On the other road, they can lift themselves in a peaceful, democratic way to prosperity, health, and hope.

Upon the outcome of their struggle depends the fate of freedom in this hemisphere for all of us.

AMBASSADOR LOEB—AN OUTSTANDING REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 15 issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune telling of the fine work which our ambassador to Peru, Mr. James Loeb, has been doing since his appointment this past spring.

I might say, Mr. President, that on my recent visit to Peru I saw at firsthand the fine work which Ambassador Loeb has been performing for our country. He has made a most excellent impression on the Peruvian people and has rendered yeoman service in helping to create a better understanding on the part of the people of Peru as to what our great country stands for. He is an effective and respected spokesman for the Alliance for Progress.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Loeb for a number of years. The President could not have found a better or more highly qualified man for this important, sensitive, and difficult position. Mr. Loeb's background knowledge of South America, his democratic idealism and spirit, his vigorous and effective opposition to communism make him an ideal representative of our country in that important area.

Reading this article from the Chicago Daily Tribune, I believe that my colleagues will take pride, as I do, in the work that Mr. Loeb has been doing on our behalf. He is a working diplomat who by his service brings honor to our country and himself.

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

LOEB'S FORTHRIGHT APPROACH IN PERU PAYS DIVIDENDS FOR UNITED STATES

(By Jules Dubois)

LIMA, PERU, December 14.—"I am in a more fortunate position than the career ambassador," James Loeb, 53, born in Chicago, said in an interview. "I can stick my neck out because I have something to go home to whereas the career ambassador is not in such an advantageous position."

Loeb was appointed Ambassador here last April and arrived in May after a briefing at the State Department. He has let it be known that he is the American Ambassador and has done so in writing which he made his profession when, with Roger Tubby, he left the White House after the Truman administration and bought the Adirondack Daily Enterprise of Saranac Lake, N.Y., in 1953, and the weekly Lake Placid News in 1960. Both he and Tubby are back in government now.

Loeb and his wife, the former Ellen Katz, have relatives in Highland Park where he attended high school. His brother, Ted R. Loeb, is in the insurance business. His sister is Mrs. Herbert van Straaten. Mrs. Barton Wolf is a sister of Mrs. Loeb. Ambassador and Mrs. Loeb are the only members of their families who have moved away from Highland Park.

He went east in 1925 to get his bachelor of arts degree at Dartmouth College and then returned to Chicago to take post-graduate studies at Northwestern University.

Loeb majored in languages and got his master of arts degree in 1931, then served on the faculty as a language instructor and emerged with a doctorate in philosophy in 1936.

From Northwestern and Chicago he went to New York City and obtained a post as a French teacher on the faculty of Townsend Harris High School which was affiliated with the City College of New York.

BECAME ADA EXECUTIVE BEFORE JOINING TRUMAN

In 1941 he resigned to become national secretary of the Americans for Democratic Action. Ten years later he was consultant to President Truman's counsel, Charles Murphy, and in 1952 he was executive assistant to Averell Harriman.

Sticking his neck out here in Peru came after Loeb boiled at the silence of the intellectual groups regarding Russia's resumption of atomic testing in the atmosphere and the explosion of a 50 megaton bomb. He wrote a letter to the rector of the engineering university whom he had entertained at the embassy.

"I have not seen a single protest on the part of the intellectual community of this great Nation," his letter read. "No student or educational organization, so far as I know, has written or published any protest or held meetings against these tests. Am I wrong in supposing that had these tests been made by the United States the reaction here would have been different? Am I right in asking whether this silence means a moral double standard?"

Career diplomats were shocked at the letter and the pro-Communist Peruvian left and the Communists themselves were angered. No career diplomat ever would have undertaken such a bold venture.

"I was wrong from a protocol aspect in writing that letter," Loeb admits. "But I waited unsuccessfully for 2 months for some outcry against the Russian tests and none came. There are Peruvians who have a different concept of Voltaire's expression: 'I disagree with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it.'"

"Here there are people who will frankly say: 'I agree with what you say but I will deny to the death your right to say it.' I decided, anyway, that Saranac Lake is a good place to live in case they threw me out," he said.

But there was no rebuke from the State Department and the advantages of Loeb's noncareer approach far outweighed the disadvantages.

FRIENDLINESS IS KEY TO FOREIGN POLICY

Loeb's summation of our foreign policy toward Peru is a simplified one.

"Peru is a friendly nation and always has been," he points out. "It is our policy to help the country in every possible way. We try to help to solve the basic problems of the country."

That, in itself, is a herculean task. And now he finds himself in the middle of the presidential campaign here that could well decide the future of Peru's traditional friendliness with the United States.

He recalls the story told to him by one of his predecessors, former Ambassador Henry

R. Norweb, who was here when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. It was told to him at a dinner given by Secretary of State Dean Rusk for President Manuel Prado in September before Prado's visit to Chicago.

"A few hours after the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor, President Prado, then in his first administration, telephoned Ambassador Norweb and asked if there was anything Peru could do to help the United States," Loeb narrates.

Loeb's association with the Americans for Democratic Action opened the doors of confidence to him among the leaders of the non-Communist left, or the strong mass political party, the APRA. What the APRA will do in the forthcoming campaign will swing the balance of power.

FATE OF COUNTRY IN APRA'S HANDS

Victor Raul Haya de la Torre, the party chief, is returning from Europe January 6 to attend the national convention. His decision in the monolithic structure of the party will decide the fate of the country, for an APRA presidential candidate may fester old sores in the army.

The army has not forgiven the APRA for the massacre of its officers in 1931. The party has been in coexistence with the Prado regime and regained its lawful status under him after being outlawed more than 8 years.

There is a possibility that Haya might decide for a coalition ticket that could be headed by Pedro Beltran, the former prime minister and minister of treasury who straightened out the economy of the country. Or he might elect to nominate one of his party for the presidential role and offer the vice presidency to a prominent member of Prado's party.

Loeb will have to walk the diplomatic tightrope in the next 6 months before the elections. He is aware of it.

Loeb arrived at a time when there is a complete reorganization of our aid program and it was challenging for him to come here in the midst of an election campaign which is not only important for this country but also for the entire hemisphere.

VIOLENCE IN CAMPAIGN IS STRONG POSSIBILITY

He was catapulted into the violence that might erupt and become constant during the campaign. Two days before he arrived ex-President Gen. Manuel Odría was stoned by a mob at Huancaayo while campaigning.

The Embassy, Loeb insists, has only one position insofar as Peruvian politics is concerned. It is anti-Communist.

The post of American Ambassador is most important here and is looked upon with great respect in some circles and with obvious hatred among the Communists and fellow travelers.

Loeb's wife and two children have helped him in his efforts to meet the middle class, laboring people, and students.

SIXTEEN YEAR OLD DAUGHTER ATTENDS PERUVIAN SCHOOL

His daughter Susan, 16, goes to a Peruvian high school and finds it very interesting as do her parents.

When Loeb's son Peter, 19, was home from Harvard University for the summer where he is majoring in music, he wandered out to suburban Miraflores and played with a jazz club there for 2 weeks and later gave a jazz concert at the United States-Peruvian Cultural Institute. The concert drew an overflow crowd.

By sticking his neck out, Loeb has learned one thing and the Peruvians another. While the Peruvians have the innate Latin American sensitivity, they learned by Loeb's letter that the people of the United States are sensitive, too.

RETIREMENT OF VERNON L. TALBERTT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the adjournment of the 1st session of the 87th Congress one of the most beloved and respected servants of the U.S. Senate, one of our real officials, retired. I invite the attention of the Senate to the retirement of Vernon L. Talbertt, the chief messenger in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate. Everybody in the Senate knows Vernon. Everybody loved him not only because of his great qualities as a man, but also because of his complete dedication to the Senate as an institution, as a public body, and because of his personal loyalty to and friendship for every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, the Secretary of the Senate, Felton M. Johnston, wrote to us on December 20 and reminded us of the fact that at the end of 1961 Mr. Vernon L. Talbertt would retire. He called to our attention the fact that Vernon Talbertt had served 51 years, 6 months, and 8 days as a truly wonderful official of this body. Mr. Johnston, the Secretary, pointed out that Mr. Talbertt's service had been continuous, with the exception of 1 year, 4 months, and 18 days as an enlisted man in the U.S. Army. All of Vernon's service had been in the Office of the Secretary, and the records disclose that he had served under nine successive secretaries.

The words of Secretary Johnston, affectionately known to all of us as Skeeter, I think are quite appropriate. He said:

I have never known a more loyal and conscientious employee, and I can attest to his energy and faithfulness. He has always been extremely helpful to the Members, officers, and employees of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am sure that many of us in this body sent letters to Vernon Talbertt, knowing that most likely we would not have an opportunity to see him before his retirement. I had the privilege of sending him such a letter on December 22. I should like to quote from it for the public record, because this man has been very kind to me. I think his acts of kindness were symbolic of his whole life. I said to him:

I shall cherish your friendship as long as I live. If ever I can be of service to you or your family in any way, I trust that you will call upon me. May the good Lord bless you in the days of your retirement and may you be given the precious gift of continuing good health, vitality, and joyful spirit.

