

general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be generals

Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Gen. Herbert Butler Powell, O16684, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, O16782, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Walter August Jensen, O19006, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Warren Stilwell, O19117, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Thomas Powers, 3d, O19137, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Edward Gee, O19251, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Spalding Ehlen, O19286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Andrew Seitz, O80137, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Francis Tank, O19350, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Farnsworth Smoller, O19416, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Elmer Fellenz, O19485, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Lester Hillyard, O19524, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Johnson 3d, O19534, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Carson Kyser, O19535, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, O19781, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward William Sawyer, O19918, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Normal Basil Edwards, O19936, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Brown Richardson, O30597, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bruce Edward Kendall, O30623, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Woodrow Hiester, O20191, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Selwyn Dyson Smith, Jr., O20194, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Howard McCrum Snyder, Jr., O20213, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Arnold Heintges, O20281, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Creighton William Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, O20326, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Billingslea, O20367, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement of Senator Thomas J. Dodd on the Occasion of the Issuance of a Commemorative Postage Stamp Honoring the Late Senator Brien McMahon, Washington, D.C., July 27, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I wrote the Post Office Department to urge that a special stamp be issued to honor the memory of the late Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. This recommendation had the unanimous support of the Connecticut delegation. President Kennedy asked

the Department to give this suggestion its consideration and I was pleased to learn that Members of the Senate who had known Senator McMahon and respected his accomplishments in public office had also urged General Day to issue such a stamp.

Senator McMahon died of cancer 10 years ago July 28, almost at the peak of his career and yet with much promise unfulfilled. He had demonstrated great capacity to recognize the importance of atomic energy to public policy and to international affairs, and had mastered its implications. His was a true example of the way in which the American system has nurtured men who have met decisive challenges of their times with intelligence, realism, and imagination.

I was pleased to attend the ceremony held by the Post Office Department on July 27 in Washington to dedicate this stamp. Among the speakers were Senator THOMAS J. DODD, long a friend and

associate of Senator McMahon; and the Postmaster General.

Senator Dodd struck a significant chord in recalling the contributions which Senator McMahon had made to atomic energy and to the cause of world peace. I believe his remarks are worthy of deep consideration by the House and I offer them for the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Attending this ceremony concerning the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring the achievements of Senator Brien McMahon has a significance and a meaning for me that is difficult to describe.

It was my good fortune and privilege to know Brien McMahon as a personal friend for many, many years; to have shared experiences with him during his early years of public service in the Justice Department; to have taken part, by his side, in his political campaigns; to have watched his meteoric rise to national and then international prominence; and then to have visited at his bedside during the final days of his life.

I have known his family; his mother, who still lives in Norwalk; his brothers and sisters.

I remember him for all these reasons, and all of us have our own personal reasons for remembering him and for honoring his name.

This occasion today signifies that history, too, remembers and honors Brien McMahon. Of all the reasons for this, two stand foremost:

His contribution to the development, the harnessing, and the control of atomic energy, and his contribution to the cause of world peace.

Brien McMahon saw the specter of the world as it might be; a vast crater burned out by nuclear destruction. But he also saw a vision of the world as it could be; a world of peace, freedom, progress, and security, a world helped to these goals through the enlightened leadership of our country.

For some of us the mighty atomic blasts over Japan were really too awesome to contemplate. The explosive power that science had unleashed seemed too dreadful for comprehension, too vast to reduce within the familiar concepts of public policy. But for Brien McMahon, atomic energy was, for all its mystery, still only a creation of human genius and an instrument under human control.

It must be mastered, in all its implications, not just by scientists or by military men, but by statesmen, by the representatives of the people.

It must be developed lest our country throw away the mighty advantage for freedom and for peace which preeminence in nuclear energy gave to us.

It must be placed under civilian control, lest it become the fearful monopoly of a scientific or military elite, because large as atomic energy was, it was not too large for the American process of free government.

It must be harnessed, not just for destructive purposes, but for creative purposes in order that the potential for human progress inherent in unlocking the secrets of the sun might be fully realized for all peoples.

And finally, it must be made safe for the human race through a workable program of disarmament and control.

And so, while the first mushroom clouds of Alamogordo and Hiroshima and Nagasaki still hovered over the minds and imaginations of us all, Brien McMahon set to work.

In the months and years that followed, he developed the plans through which nuclear development was placed under civilian control and subjected to the governmental processes of a free people.

At his urging, a joint committee of the Congress was established to oversee the conduct of our atomic energy program, and he became its chairman.

Under his tireless, driving leadership, our atomic energy program moved forward to one discovery after another.

Through his blueprint, cooperation was achieved between scientists, the military, the Government, and private industry, in order that atomic science might develop, not as some unique monster, but rather as an integrated part of the traditional American system.

And what he brought forth, through his vision and his experience and his vigor, he protected with all of his political sagacity and prestige.

He successfully fought off repeated attacks upon the concept of civilian leadership of the atomic energy field. At critical moments, his intervention had historic results, such as his famous visit to President Truman which many feel was instrumental in President Truman's decision to go full speed ahead on the program to develop an American hydrogen bomb ahead of the Russians.

But Brien McMahon was more than the man who mastered the public implications of atomic energy. He was, above all, a man of peace. It was Brien McMahon who first proposed a \$50 billion Marshall plan for all the peoples of the world, to be accompanied by progressive stages of disarmament.