I cannot imagine the Senate of the United States without Vernon, but I suppose he would be the first to say we always make the necessary adjustments. Anyway, we owe him a debt of gratitude and a debt of thanks, and I think a statement of respect and honor. I know I speak for every Member of this body in these words.

DEATH OF LOUIS C. RABAUT, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution

coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 488) as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the two Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART], a resolution relative to the death of LOUIS C. RABAUT of Michigan and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

DEATH OF JOHN J. RILEY, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 489) as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the two Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. THURMOND] a resolution relative to the death of Representative JOHN J. RILEY of South Carolina, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

DEATH OF SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk will read the resolution (H. Res. 491), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sensibility and sorrow of the death of SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth through the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first and Eighty-second, and Eighty-fourth through the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress, having served as Speaker more than twice as long as any Speaker in the history of the Congress.

Resolved, That in the death of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN the United States has sustained an irreparable loss.

Resolved, That this House, of which he was a distinguished Member and leader, unite in honoring his sterling character, the ability, probity, and patriotic motives which illustrated his public career, and the grace and dignity which marked his intercourse with his fellow citizens.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] I submit a resolution relative to the death of Speaker of the House of Representatives SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable SAM RAYBURN, late Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth through the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first and Eighty-second, and Eighty-fourth through the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday next, in accordance with the order previously entered, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late distinguished Representative from Michigan, LOUIS C. RABAUT; the late distinguished Representative from South Carolina, JOHN J. RILEY; and the late distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S. Goals for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the reconvening of Congress presents us—and the Nation—with complex, broad-scope problems, opportunities, and challenges.

With the beginning of a new year, we traditionally take a backward look and attempt to evaluate our progress. Following such a review, then, we shoot for new goals for the future.

These goals, however, will not be accomplished automatically, magically, or by wishful thinking. We, as a people, rather, must rededicate ourselves to creating—and putting into action—the workable programs that will better serve humanity and promote peace and progress.

Recently, I was privileged to review broad-scope objectives which, if attained, would, in my judgment, help us to better meet the challenges of 1962. I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of these propositions printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTIONS FOR 1962

We, the people—to promote a world of peace and progress—rededicate ourselves to the following objectives:

I. Crystallize—and spread the principles and ideals of freedom around the world. In the past, we as a nation have not engaged in broad-scale efforts to export our political concepts. Why? Because we respected for all nations what we will fight to preserve for ourselves: That is, the right of self-determination. In a world threatened by communism (expansionism and aggression) we must, however, not only improve the U.S. system of freedom, but also expand efforts to establish a global climate in which all nations may enjoy the right of self-determination.

II. Create a more dynamic economic system to—

Enable all citizens to live on still better standards—now the highest in world history;

Assure that our agricultural-industrial-technological system meets the needs of a fast-growing 185 million population and the revolutionary fast-changing times;

Maintain the United States out-front economic position—with a gross national product estimated at a current output rate of \$540 billion annually. By comparison this far exceeds in value the combined output, valued at \$350 billion, of the Soviet bloc (including Albania, Bulgaria, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R.);

Strengthen our faith in the ability of the United States and the free world to continue to outproduce and outprogress (if not outbrag) the Communist world.

III. Be better stewards of our manpower, brainpower, monetary, agricultural, technical, scientific, and other human and natural

resources to (a) assure best utilization—not wasteful dissipation—of these God-given and man-created resources, for the American people; and (b) demonstrate a willingness to earmark the necessary human and natural resources and productivity to promote peace and freedom in the world.

IV. Strengthen the free world defenses: A mighty jet-missile-space-nuclear U.S. force serving as the backbone of free world alliances provides a shield (a) against Communist military aggression and (b) holds the Communists at bay while undertaking counteroffensives on nonmilitary fronts to regain lost territory and attain the triumph of freedom—not communism—in the world.

V. To better understand—and more effectively combat—the threat of communism on military, economic, political, cultural, ideological fronts.

VI. Better educate the world on how free economic, social, cultural, political systems of, by, and for the people—not Red dictatorship—can best serve a people; better than totalitarian communism.

VII. Expand economic, political, social, cultural cooperation among nations of the free world alliances for peaceful progress.

VIII. Renew efforts to better understand, and improve, man's relationship to man. Despite thousands of years of existence and experience, mankind is still adolescently groping for a mature fundamental understanding of human relationships that will— if ultimately attained—enable people to work and live peaceably together on earth.

"The Role of the Government in Education"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a national conference on curriculum experimentation was held at the University of Minnesota, Center for Continuation Study, at the end of September. Among the speakers was a former member of the faculty at Davis and Elkins College, and now the senior Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH. In a searching and thoughtful address on "The Role of Government in Education," he spoke of the need and function of Federal support for the national educational effort, and of the need for review of educational methods. I ask unanimous consent that the speech given by Senator RANDOLPH be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to include a letter commenting on Senator RANDOLPH's address, which was written by five Minnesota educators, and was printed in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, of Charleston, W. Va., on November 5, 1961.

If the Senator from West Virginia were not now on the floor, I would read aloud the letter of commendation which has been signed by a number of educators in my State. But I know that because of his modesty he would attempt to qualify the statements; so I merely

submit the letter for printing in the RECORD.

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

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the National Conference on Curriculum Experimentation Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., September 28, 1961)

It is doubtful that anyone in this room is unfamiliar with the famous declaration of the Ordinance of 1787 in which the Congress of the Confederation stated that:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Since that time there has been a steadily increasing involvement of the Federal Government in education, a participation which now embraces every major department of the executive branch and every level of education from elementary school to post-doctoral research. Since 1777, when the National Government initiated instruction of military personnel, there have been some 45 major programs enacted in aid to specialized and general education as well as research.

In the 87th Congress alone, 16 different measures involving substantial Federal assistance to educational, scientific and cultural affairs were either acted upon by one of the bodies of Congress or reported by a congressional committee. These ranged in scope from the School Assistance Act of 1961, offering aid to school construction and teachers' salaries, which was passed by the Senate with a vote of 49 to 34, to the very constructive measures introduced in the House by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, which would establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and a system of State grants for the establishment of development programs in the arts.

There is no question, therefore, that the Federal role in education, and in related scientific and cultural activities, is a massive and diverse one. Nor is there any question in my mind but that this role is amply justified by the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution, the intent of the Founders, and the needs of modern society.

There will doubtless continue to emerge from some quarters—at the occasion of every Federal advance in this area—the claim that education is solely a State and local responsibility and that Federal aid inevitably leads to "Federal control." This cliché and the regrettable religious controversy were, of course, the chief obstacles to enactment of general aid-to-education legislation in the House this session. Regardless of how outworn the argument and how completely the history of such legislation fails to substantiate the fears of Federal control, it still carries a strong appeal to many. Apparently, however, the opponents of general aid to education are able to quell their anxieties concerning Federal control when the issue is one of aid to so-called federally "impacted" areas—many of which are communities that have lobbied intensively in Washington to acquire the Federal installations that are now presumed to be such a burden.

However, this is secondary to the issue on curriculum experimentation—a topic that is central not only to this conference, but also to the future of the American educational system. As Prof. Robert Ulich of Harvard stated a decade ago:

"Prolongation of school age is in itself not a blessing, but may even be a curse to

civilization unless there goes together with the prolongation a revolutionary rethinking of the total program and a restructuring of the total educational system from the secondary school upwards."

I would concur with Professor Ulich's statement, as far as it goes, but I would extend this injunction to the elementary school as well.

The need for such "rethinking and restructuring" was recently dramatized for me by encountering reference to a study of elementary school geography conducted by John D. McAulay of Pennsylvania State University. Professor McAulay discovered that over the 20-year period covered by his inquiry, there was a lag of 10 years between formulation of new generalizations by professional geographers and the acceptance of such principles in the textbooks; and there was an additional lag of a decade before these materials were introduced in the public school curriculum.

If this condition still prevails—as it doubtless does in many if not most school systems, despite the greater articulation between university scholars and public school teachers—it would point toward very serious limitations in our traditional methods of local and State determinations of curriculum. And it becomes a "clear and present danger" to the function of public education when viewed in the light of such a comment as that of Dr. Bentley Glass regarding the doubling time of scientific knowledge as approximately 10 years.

It would be a reasonable conjecture also that in such fields as physics and the life sciences, where I believe the growth of knowledge has been particularly rapid in recent decades, this lag between the discovery and the diffusion of new principles is even greater than in geography.

Even such presumably reliable absolutes—in the minds of some—as the teaching of English and the classical languages seem to be not immune to the impact of new knowledge and new insights regarding the process of learning. But I am informed that the significant developments of descriptive grammar and scientific linguistics of the past few decades have as yet impinged but little upon elementary and secondary teaching of English.