This proposal staggered the complacency of the day and invited the ridicule of those of little vision.

It is interesting to note that the total of our foreign aid has now reached twice the figure originally proposed by Brien McMahon. But it is sad to note that this huge expenditure has achieved only a fraction of the good it might have accomplished had it been brought forward and carried out with the imagination and the idealism and the vision advocated by Brien McMahon.

Peace, international friendship, practical disarmament and aid to less fortunate peoples—these were the causes with which Brien McMahon most wished to be identified, and these are the causes for which he will be remembered in history and for which we honor him today.

He was taken from us 10 years ago today, at the age of 48. He was stricken at the height of his rare power, in the midst of what surely would have been one of the most memorable public careers of our entire history.

The passage of years has served only to increase his stature. We see this in the tributes to his memory made by the statesmen of our day. We see it in the magnificent Brien McMahon High School, dedicated only recently in Norwalk. And we see a manifestation of this in the ceremony in which we participate today.

These remembrances, significant and worthy as they are, are just the outward signs.

Long ago, Abraham Lincoln, on being asked to comment on the proposal to raise a marble monument to his fallen friend and ally Congressman Owen Lovejoy, replied:

"Let him have the marble monument, along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty, unselfishly, for all men."

We rejoice in today's commemoration of Brien McMahon. We are pleased to see his name and his image enshrined in official public remembrance. But we know that the most lofty, the most lasting, the most significant monument to Brien McMahon is the memorial which will live in the hearts of all who knew him, in the minds of all who know of his deeds, and in the principles which he advanced, which shall go on and which shall triumph.

The Eskimo Art Exhibit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, Traverse City, Mich., is not quite as close to the North Pole as some people may think. Nevertheless, the faculty and students at Northwestern Michigan College have taken a rather special interest in Eskimo art.

Eighty-three stone cut and sealskin prints of Baffin Island Eskimos are being assembled at the college for one of the finest exhibits ever offered of this truly American art form. The proceeds of the exhibit, which will last from August

1 through September 30, will be donated to the Mark Osterlin Library located on the campus of Northwestern Michigan College.

Last year, when a similar showing of Eskimo art was presented at the college, the library fund was enriched by about \$900. All indications are that the exhibit this year will meet with even greater success than the one a year ago.

In addition to assisting the college library fund, the Eskimo art exhibit should help greatly to interest students and townspeople in art, and to provide a cultural stimulus in northern Michigan. Because of these laudable objectives, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the activities of the faculty and students at Northwestern Michigan College on this project are worthy of special notice.

Equal Pay for Equal Work: Justice and a Sound and Growing Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the equal pay bill, which passed this House last Wednesday, is a great landmark in American legislative history. For by supporting this measure, we have looked back and have reaffirmed our faith in the principles of the past upon which this Nation was founded; yet, at the same time, we have looked ahead to a sound and growing economy for the future.

H.R. 11677, like the equal pay legislation already passed by 22 States, declares that as a matter of national policy "work of comparable character on jobs requiring comparable skills should receive equal remuneration regardless of the sex of the worker." This concept of wage justice is firmly rooted in the principles of equality of the American political tradition.

By supporting this legislation, we have also taken an important step toward eliminating the double discrimination suffered by millions of our citizens. I refer to the women who are being subjected to wage discrimination as a result of their sex, while receiving an additional "deduction" in their paychecks because of their color, religion, or ethnic background.

Each year, more and more women are taking their place beside men in the labor force. Today, 24½ million women comprise about one-third of our working population. By 1970, that total is expected to increase to 30 million.

By granting these 24½ million women "equal pay for equal work," we will have made important progress toward a sound and growing economy. For it is vital that we make full use of their potential by giving them the same incentive that we grant to men to encourage them to increase their skills and productivity. Secondly, by eliminating an inducement for employers to replace men

with lower salaried women workers, we will have destroyed a constant threat to millions of wage earners and a condition that acts as a depressant on general wage levels.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to praise the many private organizations and individuals who have diligently campaigned for "equal pay for equal work," both major political parties who advocated the same in their 1960 platforms, and my distinguished colleagues, under the skillful leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELENSKI), who have so zealously fought for this important and long-overdue legislation.

Medicine: A Noble Walk of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great services rendered to the public by any Government employee in recent years was that performed recently by Dr. Frances Oldham Kelsey, of the Food and Drug Administration, when she refused to approve the sale in this country of the drug thalidomide.

Thalidomide now has been revealed as the cause of the malformation of almost 10,000 babies in Europe.

I undertook to express my admiration for Dr. Kelsey in my latest newsletter, which follows:

MEDICINE: A NOBLE WALK OF LIFE

Physicians always have been heroes to me. Along with the sincere clergyman, a good doctor gives more of himself to others, I think, than almost anyone else, excepting mothers.

I never shall forget Dr. Lee Clanton, the smalltown doctor who used to treat the ills of the large family of which I am a member. The sight of his model T Ford chugging down the hill to our farmhouse when we were in trouble is the most comforting memory of my childhood.

All I remember of Dr. Clanton's appearance are his strong hands and tired eyes. I used to marvel that hands so large—he was a big doctor, in every way—could be so gentle.

I knew the reason for the tired eyes, for Dr. Clanton ranged a vast farm countryside like a guardian angel, night and day. Looking back on it, I hardly can believe that he lived to a ripe old age (which he did, God bless him) so grueling were the physical burdens he imposed upon himself. I revere him as a sort of demigod, who gave himself selflessly to his friends and neighbors until the day he died.

As a dentist, I suspect now that he was only adequate; he took care of our teeth, too. I have some of his work in my mouth to this day.

I came to understand, too, that Dr. Clanton lived always with death. I had a fierce will to win and I was surrounded by brothers with spirits equally competitive, whether the contest was for checkers, baseball or the smiles of the pretty little girl on the next farm, 2 miles distant. (Where is Ethel now, I wonder?)

So I sorrowed with Dr. Clanton with every fight he lost to death, as all doctors must, all too often. And the great respect and affection I had for him has endured through all these years for the medical profession as a whole.

All of the foregoing is preliminary to a salute to another doctor—a woman, in this case. I refer to Dr. Frances Kelsey, a public servant and Government employee, which makes her a member of a much-maligned breed. She works for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In case you are wondering, she is a doctor of medicine, like Dr. Clanton.

I am sure you will recognize Dr. Kelsey's name. She is the gently stubborn lady who refused to approve the sale in this country of thalidomide, a sleeping pill and tranquilizer, until she was positive it had been proved out.

Thalidomide was being widely used in Europe, principally by expectant mothers. Dr. Kelsey was placed under tremendous pressure to approve its use in this country. True to her responsibility to the people she serves, she stood lonely and adamant, saying: "Wait until we can be sure."

Her inspired intuition and courage has been tragically vindicated. An estimated 6,000 babies in continental Europe and 3,500 in England have been or will be born without arms or legs—or with only 1 or 2 or 3—as the result of their mothers use of thalidomide during pregnancy.

Only God can know how many American babies Dr. Kelsey's devotion to duty has saved from being born with seal-like flippers instead of arms and legs.

I bow in grateful homage to a great and brave woman. But more than that, to a noble walk of life—the practice of medicine.

Remarks of J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, at the Ceremony Dedicating the Brien McMahon Commemorative Stamp, Washington, D.C., July 27, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend a ceremony at the Post Office Department to dedicate a commemorative stamp honoring the late Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. I had written the Post Office Department to urge that such a stamp be issued and had received broad support from Connecticut and from the Connecticut delegation.

Among the speakers at the ceremony was Senator THOMAS J. DODD, a great and good friend of the late Senator. The keynote remarks at the dedication ceremony were delivered by the Postmaster General, J. Edward Day, and I offer them for the RECORD:

REMARKS OF J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE CEREMONY DEDICATING THE BRIEN MCMAHON COMMEMORATIVE STAMP, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 27, 1962

At some prehistoric time, in some unknown place, a tribe of primitive people learned to kindle fire. This mysterious and awesome event was undoubtedly as astounding to

them as the release of atomic energy was to us.

Let us assume that the tribal leaders met in council to debate the problems arising out of this weird new phenomenon. Fire, quite obviously, was a potent weapon: it could be used to destroy the village of your enemy.

So the military advisers of the day may have counseled that the secret for kindling it be retained under rigid controls. But, perhaps there were others on hand who saw in fire a great force for good. Warmth and well-being are the gifts of fire. The progress of civilization is based on the peaceful use of fire.

Fortunately for this Nation, Brien McMahon was a man who was able to see beyond the holocaust at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He saw potential good in the fire unleashed by the atom.

Brien McMahon was a man of vision—a visionary in the best sense. He was not a dreamer-visionary. He was a working-visionary.

Many of you who are present today will remember the grueling work that went into obtaining passage of the McMahon Act of 1946. That act led to creation of the Atomic Energy Commission and fostered the peaceful uses of atomic energy. There were moments when Senator McMahon stood virtually alone in his belief that military control of atomic energy was not in our best national interest.

Let me reset the stage for you. In those days, we were riding the tiger and did not know how to dismount. The atom bomb had created psychological and diplomatic problems of great magnitude. Few people realized the full significance of the release of atomic energy.

The force of an atomic blast could be measured in relation to explosion of a given number of tons of TNT. But the potential of nuclear energy for industrial or medical research was neither widely known nor well understood. Congress appeared disinclined to take the terrifying new weapon out of the hands of the military. The White House seemed lukewarm to Senator McMahon's proposal for civilian control.

Senator McMahon was then a relatively obscure, 42-year-old freshman Senator. But he became the first chairman of the special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, an assignment of unusual responsibility for a Senator serving his first term. He labored assiduously to qualify himself as a lay expert on nuclear problems. He took training courses at the U.S. Bureau of Standards, so as to better understand the unbounded new horizons opened by the atomic age. And slowly, through hard toil and patient persuasion, he was able to break down the barriers of opposition. The Congress, once almost solidly opposed, gradually came to agree with him. The Atomic Energy Act was passed and signed into law by President Truman on August 1, 1946.

The influence of Brien McMahon's work will be felt in the future even more than it is felt now. Each new application for good in atomic research in the decades to come will have had its origins, directly or indirectly, in the McMahon Act.

The benefits of his contribution will multiply over the years.

Were Brien McMahon alive today he would be gratified to see the atomic energy museum at Oak Ridge, Tenn. The museum displays examples of how atomic energy is being applied in medicine, in agriculture, and in industry. There are examples of industrial research that have, for example, resulted in improved petroleum products. Certainly, these are things that Senator McMahon envisioned 16 years ago.