And consider this statement regarding the teaching of classical languages, from the Committee on Secondary Schools of the American Council of Learned Societies:

"With respect to the classics, the panel agrees with the steering committee of the foreign language program of the Modern Language Association than 'an ancient language can be learned most efficiently if a modern foreign language has first been approached as speech' and therefore recommends that, contrary to practice, a modern language be studied before Greek or Latin."

This view would probably be considered rank heresy by most teachers of Greek and Latin today, and most assuredly by my own Latin teacher of 40 years ago.

I regret that I was not able to attend your earlier sessions and listen to the reports on some of the curriculum experiments that are in progress throughout the country. This is a seminal and immensely exciting field and one which holds much of the future of American education in its hands.

And it is a field to which the Congress is not insensitive in its own deliberations on aid to education. Though, in view of the deletion by the House Education and Labor Committee of the provisions of S. 1021 for curriculum experimentation, perhaps I had best qualify that statement. My very able congressional colleague, Representative THOMPSON, has the burden of explaining the House actions and I shall therefore restrict my comments to the functioning of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and its Subcommittee on Education.

In passing, it may be of interest to you to learn that among the nine members of our Subcommittee on Education, there are three of us who have had experience in teaching: Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, the chairman, who has a very distinguished background as a professor of law, and was a former law student and professor here at the University of Minnesota; Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas, who was an instructor for several years in the public schools of that State, and I, who taught public speaking and journalism for a number of years at Davis and Elkins College, West Virginia, and South-eastern University in Washington. It may fairly be stated therefore that in addition to the other able and highly educated members of that subcommittee, it has a substantial proportion of professional background for receptivity to the problems of our educational system, the community of scholars, and the teaching profession.

Regarding the more specific question of curriculum experimentation, we of course incorporated in the School Assistance Act of 1961 provisions prescribing that each State set aside 10 percent of its allotment for this purpose and other special projects.

However, more directly related and heavily oriented toward curriculum questions is the National Defense Education Act which was extended by the Congress for 2 years. The principal function of this program was and is to strengthen the curriculum, particularly in the areas of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. During the Senate committee hearings on this measure in May of this year, much of the testimony was devoted to curriculum problems, with considerable emphasis upon the need to broaden the curriculum support to include American history, government, economics, and sociology.

It is unfortunate that Federal assistance has not been extended to these areas, but that is largely the result in this instance, I believe, of the initial justification of the measure in terms of the limited conception of national defense. Though Federal support for a strengthened curriculum in many other areas is just as essential to the long-term security and development of America as the development of physics or foreign languages, it is more difficult to justify such action in terms of immediate national defense needs.

This brings me to the larger question of Federal support throughout the structure of knowledge and through all the modern branches of inquiry. Though not immediately bearing upon curriculum problems, this question most assuredly has long-range implications for such a conference as this.

Perhaps the best index of Federal activity in this field is given in the Federal Funds for Science bulletin published by the National Science Foundation. In the most recent edition, No. IX, total funds for research in all sciences—and this refers to research only, not research and development—in fiscal 1959 are recorded as \$1.39 billion. The physical sciences, as would be expected, are the largest recipients, to the amount of \$765 million; the life sciences follow with \$420 million; the social sciences with \$31 million, and the psychological sciences with \$24 million. Other sciences, a category including space sciences, operations research, etc., received \$150 million.

For fiscal 1961, there is an estimated \$2.3 billion—the figures not yet having been completely tabulated—for an increase of approximately 65 percent, the physical sciences receiving the bulk of the increase, with a total amount of approximately \$1.5 billion; the life sciences, \$.68 billion; the psychological sciences, \$.4 billion; the social sciences, \$.4 billion; and other sciences, \$.3 billion. Presumably, the category of space sciences, in view of the increased activity in this area, is no longer tabulated in other sciences.

If you will bear with me in relating a few more figures, I would like to extend the implications of these remarks as they apply to universities and the academic community.

In the total Federal funds obligated for research in fiscal 1960, approximately 39 percent was devoted to basic research, that is, the type of research directed toward the increase of knowledge within a particular field without reference to practical application of such knowledge. Within the aforementioned categories, the physical sciences averaged 31 percent basic research funds; the life sciences, 34 percent; the psychological sciences, 41 percent; and the social sciences, 24 percent. In comparison to the investment of private industry in basic research (perhaps 5 to 8 percent of its total research and development expenditures), this represents, of course, an extremely high ratio, and is probably sufficient to maintain an adequate "capital reserve" in scientific knowledge.

Of the total Federal funds obligated for basic research in fiscal 1960, 44 percent was distributed to educational institutions, 30 percent to Federal agencies, 14 percent to profit organizations, and 12 percent to foundations and other groups. Many university administrators are, of course, delighted by this distribution. Yet I suggest that the very fact of this Federal cornucopia holds threatening implications for the development of knowledge within our academic community and ultimately for the intellectual and cultural life of America.

You ladies and gentlemen who live more intimately with the problem than I doubtless know that no Federal grant covers the full cost of research, and even less so when it is distributed on some sort of matching basis. The difference between the Federal grant and the actual cost of research must, therefore, be drawn from other sources of university revenue. With the heavy preponderance of Federal funds going to the physical and life sciences, this consequently means an inevitable weakening of support by the universities themselves of the social sciences, the psychological sciences and the humanities—those stepchildren of a modern industrial society which have traditionally carried a major share of the burden of transmitting our cultural heritage from one generation to the next.

Acknowledging that the bare figures are not an adequate index of the proportion of research activity among the various fields, because of the inordinate expense of so much of the research in the physical and biological sciences as compared to the psychological and social sciences, there still exists a disproportionate emphasis on the former. This imbalance is, of course, accentuated by the exigencies of national security, but it is not created by them. It stems primarily from a short-sighted utilitarian cast of our society. And with regard to congressional resistance toward Federal support of the social sciences, it emerges partly from the uninformed suspicion on the part of some Members of Congress that the social scientists "want to tell us how to live."

Both of these problems must be addressed by the academic community, for the universe of knowledge is one; and we cannot long skimp on behavioral studies and the humanities without soon feeling the effects in the tone and quality of life in America.

The correction of such imbalances cannot be initiated by the Congress. For we do not possess the expert, the professional and detailed knowledge of where the inadequacies exist. The initiative for action of the sort implied here must come from the academic, scientific and school spokesmen.

I have seen some of the reports of the work conducted under grants from the National Science Foundation by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study at Boulder, Colo. This valuable work fully justifies the state-

ment by your chairman, Dr. Paul Rosenbloom, that "a modest program, conceived with imagination, may be more valuable than a much more costly program of a routine nature." Such studies, conducted by the other major scientific and academic societies as well, should lead to the sort of rethinking and restructuring of which Professor Ulich spoke.

But it would seem to me that we would still need some agency in the nature of a National Advisory Council on Education to bring these findings in relation to one another, and through advice and persuasion, give more rigorous attention to a coherent curriculum that meets certain national minimal standards. Of course, I am aware of the vigilance with which State and local authorities guard their rights in the field of curriculum planning. And I do not suggest that these rights be overridden by any national authority. However, it does seem to me that the national scientific and academic societies and the Federal Government have a responsibility to bring the local agencies—through every voluntary means possible—up to national standards consistent with the needs of a rapidly changing technology and the increase in scientific knowledge. I would hope that the relevant congressional committees might receive the benefit of your counsel and that of your respective professional societies in the continuing future. For although the record of Congress on educational legislation this past session was hardly encouraging, the issue is not closed, and I can assure you that many of us are determined to achieve affirmative action in the future.

In closing, I would refer to a general curriculum problem and one which embraces many of the more detailed issues of your conference—that is, the need for the attainment of a point of view which can encompass the new and altered scope of change in life. This, I believe, is the central task of the schools today. One aspect of this problem was discussed by the eminent Austrian theoretical physicist Hans Thirring, in his article, "Education for the Age of Science" (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, v. XV, No. 7, Sept. 1959), Dr. Thirring expressed the hope that there might be included in our primary and secondary school curriculum an "ABC of elementary wisdom."

We have conventionally assumed that wisdom is the peculiar attribute of age. In this respect we have shown little advance over the doctrine of the Athenian philosopher, Solon, who taught that wisdom is to be achieved only through suffering—possibly because our traditional education has forced men to suffer before achieving wisdom. Dr. Thirring believes that this need not be.

"According to the definition of wisdom which I am proposing," he writes "even a young person, driven by all the passions and impulses of his age, and without being a marvel of virtue or self-sacrifice, might be called wise, if he fulfills these conditions:

"First, to possess the knowledge and good will for a better understanding of, and insight into, himself and his fellow men.

"Second, to be able to assign the proper values to the various human issues, duties, and responsibilities.

"Third, to be trained to understand man's natural inclination to overestimate the issues lying within the range of his limited mental perspective."