Under the policies pursued by the Atomic Energy Commission, many nations have

shared and benefited from the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Senator McMahon served the people of Connecticut in the U.S. Senate from 1945 until his premature death just 10 years ago at the age of 48.

President Truman said in eulogy: "Senator McMahon was one of the first to see the fantastic possibility for good in the wise use of atomic power. As he conceived it, the miracle of the release of atomic power was intended for man's everlasting benefit—not his destruction."

I hope that issuance of the Brien McMahon commemorative postage stamp will serve to highlight for millions of Americans the great contribution he made to our society. I hope it will serve to remind us that the best chapters of our history record the courage of men of vision.

Judge C. Beverly Briley, of Davidson County, Tenn., Newly Elected President of the National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of County Officials held its 27th annual conference at the Statler Hilton Hotel in New York City on July 8-11. It was an outstanding gathering of county officials from all parts of the United States.

Much progress has been made in the last few years by the National Association of County Officials. The president for the past year has been David W. Bird, of San Diego, Calif., who has made an excellent contribution to the association.

The executive director of the association is Bernard F. Hillenbrand, who in the past few years has really also made an outstanding contribution in the building of the association.

The president for the new year, who was elected on Wednesday, July 11, is Judge C. Beverly Briley, who is the county judge of Davidson County, Tenn.

I had the privilege and honor of working with Judge Briley from 1954 to 1958 when I was executive secretary of the Tennessee County Services Association, an organization composed of the county judges and county highway officials of Tennessee.

Judge Briley has made an outstanding contribution not only to Davidson County, Tenn., as a leader in county government, but to Tennessee as well. His keen insight into all types of county government, his alertness, his honesty, and his energy have been superb.

Recently, through his work and that of other leaders in Davidson County, this county has adopted the metropolitan form of government, thereby combining governmental functions of the city of Nashville and Davidson County.

Judge Briley will make an outstanding contribution to the National Association of County Officials. In his acceptance speech as president of the

association he made the point that counties in the recent years have been taking up the problems of local government in a realistic manner and that they are answering the challenges of the local problems.

He also stated that in his judgment, and the judgment of the most of the people who had studied government, that the suburban problem had arisen in the counties—or rather in the cities as such—and that this was true even in the rural areas, because the towns had been accepting more of the population of the counties and that the county governments had not had the opportunities to obtain the responsibilities and authority of rendering the services that were needed in this population migration.

He further stated that with the new concept of county government that they were moving ahead in the field of local government and in the forefront with the kind of leadership that was demonstrated in their meeting in New York and that certainly the problems of the people could be solved; that the association was going to assume a further leadership as they had done during the past decade of developing programs and cooperative understanding between all governmental agencies to achieve the best service at the most economical level of government for serving their people.

They all decided that they will have in Washington in February of 1963, as a tentative date, a second urban county congress, similar to the one they had some 4 years ago. And on this occasion they will attempt to bring up to date the activities that have been taking place in the field of local government toward solving the urban type of problems. And when they use the word "urban" they are not talking about just the big metropolitan centers, but the urban problems that are affecting every county seat, such as water supply, sewerage, and so forth; and that in this conference they expected to have a review of what had taken place prior to—rather since—the last urban county congress and project an additional future.

There were two editorials commending Judge Briley—one in the Nashville Tennessean which is the morning newspaper in Nashville, published by Amon C. Evans; and the other in the Nashville Banner which is the afternoon paper in Nashville, published by James G. Stahlman.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, July 12, 1962]

NATIONAL HONOR FOR JUDGE BRILEY

Davidson County Judge Beverly Briley was installed as president of the National Association of County Officials in New York last night. His elevation to the highest post in his chosen field is a compliment not only to him and his efforts, but to his community.

Judge Briley has been nationally recognized among his county official colleagues for a number of years. His election as national president was predestined by his selection last year as vice president.

Though he did not originate the idea of consolidated local government, adopted here June 28, Judge Briley certainly is due credit for proposing it as a solution to Nashville-Davidson County problems. He worked hard

for its adoption. Its success in referendum was a testimonial not only to the common-sense of merged local governments, but to the public's confidence in Judge Briley's opinion. Public servants can receive no higher commendation.

[From the Nashville Banner, July 12, 1962]

CONGRATULATIONS, JUDGE BRILEY

Wednesday in New York, Davidson County Judge Beverly Briley was elected president of the National Association of County Officials (NACO), climaxed several years as an active member and officer of the organization.

Judge Briley who has headed the Tennessee organization, a counterpart to the national organization, was one of the prime movers in overhauling and modernizing NACO.

Since the reorganization which included retaining a capable executive administrator, the association has developed into a highly regarded organization, giving the Nation's counties a voice which is respected at every level.

This new approach was needed, Judge Briley and other progressive NACO members believed, because the face of the Nation's counties was changing. In many, many instances—as was the case of Davidson County—farmlands had become subdivisions and the new problems were urban and no longer rural.

To be elected the head of a national organization is a personal tribute to Judge Briley, but it also is an honor for Davidson County, Tenn., to get this recognition—something that we all can be proud of.

The Banner joins the judge's many other friends and associates in congratulating him on the honor bestowed.

The Swedish National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to show to the Members of this House the worthy ends that a national lottery can serve. Properly channeled, the revenues from a national lottery can be a great aid to the people of the country in question.

Perhaps the wisest users of the national lottery scheme are the Scandinavians. Each of the four nations of Europe's north have seen the merits of a national lottery as a means with which to promote their highly developed cultures.

The largest of the Scandinavian lotteries is run by the Government of Sweden. Not only is the Swedish lottery the largest Scandinavian lottery, but it is the most profitable. In 1961, the gross receipts of the Swedish national came to almost \$56 million. Total Government profit was over \$31 million. A good portion of this money is set aside for cultural activities, and the rest is devoted to general budget purposes.

The Swedes are proud of the contribution that this lottery makes to the cultural attainment of their nation. They are well aware of the percentage profit made by the Government, but they realize the worth of the uses to which their money is put. Sweden is quite

cognizant of the fact that a national lottery is an excellent tool with which to advance the public welfare.

Mr. Speaker, a national lottery in the United States can pump into our Treasury over \$10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used for tax cuts and reduction of our national debt.

Satellites and Folklore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I was one of nine Members in this body who voted against the Space Communications Satellite bill which was then supported by the vast majority of the House.

Mine was a rather lonesome-looking position, to be one of only nine. Yet, I did not really feel lonely in taking my stand.

However, any man is going to take another look at his position when the overwhelming majority of his colleagues go contrary to his position. I confess I have taken another look at my vote, and today I can say that I am more resolutely convinced than before that I did the right thing.

I voted against the creation of a corporation to be franchised by this body which would be favored by giving to it the biggest giveaway in our history. It was proposed that we give it the right to develop, manage, and exact profit from a system of space communication satellites.

I was appalled at this suggestion, for it struck me as highly inappropriate that this Government should approach the development of outer space in much the same way that the kingdoms of Europe conceived of the development of this continent 300 or 400 years ago. It seemed inappropriate that we should approach the potential of our space interests in the same forms as were used in creating the Hudson's Bay Trading Co. to exploit the continent, or John Jacob Astor's American Fur Co., or the British East India Co., the British Mahogany Co., or any of the others.

We have spent many years and undergone many trials in extricating ourselves from the involvement of private and Government-sponsored corporations that were once used to exploit undeveloped areas, and even to create nations where none had existed before. Our history has often been troubled as the result of our people being involved in commitments and actions on the part of corporate groups who did not necessarily have the same interest that the American people had.

Yet, there is strong feeling in this Congress that we should take a course that would lay ourselves open to repeating past errors on this score.

This is what I make of the communications satellite bill and I am heartened

that under the deliberative processes of the other body this bill is receiving careful scrutiny. It should be scrutinized, for in addition to being an unwarranted giveaway it is latent with danger.

There is an additional comment that should be made to those who have argued that although A.T. & T. and its associated bodies would undoubtedly end up with effective control of this Government-sponsored corporation, this is not objectionable since, after all, A.T. & T. is itself owned and run by the people of the United States through widespread stock ownership and the election of managers by such stockowners.

This argument is more folklore than fact and this became ludicrously evident in a recent picture carried in the Washington Post. The picture was of a stockholders meeting of this giant corporation. It showed the few rows of filled seats in a veritable sea of empty auditorium chairs.

The empty chairs that spread out of the range of the camera lens were for the absent stockholders. And their very absence revealed the fiction of control by widespread ownership.

Let us not perpetuate this fiction further and use it to delude ourselves into thinking that the sheer number of stockholders provides any assurance of responsive or responsible control in the public interest.

It is wrong for this Congress to give the property and the sovereignty of the people to this private corporate body. We won this argument when the Atomic Energy Commission was established a few years ago and this new atomic power was held in trust for the people. Let us not lose it now with this latest technological breakthrough on communications.

I say it is good that the Senate is moving with caution on this measure. This is not the day and time to revive the Hudson Bay Co. America should speak for itself in dealing with other nations and not delegate this to private corporation executives.

Most important, we are the trustees of what belongs to the American people. We cannot fulfill our trust by franchising out the property and prerogatives of the people for private profit.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news-letter of July 28, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, July 28, 1962)

Intellectual honesty, practiced as political honesty, may be defined as speaking, acting, and voting as one believes to be right (vote one's convictions) rather than trying just

to be politically smart. Since Members of Congress do not and cannot under House rules question the integrity or motives of other elected officials, that is their colleagues, it is up to the people to recognize, know, and label what is political honesty and what is not. This week's legislative events, or any week's, could be the appropriate vehicle for such critical evaluation.

Agricultural appropriations, costing taxpayers \$5,475,842,500 provides the necessary wherewithal to continue for another year the farce of Federal handouts to and control of farmers—a large bloc of citizens and voters. Farmers' objections are partially silenced by Federal largesse. It's a high price to pay for control over their lives and what they may do with their property. The Dole amendment became the most famous part of the bill, an amendment that sought to bar the administration's use of taxpayers' money for propaganda purposes of influencing passage or rejection of legislation. It was rejected by a straight party line teller vote 172-118. Democrats for rejection of the amendment—Republicans against.

Mann Creek Federal reclamation project in Idaho passed 199 to 162. This relatively small project, costing \$3,225,000, will provide water and irrigation for 5,000 acres of land to grow hay, barley, wheat, or for pasture. At the same time in hay alone 258,747 acres have been retired into the soil bank, costing the taxpayers \$2,200,000 per year.