These may seem ambitious aims to establish for primary and secondary schools, but I would venture to say that if the foundation for such a perspective is not laid during the relatively flexible and plastic condition of youth it is seldom achieved thereafter. For there are few of us who radically alter our intellectual and spiritual garments after passing into adulthood.

Now, this is not to suggest that the schools should merely attempt to inculcate a set of socially acceptable and humanitarian attitudes. Far be it from that. The kind of wisdom, the kind of excellence, which our society calls for today is not to be achieved by shortcuts or "life-adjustment" course.

On the contrary, the quality of mind most in need today is that which is fostered by discipline in the basic methods of inquiry and techniques of problem solving. Only when a student feels at home with the basic structure of investigative methods and problem solving will he welcome the challenge of novel conditions and achieve competency in meeting them. I would suggest, therefore, that we attempt to break through the ancient argument of "student centered" versus "subject matter centered" teaching and consider the value of "problem centered" teaching, with the problem embracing student, subject matter, and—I might add—teacher, as well.

In its practical applications this should mean that we would teach science as a process of inquiry rather than the products of inquiry; we would teach art as the creation and appreciation of objects rather than their identification and labeling; and we would teach history as a pattern of inquiry and a process in time rather than as an aggregate of facts.

Many people of late—laymen as well as scholars and teachers—have posed the problem in terms of a choice between quantity and quality, a choice between equality and excellence.

We have no choice. We must—if our civilization is to survive and persevere—have both.

We must have a generally informed citizenry capable of making intelligent decisions on matters of the public good. And we must have the highly trained specialists as well as the men and women of broad-gauge learning that our modern complex society demands.

In this regard, we may bear in mind the remarks of Epictetus when commenting upon the fall of Athenian democracy as caused by education of the few: "The State says that only free men will be educated; God says only educated men will be free."

[From the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., Nov. 5, 1961]

MINNESOTA EDUCATORS LAUD SENATOR RANDOLPH'S WISDOM

EDITOR:

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, gave on September 28 at the University of Minnesota a brilliant speech on the role of the Federal Government in education. His address was one of the outstanding events of a national conference on curriculum experimentation, attended by about 75 leaders from all over the country, and from every segment of the educational community.

We were all impressed by Senator RANDOLPH's sincerity and deep understanding. He got down to the heart of the matter—how the general welfare depends on what our children are taught in our schools * * *. He stressed the importance of our young people learning to assign the proper values to the various human issues, duties, and responsibilities.

Your Senator also pointed out several ways in which the Federal Government could act in the national interest in these matters without interfering with local control. He made a forceful plea that both professionals and laymen discuss their interests in educational legislation with their Congressmen at the time when the congressional committees are working on these problems, and not to depend solely on the large lobbies in Washington.

He discussed many complex issues * * * without a single platitude or cliché. We also

appreciated his frank and courageous answers from the floor.

Senator RANDOLPH came to our conference at considerable cost to his personal comfort as well as at a financial sacrifice. He left Washington immediately after the Senate adjourned with little time for rest.

We congratulate the people of West Virginia on being represented by such a wise and well-informed man. We hope the whole country will continue to benefit for a long time from the dedicated services of Senator RANDOLPH.

R. H. BECK,
Professor of Education.

F. E. BERGER,
Director, Center of Continuation Study.

N. DEWITT,
Chairman, Professor of Classics.

L. HURWICZ,
Professor of Economics.

P. C. ROSENBLUM,
Professor of Mathematics, State Department of Education, Institute of Technology.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

Berlin: The Symbol of Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today one of the great trouble spots in the world is the city of Berlin. One can understand the problem by reading the newspapers, but a better appreciation and understanding can be had by visiting this famous city which is located physically within the heart of the Soviet zone of occupation. I was fortunate in the course of my legislative duties to visit Berlin, to talk to many people, to observe conditions, and to draw some personal conclusions. While my visit was of brief duration, I had the privilege and opportunity to speak with officials in authority, to inspect places barred to nongovernmental persons, and to receive briefings by military and civilian officials. Upon my return I was invited to speak before the International Relations Club of St. John's University and the Columbian Lawyers Association. After my talks, there was a question-and-answer period. I believe that my talk before the Columbia Lawyers Association on December 13, 1961, in the Bronx might prove interesting and informative to the readers. My speech follows:

Mr. President Nicholas Iannuzzi, Surgeon Samuel Di Falco, Judge Louis Pagnucco, who trained me in the district attorney's office of New York County in 1945, Sylvester Cosentino, president of my political club, distinguished guests and members of the association, at the outset let me thank you for the invitation offered through your secretary, Jerry Crispino, to address you. I am pleased to meet many of my old friends, some of whom I had the honor of sponsoring for admission to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

On December 6, 1961, I returned from a trip to Rome, Berlin, and Paris. I would like to talk about the city of Berlin.

1. What the issue is and what the problems are.
2. What is happening there.
3. What the recent events signify, such as: (a) The building of the wall in the middle of the city of Berlin from north to south separating West and East Berlin; (b) the interference with the free movement of our Government and our garrison soldiers; (c) the interference with our access routes.
4. What a free city of Berlin means to the free world.

Germany, as you know, after World War II was divided into four zones of occupation or sectors and Greater Berlin being a fifth zone of occupation. These zones were known as the United States, British, French, and U.S.S.R. The city of Berlin which is geographically located within the Soviet sector, 110 miles distant from the western allied frontier, was physically divided into four sectors, Britain, United States, French in the western part of the city and the Soviet in the eastern part of the city.

A 10-day visit normally could hardly qualify one as an expert but permit me to detail some of my activity in the political military economic spheres.

I had a very interesting talk with Gen. Lucius Clay, the special consultant and representative of President John F. Kennedy in Berlin, who was the former military governor in Germany and closely associated with Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in World War II. Those who wish to get more detailed information may read General Clay's book "Decision in Germany." After my talk with General Clay I concluded that if he were present on August 13 when the East German authorities started to put up the barbed wire and the wall that we would have taken quick action to preserve our access and rights by taking it down.

I and my colleagues were briefed as to recent events by Brig. Gen. F. O. Hartel of the Berlin Command, Lt. Col. Emanuel Tineri, staff secretary of office U.S. commander, Col. T. C. Foote and Maj. F. E. Karhohs. They discussed also our military posture in Berlin, the organizational setup of the Allied control council which governed and has jurisdiction over Germany, and the Allied Kommandature which governed Greater Berlin. They discussed the background of Germany, Berlin, and the recent events in Berlin beginning August 13, 1961, when the East German authorities with the urging and the consent of the Soviet Government commenced to build the wall through the city.

We interviewed the assistant chief of the U.S. Mission Berlin, E. A. Lightner. Later I had a short talk with Maj. Gen. A. Watson, the U.S. commander in Berlin, after his emergency talk with the Soviet commander. We were then briefed by the political analyst, Mr. G. F. Muller, and the economics expert, Mr. Frank Taylor.

We visited the trouble spot, "check point Charlie," on the Friedrichstrasse which is set aside as the entry point for our military forces and Government personnel and which was the scene of the confrontation of American and Soviet tanks. We visited the American, British, and French zones, and inspected the 28 mile wall which meanders through the heart of the city of Berlin from north to south dividing the Western sector of Berlin from East Berlin.

This wall must be seen to be appreciated. This wall of concrete, barbed wire, twists and turns for 28 miles from the north part of the city to the southern part of Berlin. Imagine if you will a concrete wall dividing 5th Avenue from 14th Street up to Central Park across 57th Street over to Columbus Avenue, up Broadway to 207th Street, across Fordham Road to the grand concourse down to 161st Street over to 3d Avenue and down to 125th Street over to the East River down to South Ferry, with a wall blocking inter-

sections, and the buildings bricked up forming part of the wall for a distance of 28 miles. This is what the wall would mean in New York City. The houses are evacuated and land cleared behind it for a distance of 200 feet with tank traps and concrete poles imbedded into the ground. Near this wall stand soldiers on guard, the East German police or "vopos." Where the wall crosses the cemetery, the entrances are bricked up and the grief-stricken families are forced to place their wreaths at the base of the wall. They are denied the opportunity to bring their dead for burial or the opportunity to show their respect to their deceased loved ones. In the French sector, on Bernauer Strasse, East Berliners jumped to their death in seeking to escape. One can see crosses on the sidewalk with mourners placing their wreaths daily to show their sorrow.

It was on a Sunday, August 13, 1961, that West Berliners were surprised by the East Berliners putting up barbed wire fences. This precipitated a last minute exodus of East Berliners who sought to escape; young people, old people; secret police and others made their escape to West Berlin. During the month of August more than 40,000 refugees fled and took refuge at the Marienfelde refugee camp, where they were housed. Approximately 200,000 escaped during 1961 from Soviet sector and from East Berlin. I had the good fortune to see how they processed their refugees. One person in particular on November 4, escaped with a friend, avoiding the shots of East Berlin police, the vopos and the East German police. He swam across the Spray River and escaped. After a month's convalescence in the hospital, he was processed, given a job and permitted to make a new life. He was a former postal clerk who refused to join the secret police. He refused because he did not want to shoot down West Berliners and his friends. Many of the refugees who are processed through the camp are directed to that part of West Germany where they desire to go or where their talents or background fit them.