The Equal Pay Act of 1962 passed hurriedly (almost like sweeping something under the rug), with Members refusing to make a record vote. This bill seeks to make a Federal law, replacing State and local laws, forcing equal pay regardless of sex, wherever there is comparable work and comparable skills. "Equal work" became the language on amendment and made better the surface good sense of no discrimination in pay because of sex. I opposed it because this bill will result in women losing jobs. The reasoning, as I see it, is elementary. All States, in various forms and combinations have women labor laws related to hours of work, maximum and dally, meal and rest periods, night work, employment before and after childbirth, occupational limitations—seating and weightlifting requirements—all recognizing one thing women are different than men—not equal, unequal, better or worse—just different by design and function as the reproducers of the human race. So it is that women are not expected to be able to stand as long as men—therefore, seats are provided. (No, we don't treat our women as the Communists do—as equals in work and work conditions.) Whatever these differences, when the time comes that women cannot produce equal output, should this law pass an employer would be foolish not to, wherever possible, replace her with a man. Most likely, he will hire men instead of women. The bill passed the House of course, mainly because of political pressure. Members feared that some constituents back home might construe their vote to indicate they thought women not as good as men. I, too, believe that everyone ought to be paid the same for the same work output.

The foreign aid authorization conference agreement between House and Senate passed 221 to 162. I opposed it because the conferees struck out the House prohibition of the U.S. additional support of the U.N. when member nations refuse to pay up their delinquent just part (which is small enough, to say the least), and because the House and Senate capitulated to White House pressure to permit the President greater latitude in giving away taxpayers' money abroad, including to Communist countries. The extent of the President's openhanded aid to the United Nations and Communists all during recent months only now has come to light in the June 25, 1962, Joint House-

Senate report (Document 85-213) which shows the United States agreed to permit 78 nations to reduce their U.N. contributions because the United States volunteered to pay it for them to a total of \$11.4 million (beyond our usual lion-share assessment) between November 1961 and June 30, 1962.

Texas, as a depressed area, which our Governor and Texas Members of Congress have stoutly denied to be the case, was granted a \$420,000 loan to build a 72-room motel in Woodville, Tex. "The project is part of an overall plan to expand the economy of eastern Texas. Seventy-five jobs will be created." That is an example of how the Federal Government Area Redevelopment Act is working.

News commentators are being forcibly suppressed by the Attorney General who has filed antitrust proceedings against King Features. Noted columnists are being told that any derogatory or noncomplimentary articles about the Kennedys will be reason for deletion of their stories. How is that for freedom of the press and speech in "the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

"Every honest man will suppose honest acts to flow from honest principles."—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

J.F.K.: Is There a Doctor in the House?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during his campaign for the Presidency, John F. Kennedy criticized the growth rate of this country and attacked President Eisenhower's economic and fiscal policies for not moving the Nation forward rapidly enough. He said in a speech in Detroit on September 5, 1960, that the Nation's economy was in bad health and "we had better call for a new doctor in Washington."

Today, Mr. Speaker, nearly 18 months after his inauguration, President Kennedy's economic and fiscal policies have brought America to a near halt. All of which promoted Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, to state in a National Press Club speech on July 26:

I think it's about time we ask if there is a doctor in the house.

Mr. Speaker, because the Senator from Arizona offers some pertinent comments about the state of the Nation's economy and where we are headed under the policies of the New Frontier, I would like to call the attention of the House to his remarks and I include his address in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, JULY 26, 1962

Mr. President, members and guests of the National Press Club, I am delighted to be here today and I want to thank your speakers committee for inviting me. I always feel a high degree of freedom when I speak before this club, and I think it is because nothing I say here ever gets into print. This imbues me with that wonderful off-the-record feeling so dear to Mem-

bers of Congress who like to indulge in verbal freewheeling.

Now when I was first told about this invitation, I spent considerable time wondering what I should say here. I wondered, for example, whether I should lecture the press about its high responsibility in the life of the Nation, whether I should make a case for or against quoting Congressmen and Senators out of context, or whether I should merely announce the cancellation of my subscription to the New York Times.

But I decided against shop talk. I decided that as long as I had this fine captive audience at my mercy, I might as well get a few things off my chest.

Let's start with the Congress of the United States. And here let me say that the handling of this Congress by the administration and its party leaders in the House and Senate is about the worst I have seen since being here. I suppose this is as it should be, since no one can expect the operation of Congress to exceed in excellence the subject matter it is given to work on. Since many of the legislative proposals sent up to the Hill from the White House are farfetched and ridiculous, it isn't surprising that the legislative machinery should break down in midsession under the weight of Democratic arguments and blunders.

But it certainly is a strange way to "get the Nation moving." When you recall the ringing campaign promises of the New Frontier and then look at the state of the economy and the record of President Kennedy's Democratic-controlled Congress, you begin to understand what a poor bill of goods has been sold to the American people.

If this Nation is moving under the guidance of the Democratic administration, it is moving in the wrong direction; it is moving toward complete chaos compounded by unemployment, recession, balance-of-payments deficits and a depleted gold reserve. It is moving in the wrong direction on all economic fronts, and the sorry part of it all is that no one in the White House seems to know what to do about the situation.

Maybe you will recall last year's anti-recession program. It was sent up to Congress with many claims. It was to take the Nation out of the doldrums and spark a Kennedy recovery in 1962. It was to wipe out unemployment. It was to do a lot of things. And it was adopted. The Congress raised the minimum wage, provided help for depressed areas, and generally did about everything along this line that the President requested.

But it didn't work. We are today closer to a serious recession than we were when the New Frontier started its meaningless chant about getting America on the move. And we are presented with the spectacle of a government hemming and hawing over what to do to remedy the situation. Half of the White House brain trust seems to favor an immediate cut in taxes; the other half apparently wants to wait until next year. Former President Eisenhower used the word "floundering" to describe the present administration. And I believe he hit the nail right on the head. What we have today in the Federal Government is irresponsibility laced with indecision and uncertainty. The more you read today of what is known as "the economic debate," the more impressed you become with the feeling that the White House is adrift on the sea without a compass. You begin to get the frightening idea that those in charge of Federal fiscal and monetary policy actually don't know what to do. You begin to understand that the President and his economic advisers aren't sure what will help and what will hurt. And finally you come face to face with the inescapable conclusion that these are not the men who can get America moving in a way that will accelerate economic growth and quiet the fears of foreign governments about the stability of the American dollar.

All you have to do is look at the rate of economic growth today to realize that something is seriously wrong. The latest gross national product figures show an increase in the second quarter of 1962 of only 1.3 percent. After a year and a half of meddling by the New Frontier, we have slowed down to a snail's pace while Europe and the rest of the world continue to flourish.

According to the Government's figures, the gross national product stands at a yearly rate of \$552 billion. This is \$7 billion more than the rate established during the first quarter of 1962.

Now a \$7 billion increase might seem like a sizable one if you don't stop to consider that the upward rate was nearly twice this amount last year on a quarter-to-quarter basis. And the rate last year was the one the Kennedy administration considered far too small to provide for the demands of a growing population in a nation with world-wide obligations.

To get an idea of how slow the economic rate actually is, it is important to remember that the Kennedy administration has been talking in terms of a gross national product total of \$570 billion by the end of 1962.

And to get this problem into even better perspective, we might hark back to the 1960 presidential campaign and listen to what Candidate Kennedy had to say about proper economic growth. In those days, of course, the gross national product was growing at almost twice the rate announced for the second quarter of 1962. But Candidate Kennedy viewed the situation with alarm. Here is what he had to say about it in a speech delivered on September 5, 1960, in Detroit's Cadillac Square:

"Under Republican leadership, we have not been growing. The workers have noted it in unemployment and short workweeks. Businessmen have noted it in idle plant capacity and rising inventories. And Mr. Khrushchev noted it when he promised to 'bury' us."

"Three facts are indisputable:

"Fact No. 1: Between 1947 and 1953, under the administration of Harry Truman, our average annual rate of growth was 4½ percent. Between 1953 and 1959, under a Republican administration, the rate was only 2¼ percent—less than half as much. And today our key industries such as auto and steel are operating at much less than full capacity.

"Fact No. 2: While our economy is crawling forward at an average rate of only 2¼ percent, the Russian gross national product is annually increasing at 7 percent—three times as fast.

"Fact No. 3: Our rate of growth was surpassed by almost every major industrial nation during the past years of drift and indecision—including Germany, France, the Netherlands, Italy, Japan. These are facts we must face. This is the record our opponents have described as a healthy rate of economic growth. And I defy them to find anything healthy about it."

And that's not all. Let me quote Candidate Kennedy's conclusion. Here's what he said:

"When this country, with all its potential, is growing at less than half the rate achieved by the Soviet Union, less than the rate of almost every major industrial nation on earth, then our health is obviously down and we had better call for a new doctor in Washington."

Thus spoke Mr. Kennedy when the Nation's economic growth stood at two and a quarter percent. Today I think it's about time we ask if there is a doctor in the house.

Now, we have heard a great deal about the administration's trade program. I won't go into details that you already know about this vast request for executive authority over the Nation's tariff and trade policies. What I want to emphasize is that this has been promoted as a cure-all for

our outstanding economic difficulties. This is the legislation, we are told, which will increase American exports, which will enable American industry to better compete with foreign producers, which will ease the deficit in our international balance of payments, which will put us in harness with the European Common Market.

The trouble is going to set in if and when this program is passed and we find that it won't do what was promised. For I am convinced that it will not do all or any of these things for the American economy unless it is accompanied with other moves—unless it is welded into an overall plan of fiscal responsibility incorporating reduced Government spending, a balanced budget, tax reform and payments on the national debt.

Now, free trade is a worthy economic objective. And, of course, no one can or will argue with the desirability of a net increase in our exports over our imports. But it is wishful thinking to assume that the administration's trade program will accomplish this merely because the bill sets it forth as one of its purposes. No one can guarantee that unilateral tariff changes by the United States, no matter how sweeping, will bring about an increase in exports. This is because trade and tariffs are not one-way streets. And, if our drastic tariff reductions are not matched by foreign countries and not accompanied by acts of fiscal responsibility, this bill will get us into greater trouble than we are in at present. And I might remind you that the history of reciprocity is not particularly encouraging. At the present time, our industrial tariffs average about 11 percent; those of the Common Market countries average 14 percent; and only a few countries have an average any lower than ours.

What we desperately need in this country is a higher rate of capital investment. The rate today is about equal to what it was in 1957. And that's not enough to keep the economy expanding. We also need better plants and equipment to help us compete on a quality basis with foreign manufacturers. So, what can we do about it? I believe the President could solve much of the problem by recommending immediately a greatly liberalized treatment of depreciation in our tax laws. I mean something sizable enough to allow industry to begin replacing some of the \$95 billion worth of aging and obsolete equipment with which it is presently saddled. The highly publicized moves he has recently made in this direction—that piddling 8-percent tax credit recommendation and the equally small \$1.5 billion adjustment in depreciation allowance schedules—are too small to be counted. They won't make a dent in the overall problem.