We visited McNairs training field barracks where we reviewed the training of our U.S. 2d and 3d battle groups of the 6th Infantry Division. We observed signal corps and artillery practice and riot control squad practice.

All this took place in drizzling rain. We interviewed Col. J. Deane and Lt. Col. D. Hickman, the battle commander. We inspected our military equipment and the Signal Corps equipments and the new Army rifles, submachine and machineguns, and antitank bazookas. Our equipment is modern; our boys well trained, poised, on edge, and ready. Colonel Deane told us the story of one of the boys by the name of "Mexico."

When East Berliners saw too many people escaping, they cleared the area near the wall and warned that any person who approached within 100 yards, would be shot or handled. Our troops refused to be restricted in their actions on our side of the wall and our boys moved forward, including this soldier, Private Mexico. The East German soldiers threatened to spray a hose on this young soldier.

As they brought the hose spray toward him, Mexico stood his ground, took off a hand grenade from his person and indicated by his gestures that if he were molested with the water hose that he would hurl the hand grenade. When the East Germans saw this they lowered the hose and spray and backed away. Trouble was averted. Colonel Deane said he felt like hugging the boy, because of the poise, courage, and restraint he displayed under pressure. Our boys are unafraid. They have been instructed not to start a fight but have been told not to back away from their position. Our boys are ready and equipped for any eventuality.

We visited the refugee camp of Marienfelde where we observed the process by which the West Berlin authorities handled and handles the hundred of thousands of refugees from East Berlin and the Soviet sector of Berlin. More than 3 million people have fled the Soviet Zone since the war. Over 200,000 have left since the beginning of the year, and despite the wall and tyrannical conditions, many people escape East Berlin to freedom in West Berlin.

We also visited East Berlin as tourists through the S. Bahn which is the elevated train system. To obtain entry to East Berlin, and to return, it was necessary to show identification which I did with my social security card inasmuch as I refused to show my passport or congressional documents so that my official status would not be disclosed. We were stopped by three guards. It is easier to get into East Berlin than out of East Berlin. When I started to get out of East Berlin the guard demanded a photograph. While I had my passport which contains my photograph in my inner pocket, I refused to show it and insisted that I was an American and that my social security card sufficed. The guard let me pass.

In Paris we interviewed Gen. James Gavin, Ambassador to France, with whom I discussed the Berlin situation, the position and attitude of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, the French attitude toward West Germany and Berlin, and the reasons General de Gaulle insists on developing his own atomic weapons.

We visited NATO headquarters where we conferred with Ambassador Tom Finletter on the role of West Germany in NATO. We were then briefed by top American officers of NATO on the overall NATO military posture, and the mutual weapon development program in its various phases. We had various conferences with businessmen on the economic situation, and the effect of the Common Market. There is no doubt that economic unity will conduce to political and military unity and that the Common Market is eliminating any tensions which might exist between France and West Germany.

What is the issue in Berlin and what are the problems? The important issue in Berlin is that the Western Allies are trying to maintain their position in Berlin and to keep West Berlin from being taken over by the Communists. Russia is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin and eventually to take over West Berlin. An ancillary issue and pertinent to the major issue is: Will East Berlin be recognized as a sovereign unit?

There are four major problems involved:

- (1) Air and ground access to the city of Berlin from the West and freedom of movement within the city of Berlin.
- (2) Our so-called propaganda activities.
- (3) Refugee flow.
- (4) Strength of allied garrison.

These issues and problems are related to the overall issue of: Shall there be a united Germany with Berlin as its capital and one treaty or shall there be a divided Germany with two treaties?

We must never forget that the Soviet fears the German people, its intelligence and its ability to make war. It has reason to respect Germany and its prowess. Germany, with its 72 million people, almost defeated Russia and laid waste its lands. The Soviet breakthrough in space and its development of missiles and nuclear weapons have been stimulated by captive German scientists. The Soviet is furious because West Germany joined the NATO forces in the NATO Pact. The U.S.S.R. intends to divide Germany as best it can even if it means separating 17 million Germans from West Germany and imprisoning 1.1 million East Berliners behind the wall.

Contrast France, which suffered from the devastation of war begun by Germany. France believes it can live in peace with Germany. France has joined with West Germany in the Common Market and De Gaulle believes that economic unity with Germany will relieve the tensions behind the countries and bring permanent peace. Trade between West Germany and U.S.S.R. in a common market program and an exchange of peoples might help in eliminating tensions.

The East German authorities claim that the Western Allies' activities in sending our troops through East Berlin are violating a sovereign state's rights and are provocative.

The Western Allies, that is, United States, United Kingdom, and France, do not recognize East Germany as a sovereign state or the German Democratic Republic as a legal government. Our position is that East Germany and East Berlin are parts of occupied territory under the jurisdiction of the Soviet subject to veto by the Allied Control Council and the four commanders in Berlin, the Kommandatura, and that by agreement we have a right to come and go as we please.

The Soviet threatens to sign a separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic representing East Germany. The Western allies claim that the Soviet has no right to sign unilaterally a peace treaty with an illegal government and that we recognize only the Soviet authority in East Germany and in East Berlin. The Western allies further claim that putting up a wall, stopping our personnel from free travel and requiring identification and harassing our troops are designed to demonstrate the legality of the German Democratic Republic and the sovereignty of East Germany.

To better understand the present-day situation and to determine whether the allies are right or wrong, it is necessary to look backward and to at least reexamine some of the highlights in the long series of events which led to the situation today.

In 1943 the Western allies met with Soviet officials and agreed on zones of occupation for Germany and Berlin. Our soldiers did better than our statesmen anticipated and by the time Germany surrendered, our troops had gone far beyond the lines that the statesmen had set up. We were therefore required to pull back our forces from Saxony and Thuringia and on July 4, 1945, our forces entered into West Berlin which the Soviet vacated. England had suggested that we not pull back our troops, but the U.S. keeping to its agreement and understanding withdrew U.S. forces from Thuringia and Saxony which its armies had overrun and conquered.

Each of the allies, France, United States, and United Kingdom, controlled a zone in West Germany and the Soviets controlled a zone in East Germany; and the authority was subject to veto only by unanimous agreement of the four commanders acting as the Allied Control Council.

Greater Berlin was divided into four zones. Each of Western Allies garrisoned the Western zones allotted it and the Soviet garrisoned East Berlin. The city of Berlin was to be administered by a four-power Allied Kommandatura composed of four Allied city commandants, with a rotating chairmanship.

The Soviet commandant walked out of the Allied Kommandatura at the time of the Berlin blockade in 1948. Concurrently the freely elected citywide government was forced out of the city hall or rathouse located in the Soviet sector of Berlin; moved to Schoeneberg and the city was divided into East and West Berlin.

Analyzing what the Soviet Union has done since it withdrew from the Allied control council in 1948, and from the Allied Kommandatura, one can see a common thread in the Soviet actions, leading to one conclusion; that is that the Soviets decided

to unilaterally terminate our agreements of occupation, and decided by itself that the Western Allies could have Western Germany and the Soviet would take Eastern Germany, including all of Berlin either under a puppet regime or under its own control. Here is what has happened which leads a person to such a conclusion:

1. East Germany set up a separate currency in 1948.

2. Soviet blockaded the ground access to Western Berlin in 1948.

3. East Germany imposed an Autobahn-toll on Western Germans, West Berliners, and foreigners on highways leading to Berlin.

4. East Germany curbed telephone service between East and West Berlin in 1952.

5. The German Democratic Republic passed a passport law on December 11, 1957 requiring East Berliners and East Germans to get passports if they desired to go to West Germany under the Federal Republic of Germany.

6. German Democratic Republic passed a law requiring West Berliners desiring to go to the Soviet Zone to get a special permit which is seldom granted.

7. The Soviets proposed that West Berlin be declared a free city with the United Nations protecting the free city November 27, 1958.

8. West German visitors were refused free access to the Soviet sector and East Germany.

9. August 13, 1961, East Germany constructed a wall 28 miles long, dividing East Berlin from West Berlin, barring East Berliners from going to West Berlin and West Germany, and imprisoning 1,100,000 East Berliners.

10. East Germany required identification by all people at crossings except at check point Charlie at the Friedrichstrasse where military forces and Government personnel commands cross to East Berlin; narrowed the opening at check point Charlie, and erected red and white striped customs barrier gate at the seven crossing points.

This is the history of events so far seeking to destroy the quadripartite agreement. It is a salami tactic, cutting off a piece at a time until there is no salami left.

While we Americans have a sound legal position in Germany and Berlin, the Soviet and East German authorities are acting, and because of lack of immediate Allied action the Soviet is cutting off the access routes. Allied forces and Government personnel have five agreed routes left for access to Berlin, three air corridors, the Autobahn from Helmsstedt to Berlin and the rail line through Marienborn. There are seven crossing points between East and West Berlin. How long these access routes will remain open is a matter of conjecture. The East German authorities claim that the Western Allied activities in sending our troops through East Berlin are violating a sovereign state's rights and are provocative.

The Western Allies, that is United States, United Kingdom, and France do not recognize East Germany as a sovereign state and do not recognize the German Democratic Republic as a legal government. Our legal position is that East Germany and East Berlin are parts of occupied territory under the jurisdiction of the Soviet, subject to veto by the Allied Control Council and the four commanders in Berlin, the Kommandatura, and air access to Berlin along the three corridors from West Germany is and has been unrestricted since the end of World War II in 1945.

We claim the rights with respect to air access to Berlin derive from precisely the same source as do the rights of the U.S.S.R. in East Germany, and in East Berlin, namely the joint military defeat of the German Reich and the joint assumption of supreme authority over Germany. These rights are confirmed by the circumstances under which

the Four Powers entered Germany, by their subsequent discussions and agreements, and by open and established practice over a period of 15 years.

Right of access to Berlin was spelled out by the following events:

1. November 14, 1944, European Advisory Commission agreement.

2. Talks of Gen. Lucius Clay with General Zhukov June 29, 1945, regarding the withdrawal of troops and entry of American forces into Berlin.

3. Correspondence between President Truman and Marshal Stalin at end of Berlin blockade, 1949.

4. Orders by Gen. Vassily Chukov in ordering end of blockade in May 1949.

5. An agreement between Allied Powers in 1949 guaranteeing right of access.

What do these recent events in Berlin signify? The 28 mile wall in the heart of the city is more than a physical division of a city. To Americans it is a symbol of a division between freedom and tyranny, freedom in the West and imprisonment in the East. To Germans in the West it is a barrier to the unification of Germany, and a goad to their nationalistic aspirations. This wall is ghoulish. Walls in the past such as the Chinese wall were designed to keep people out, this wall is designed to keep people in. It separates families and relatives. It seals the fate of 1.1 million Germans.

It is a prelude to a separate unilateral peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic with U.S.S.R.

It is an affirmative action reaffirming the Soviet declaration that it no longer recognizes quadripartite control of East Berlin and Berlin.

It is an attack on the Potsdam agreement which promised unity of Germany.

It is a forerunner of blockade to West Berliners.

It is a forerunner of a customs toll on the Autobahn which would hinder transportation of trade goods.

The wall blocking the crossing at the Brandenburg gate has a special and significant meaning. The Germans have always been neurotically attracted by symbols and the Brandenburg gate has been a symbol of the glorious past, a dreary present and an uncertain future. At the Bradenburg gate Germany was once united and here it was later divided. It was here that Napoleon celebrated his capture of Berlin, removed the Guadriga, a bronze statue of the goddess Victoria drawn by four horses, it was here that when Berlin split during the revolution of 1948, the Brandenburg gate became the symbol of reunification and freedom. Within its sight the Reichstag went up in flames. During the battle of Berlin, the U.S. Embassy which stood next to the Brandenburg gate was bombed and destroyed with other buildings in the vicinity. It is within its shadow that Hitler was entombed in his impenetrable bunker. It was here that the students of workers of East Germany on June 17, 1953, with sticks and stones stormed the barricades put up by the Red army until their bones were broken by Red enemy tanks.

What does Berlin mean to the world and to Germany? Without a unified Berlin there can never be a united Germany. West Berlin is a lighthouse of freedom in a dark totalitarian sea. It demonstrates the economic superiority of a free society which allows and encourages individual initiative. More important it is a shining model of political intellectual and spiritual freedom with which individual liberties are assured and the people chose those who govern them.

For the Western allies, free Berlin is their symbol, the evidence and the acid test of their unity, strength, and determination.

Berlin is a battleground of wills. The allies have a responsibility not to cause a nuclear war but they have a responsibility

not to permit the freedom there to be whittled away by actions which in their small measurements, mean very little but when added up are substantial. France will not yield, Germany does not wish to yield, England seeks compromise, and the United States does not want to chance war. The U.S.S.R. wants to maintain what is theirs and to negotiate what belongs to the allies.

As General De Gaulle says, he is not concerned with the opinion of Nkrumah or world opinion. He will not negotiate to give away under threats, any of the rights which belong to the Allied Powers. He demands that the Soviet come forward with plans to negotiate the overall problems, not Berlin alone.

The task is difficult and the decision is weighty. With faith and the courage of freemen our leaders will decide. Whatever the decision is, we can be certain that our strength is superior, our equipment is of the best, and our boys in Berlin are ready for any eventuality. What shall we do?

We must encourage our leaders to stand firm; to let our President know that we support a firm position and that any further yielding on our part must be accompanied not only by a written agreement but also by physical changes which will permit the carrying out of the Soviet written promise and will not prevent performance of the promise.

That in view of the past broken promises by the U.S.S.R. of free access to Berlin, West Germany must be given that portion of the Soviet sector between the East frontier of the allied sector and the west frontier of Berlin, an area of 110 miles, so that the air corridors and access routes cannot be interfered with. This should be in my opinion one of the areas of negotiation in regard to Berlin.

Once our leaders make a decision we cannot submit any further arguments or reasons for any proposed settlement. We must make our wishes known now. After the decision is made and agreement is reached, we must maintain our word and we must be as soldiers in the ranks, and understand that thereafter it is not for us to reason why but it is for us to do or cry.

Extremist Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is fashionable nowadays to point the finger of shame at extremists of the right, and many, including President Kennedy, have impugned the motives of many conservative patriotic citizens. Also, occasionally, criticism is directed at leftists, although strangely enough, many political leaders are inconsistently silent when it comes to condemning extreme liberals.

As for me, I am not joining any chorus of intolerance. Rather, I would proclaim with pride that this is a land where freedom of belief is not condemned. Indeed, in America, our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution were born out of such travail of dispute and clash of view. Freedom of thought and expression is what has made America great. So, rather than scorn American citizens for their convictions, I prefer to welcome all extremists, providing only,

of course, they do not violate or advocate measures in nonconformity with law and order.

Let all liberals and conservatives express their honest convictions, and as George Washington said, when the people have the facts they will do the right thing.

Congress Faces Many Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the election of Speaker definitely took the spotlight, especially for Massachusetts, as this session of Congress commences its work.

While the election of Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK was already assured, it is noteworthy, indeed, that for the third time since 1947, a distinguished son of the Bay State has taken over the third highest office in the land—an office second in succession to the Presidency. Congressman MARTIN held the position for two prior periods and now Congressman McCORMACK is being elevated to this very high post to succeed the great, beloved "Mr. Sam."

For our State, there is great significance in having another famous son of Massachusetts in this office because the Speaker of the House is the foremost parliamentary, political leader of the Nation and the world, whose influence over the course of history, at home and abroad, is truly immeasurable.

We of the Massachusetts congressional delegation are especially proud and gratified by the richly merited promotion of our distinguished and beloved colleague and friend, Congressman McCORMACK, who brings to his most arduous and vital tasks a ripe experience in the affairs of the Federal Government, seldom, if ever, excelled by any of his predecessors.

His election is another great day for Massachusetts, and it holds a promise of effective, united leadership on Capitol Hill and in the Government that will contribute greatly to the solution of many extremely grave and difficult problems.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND WORLD COMMUNISM

Fortunately, our defense machinery is in very good shape and our defense potential is incredibly powerful and well coordinated, and together with that of our allies continues to exert tremendous, deterrent effects upon possible aggression.

Our House Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, will continue its work in rounding out and, where necessary, buttressing the many components and systems which are required to defend us, to prevent all-out war and promote peace.

We have made very impressive gains in many vital fields of defense and our

defensive and striking position is continuously being strengthened.

It is likely that our committee will be faced with many pressing demands from the American public to take a sharp look at the entire reserve setup, particularly the plight of those reservists recently called to active duty.

A most important corollary to the defense of the Nation and the free world must be our unceasing, determined campaign for peace with all its connotations and that means, of course, proposals for universal disarmament and control of nuclear energy based on carefully devised and special safeguards that will not only put an end to aggressive designs and actions, but prompt the organization of the world under a rule of law and a human brotherhood that will promote peace and betterment for all peoples. I expect that the Congress will make considerable progress along these lines this session, and it goes without saying that the President will find ready and overwhelming support in the Congress for any efforts he makes to check the forces of communism, dispel the fears of nuclear destruction and establish enduring peace. But we must recognize that it takes two to make a bargain and sincere Soviet cooperation is required to secure this end.

On the domestic front, there are numerous challenging, and especially complex, questions that Congress must tackle this year.

Recognizing the more or less urgent needs of the people, the national well-being, problems dealing with the growth and strength of our great, productive economy and compelling social problems that lay claim to our interest and attention, Congress will be called upon to consider: First, medical care and the public health; second, support and aid to education; third, streamlining and improving the tax system; fourth, reciprocal trade; fifth, the continuing gap in international payments; sixth, accommodation to the problems and intricacies presented by the so-called Common Markets; seventh, broader planning and implementation of urban and community rehabilitation, renewal, and improvement; eighth, thorny agricultural problems requiring production for actual use rather than warehouse waste, reducing the staggering burdens on the public treasury, establishing more equitable balance between farm income and consumer prices; and, ninth, a host of problems having to do with better utilization, control and use of water, including development of new sources, elimination of pollution, conservation of precious natural resources.

These are but a handful of the many legislative proposals which will undoubtedly be presented for the consideration of the Congress.

There are numerous very controversial questions, like medical care, which the Congress will explore with regard to need, its cost, its adequacy to suit public need, adaptability to free enterprise and other pertinent factors.

In the field of education, another controversial area, consideration will be given to aid to construction, higher standards, support of State efforts for

adequate pay for teachers, assistance to federally impacted areas, and other proposals relating to Federal encouragement and support of higher education through various grants, loans, scholarships, research projects, and other aids calculated to beef up our education system to cope with competitive standards in other countries and make higher education more generally available to qualified young Americans.

The revision of trade and tariff laws is bound to produce more controversy. Whether the Congress will go along with proposals to open still wider the markets of this country to cheaply produced foreign goods from overseas is at the moment obscure, but it is certain that any measure along these lines will be met with strong determined opposition.

Tax laws need general overhauling, but it is probably too much to hope for that this job can or will be completed this session. Amendments to plug current loopholes and exemptions would be vexatious and costly to many but quite superficial, indeed, in probing the real areas for drastic tax reforms which lie, most likely, in those revisions, designed to spur incentives, fortify free enterprise institutions, plow profits back into expansion, and reduce onerous exactions on many individuals of the rank and file, hard-working people so to speak, upon whom current taxes, coupled with the high cost of living, are working a genuine hardship, as well as reducing their social standards.

I hardly think that such a task can be adequately tackled in an election year but perhaps some start may be made.

There is a prospect and a hope that Congress may increase the membership of the House, taking into account the Members gained by the admission of Alaska and Hawaii.

Historically, whenever new States have been admitted to the Union, the membership of the House has been increased. It is, however, about 50 years since this has been done.

It is hoped that partisan politics will not enter into this question which is essentially an issue of basic government. If a bill can be passed authorizing four additional Members, this would greatly facilitate and simplify the problem of redistricting Massachusetts. We face the redistricting problem this year because the State was lacking only about 15,000 additional population in the census of 1960. Under the situation now obtaining, Massachusetts would secure the first seat made available in any bill increasing the size of the House.

A Christmas Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, we all received and appreciated many Christmas

cards and messages. One of those which most impressed me was that which came from our colleague, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, and with her permission I am glad to place it in the RECORD today. It is brief but it is thoughtful and timely.

I hope it will be widely read and I am sure that all who read it will feel well repaid. It is as follows:

1961.

GREETINGS: I write that you may know I think of you in these days when men and nations are confused and fearful. Let me remind you that in 1781 George Washington wrote: "We must not despair, the game is yet in our hands; to play it well is all we have to do." Surely we can do this.

For our strengthening I give you words that St. Teresa of Avila wrote in the 16th century:

"Let nothing disturb thee; let nothing dismay thee:

All things pass; God never changes.

Patience attains all its strives for.

He who has God finds he lacks nothing:

God alone suffices."

May His blessing be upon you.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON.

New Era in Public Administration Advanced With Inauguration of National Computer Center of Internal Revenue Service at Martinsburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on November 6, 1961, the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., was the scene of another advancement in the technological revolution of our age. On that date the National Computer Center of the Internal Revenue Service was dedicated, thus initiating a nationwide data processing system which by 1980 will handle some 135 million tax returns and 450 million other documents.

Though the popular imagination is perhaps captured more by the dramatic advances of missile and satellite programs, the electronic computer is the more fundamental symbol of our times. For it is only through the achievements of electronic data processing that the exploration of space has been made possible, and it is the application of electronic computers to other areas of science, industry, business, and government that makes it possible for us to encompass the bewildering array of data provided in a modern industrial civilization.

Significant observations were made on this theme by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and by Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mortimer M. Caplin at the dedication of the National Computer Center. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my remarks delivered at that time and those of Secretary Dillon and Commissioner Caplin be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. Secretary, Governor Barron, Commissioner Caplin, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, we are today dedicating another step in a technological and scientific revolution the end of which is not in sight.

It has become almost axiomatic to refer to our time as the Atomic Age or the Space Age. More accurately, we might refer to it as the Computer Age—for it is the modern and fantastically ingenious electronic computer which more than any other instrument makes possible the spectacular advances of the natural sciences and modern technology in this era.

When the present computer system of the Internal Revenue Service is completed, with its nerve center here at Martinsburg, I am informed that some 100 million returns will be compared to 450 million documents pertaining to personal finances. I have no accurate measure of the amount of taxes which will thus be recovered, but I should judge that it would be in the order of several billion dollars annually. One might observe in passing that this fact would seem to refute the notion of science as being ethically neutral—in this instance, science and technology are very much on the side of a higher and more rigorous morality regarding the payment of taxes.

Presently, there are some 9,000 persons employed by the Federal Government in the operation of computers. Their activities range from performing mock weapons tests at Los Alamos and operating the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System to ordering supplies and planning highway interchanges. And before many years the computer may well have invaded every segment of our economic, industrial and political life.

In all truth we are presently embarking upon a second industrial revolution even before we have fully accommodated ourselves politically and economically to the first industrial revolution of coal and iron. The dangers implicit therein were noted more than a decade ago by one of the pioneers in this field in a work entitled "The Human Use of Human Beings." In that book Prof. Norbert Wiener pointed out that the electronic computer and its progeny may be our servants or our masters, depending upon how we order our society.

I sincerely hope, therefore, as we dedicate this National Computer Center, that we dedicate these instruments and ourselves to the continued progress of a humane civilization and that we think always of our wondrous technology, not as an end in itself, but in terms of its contribution to greater freedom and prosperity in a democratic society.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, NATIONAL COMPUTER CENTER, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1961

We are here today, not merely to dedicate one more Government building, but to launch a new era in public tax administration.

By employing electronic equipment to process an enormous mass of data far more rapidly and far more accurately than can be done by manual methods, we are taking a giant stride toward improving the operation of our tax system. We are also demonstrating that Government is a dynamic organism, capable of self-improvement through the adoption of modern tools and techniques. The British statesman, Edmund Burke, once said: "Government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for

human wants. Men have a right that these wants should be provided for by this wisdom."

One of the continuing wants of the American people is ever more efficient and more effective public administration. By meshing an automatic data processing system into the operations of the Internal Revenue Service, we are moving closer to fulfilling that want.

The ADP system we are initiating here today is a major advance that brings an entirely new dimension to tax administration.

A very important element in this advance is the fact that adoption of automatic data processing equipment will increase our total revenues by helping to insure that all of our citizens are bearing their full and fair share of the national tax burden. It should also give comforting reassurance to our honest, taxpaying citizens—and they are in the vast majority—that life will be made far more difficult for the foolish few who are tempted to cheat or to evade. And, by enhancing the certainty and fairness of our tax administration, it will strengthen the Nation to face the tasks that lie ahead.

We are locked in a struggle with a powerful and resourceful adversary. There is no end in sight to that contest. We are confident that we shall emerge victorious—no matter what form the contest may take. But, to prevail, we must have an economy that flourishes and grows stronger every year.

Our economy must support heavy expenditures to meet our urgent national needs—both at home and abroad—and to sustain the defensive forces that guard our own security and that of the entire free world. These necessary expenditures are reflected in our present tax burden. More than half of our tax dollar is devoted to defense alone, and substantial additional portions go to other programs of vital importance to our national security. Therefore, every additional dollar of revenue derived from the improved collection techniques made possible by electronic equipment is a direct contribution to the advancement of our national interest.

The facility we dedicate today is the heart of the total ADP system. Within this building, magnetic tapes will eventually store the entire record of every taxpayer in the United States. These master tapes will transcribe information electronically from data supplied by nine regional service centers to be established throughout the country. Five or six years from now, when the system is fully developed, some 78 million accounts—72 million individual and 6 million business—will be maintained here on some 400 miles of tape. From this data, the Internal Revenue Service will be able to determine the tax status of any taxpayer, at any time.

With automatic data processing equipment, the Service will be able to keep a systematic check on failure of taxpayers to file returns, to determine quickly whether taxes are owed for previous years, and to instantly detect such things as duplicate claims for refunds. It will also enable the Service to do a better job of determining which returns should be selected for audit purposes.

But the advantages of ADP will not be limited to improve tax collection. The Internal Revenue Service is also charged with paying out refunds under our system of withholding. Last year, some 36 million refund checks were mailed. Every year, some 500,000 of these checks fail to reach their destination, usually because the taxpayer has moved without leaving any forwarding address. With the help of ADP, the Internal Revenue Service will be able to cure this situation and refunds will be faster and more certain.

The new technique will not dehumanize our tax administration. It will not be man against machine—the individual taxpayer versus a giant, impersonal monster that thrives only on numbers. The Internal Revenue Service will continue to offer all the assistance and other services now provided to taxpayers with questions or problems. In fact, the new system should permit the Service to devote more time to direct, personal contacts. The overall effect will be improved and more rapid service to taxpayers in all their dealings with the Government.

I am pleased that you could join us on this important occasion. As the ADP system becomes fully operative in the years ahead, I am confident that we will look back on this occasion as a major turning point in public tax administration.

DRAFT OF REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE MORTIMER M. CAPLIN AT THE DEDICATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE NATIONAL COMPUTER CENTER, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., NOVEMBER 6, 1961

History has long been known to repeat itself, but these repetitions often produce some unpredictable patterns. A century ago, this city was the scene of bitter fighting between North and South—a symbol of the most divisive struggle in our Nation's life. Today, Martinsburg moves into a new role—the symbol of a cohesive revenue system through which Americans in all sections of our country contribute to the attainment of our national goals.

The adoption of electronic equipment as a tool in our individual, self-assessment tax system marks a major stride in revenue administration. In the next few years, the tax accounts of every taxpayer in the United States will be assembled under this roof, permitting us to collect internal revenues more efficiently and effectively than ever before and to provide better and more rapid service to taxpayers.

The Internal Revenue Service has made swift progress in converting its operations to an automatic data processing system. The construction of this national computer center is a good example of that progress. If we had met here 5 short months ago, we would have been standing in a field of grass. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the General Services Administration; to the architect, John Hans Graham, and his Mr. David Bernstein; to the builder, Scott S. Bair; to the contractor, W. Harley Miller; and to the project engineer, Marshall Elam; and to many, many others for their splendid cooperation in expediting this center.

We also have been able to accelerate other parts of our conversion to automatic data processing. Our plans for new regional service centers are substantially ahead of our original timetable. Our Atlanta service center goes into operation in a little more than 1 month from now. Philadelphia will be operational a year later. Just last week, we announced the selection of Austin, Tex., as the location of our third regional service center. We expect to announce at an early date the site of the Cincinnati region's service center. This center will process tax returns, reports, and other documents for Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Virginia, and this very fine State of West Virginia.

In addition, we are moving up our timetable to convert existing service centers in Lawrence, Mass., and Kansas City, Mo., to automatic data processing in 1963. This means that these two service centers will then handle not only their regular processing work with present techniques, but will begin to process certain business tax returns with ADP methods. In 1964 we will convert the existing service center in Ogden, Utah,

and activate the two remaining service centers in the New York and Chicago regions. At the rate we are now proceeding, every taxpayer in the United States will have his returns processed under this new system by 1966.

It is with much pleasure and pride that I make these announcements and welcome you to our ceremonies today. We in the Internal Revenue Service believe that this new direction in tax processing dedicated here will have a profound effect on the future health of our American system of government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a matter of further interest and information, regarding the role of the Federal Government in pioneering computer applications, the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, recently delivered a most enlightening address on this subject before a national symposium of the Federal Government Accountants Association. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of Chairman Macy's remarks printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

ADDRESS BY JOHN W. MACY, JR., CHAIRMAN, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, BEFORE THE 10TH ANNUAL NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTANTS ASSOCIATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 18, 1961

Government was far ahead of business in the use of EDP back in 1951, and it is still in the lead. Government has pioneered computer application and continues to pioneer it. Federal officials you will hear in this symposium are the leaders, not the followers, in the development of complex, large-scale applications of technology to assist management in reaching critical public decisions.

A brief review of the historical growth in automatic data processing gives us proper perspective on Government leadership.

The Univac which General Electric put into operation at Louisville, Ky., in the summer of 1954 was the first of these systems in business, but the first large-scale fully automatic business data processing system was delivered to a U.S. Government agency, the Bureau of the Census, in 1951.

By the end of 1957, 121 electronic systems for data processing had been installed in Government agencies. By 1957 almost every major activity in Government having large-scale paperwork and recordkeeping functions had been affected in some degree by the introduction of electronic systems.

Today there are over 700 computer systems operating in 30 Government agencies.

John Pfeiffer, in his book titled "The Human Brain," states that we need computers because we have developed ways of living too complicated for our brains to cope with. The needs, tasks, and responsibilities of big management have become so large and complex that they are no longer understandable or manageable without the aid of the modern computer. The conclusion is that the complex circuitry and design of the computer are necessary to simplify life in management. Just as thousands of years ago man learned to use simple handtools and mechanical devices to help him better cope with his environment, we have had to develop new methods to cope with the complexity of the mid-20th-century environment.

EDP is only one example of the new methods and concepts crowding in upon us.

The scope of Government operations demands leadership in developing these new ways. It demands that we understand and make use of each new concept and practice that will help us do a better job.

The rapidity of change is best illustrated by the fact that in less than half a century we can see three tides in the development of management, each one overtaking its predecessors and leaving its mark.

First of these was the era of scientific management, which placed a premium upon functional specialization according to a careful analysis of the one best way to do a job. A hallmark of scientific management was the fractionating of supervision and the separation of planning and control from the actual conduct of operations. It was an era of emphasis on devices to assure compliance. The ascendancy of machine-model scientific management over individual artisanship was expressed in industry in the formation of the great Detroit assembly lines. In government this thinking could be seen in emphasis on centralization and uniform practices—in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which led to the important establishment of the Bureau of the Budget.

The 1921 act represented a major revision in the whole budgetary procedure. It disposed of the practice whereby each agency came to Congress on its own and it focused upon an increase in Presidential control over

financial planning. For the first time we had a national budgetary system. On the audit side we also saw the requirement of centrally prescribed and relatively uniform accounting and review systems. The General Accounting Office actually kept the books of the Post Office Department until 1950.

Another administrative revolution was being generated even before the techniques of scientific management were in full flower. The work of Elton Mayo and his followers gave impetus to the participative management philosophy. It was realized that the release of productivity and the success of programs were dependent upon the involvement of people in goals and methods. Management's interest again turned to decentralization and the placing of responsibility for results at the locus of operations.

The 1940's witnessed the development of concepts underlying the Budget and Accounting Act of 1950, which decentralized responsibility for financial management to agencies under general guidelines prescribed by the central agencies. These general guidelines permitted variation in practice to meet the needs of management in each agency, while they retained the element of consistency with central review. Although the term "financial management" did not come into general use until 1953 or 1954, I was exposed to some of the earliest uses of the new concept during my own experience at

the Atomic Energy Commission in the late 1940's.

Now we are on the threshold of a new wave of managerial advance in which we will draw heavily upon a new concept of science in management. Contributions by mathematicians, statisticians, industrial engineers, and such social scientists as psychologists and economists are converging to provide new approaches to solving intricate management problems. We are finding new ways of thinking about the handling of information. We employ the capabilities of electronics both in the rapid communication of data and its manipulation.

We are thus in a position to bring more testable data to bear upon problems and to simulate solutions. While historical data will continue to be important for knowing what has happened, so that adjustments in direction can be made, managers are increasingly in need of predictive information. The concepts of operations research and the other "optimization" techniques have enhanced management's judgment by sharpening various alternative courses of action available to them, including the interrelated "penalties" and benefits accruing to each course.

The ability to obtain current, accurate, and meaningful information of the most comprehensive sort is yesterday's dream come true for those who carry the day-to-day administrative responsibility.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1962

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

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

Our Father, God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, and the kindly light that leads us on through the encircling gloom: Help us who grope in the darkness of earth's dim ways to ever remember that even the shadows themselves are born of light. As Thy servants in this chamber face the tasks of another week, lift upon them the light of Thy countenance; may they be saved from despair by the hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

Even while we are spurred to fight with all our might against the present evil which threatens freemen everywhere, may we also be lured by the vision splendid of a coming good. To this end deliver us, we pray, from the political policies which are symptoms of spiritual disease. Give us the needed courage and strength for the arduous and vast tasks of rebuilding the waste places of the earth, if at last life for all men under all skies is to be made full and free.

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

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

SAM J. ERVIN, JR., a Senator from the State of North Carolina, RUSSELL B. LONG, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, and JAMES O. EASTLAND, a

Senator from the State of Mississippi, attended the session of the Senate today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 11, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 297)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 14th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 13, 1961.

REPORT OF U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 263)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which,

with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 1962.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in execution session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that speeches in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the