But a proper recommendation on depreciation, accompanied by spending cuts to offset a resulting loss of revenue, would give a tremendous boost to the economy. It would do far more than the kind of tax cut the administration has been toying with on the theory that the need is for greater consumer purchasing power. Lack of purchasing power is not the problem.

What we're short of today is confidence. Purchasers and investors are frightened and unsure. And, in this, they are merely reflecting the attitude of the Federal Government which gives every sign of being frightened and unsure itself.

Perhaps the most important requirement for increased business activity and sound economic growth is a healthy climate. When optimism abounds, more people are eager and willing to invest in the future. When pessimism and uncertainty reign, they sit tight; their money remains idle and the wherewithal for business growth and expansion is not forthcoming.

In this context, I suggest, the whole argument over whether the Kennedy administra-

tion is antibusiness becomes largely academic. The thing that has slowed down the American economy and sent the stock market into the doldrums is the prevailing conviction that the Government is adamantly opposed to price increases and only weakly opposed to new wage increases.

At the very least, the New Frontiersmen are guilty of misunderstanding how the free enterprise system operates. They are guilty of letting the Government appear to be antagonistic, whether it actually is or not. And they are guilty of believing the business system can benefit from Government tampering.

Progress Report of the White House Committee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy was campaigning for the high office he now holds, he stated:

One of the great challenges of the sixties will be to strengthen the small independent businessman against the large business units which threaten to crowd him from the American economic scene—and to reverse the disastrous policies which are destroying this historic cornerstone of our free enterprise system.

Those of us who plead the cause of small business do not seek special privileges for that vital segment of our economy. Instead, we seek to have the Government balance the scales so that small business can compete on equal terms with all others. Inasmuch as small business comprises 95 percent of the entire business population, the importance of maintaining its economic health is readily apparent.

One year ago, President Kennedy created the White House Committee on Small Business to implement the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business. We now have the benefit of its first efforts in the form of specific recommendations whereby the Federal Government can enhance the future growth and prosperity of small firms.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, I wish to most heartily endorse these recommendations and commend the President and the White House Committee for their efforts. Because of the importance of this Committee and the results thus far achieved by it, I wish to invite my colleagues' attention to its progress report which follows:

PROGRESS REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT—ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WHITE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, JUNE 1962

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to present to you a report of the White House

Committee on Small Business. The report has the approval of all members of the Committee.

Respectfully,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Chairman, White House Committee on
Small Business.

(Department of Commerce, Department of Defense, Department of Justice, Department of Labor, Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, Federal Trade Commission, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Small Business Administration.)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

HON. JOHN E. HORNE,
Chairman, White House Committee on Business, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is with great interest and deep gratitude that I have received and read this report on the studies, evaluations, and recommendations of the White House Committee on Small Business, summarizing the Committee's first year of activity. The Committee has carefully noted the historic contribution of small businesses to our economy and the serious obstacles which they now face, and has made a number of significant observations as to the areas in which the Federal Government can enhance the future growth and prosperity of these small firms.

This administration is determined to insure a strong, diversified foundation of healthy small firms; to expand the markets for American enterprises; to preserve a system of free and open competition, and to develop constructive policies and programs in behalf of the small business community. The deliberations of this Committee vividly demonstrate that determination.

The recommendations contained in this Committee report outline specific measures whereby the Federal Government can foster and encourage small business enterprises, thus strengthening the entire economy. You may be assured that these proposals will play a significant role in this administration's planning. At the same time, your report should encourage the small businessman to help provide the leadership and initiative for America's economic growth in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

INTRODUCTION

One year ago, the President announced the creation of the White House Committee on Small Business. The membership of the Committee is comprised of representatives of those departments and agencies within the executive branch of the Federal Government whose activities most directly affect the small business community.

In his statement, the President left no doubt that the administration considers the role of small business a vital one in the national economy. The rate of economic growth essential to a sustained recovery can be achieved, he asserted, "only if the small business segment of the economy, which comprises 95 percent of all businesses in the United States, is vigorous and healthy."

The Committee was directed, first, to make a careful evaluation of existing programs of the Federal Government with the aim of strengthening and refining them. "Through the Committee," the President stated, "the Government's many efforts to foster and encourage small business enterprise should be closely coordinated to the end that they may be made as effective as possible."

Beyond this, the President made it clear that he looks "to the newly formed White House Committee on Small Business to provide the leadership in Government that is required to develop new, constructive poli-

cies and programs in behalf of small business." The Committee is expected, said the President, to "generate new ideas, new approaches to overcome obstacles that may impede small business growth."

In addition to offering guidance in the shaping of Federal policy, it was anticipated that the Committee would exercise a role in kindling the initiative and incentive of the small business community itself. As the President observed, "This Committee has great responsibility—and a corresponding great opportunity. From this Committee should come the leadership necessary to stir the imagination and reawaken the energy and daring of the individual small businessman."

For the past year, the Committee has engaged in a process of study and discussion, of evaluation and recommendation. This report summarizes the Committee's first year of activity.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

One of the first tasks which the Committee set for itself was to reexamine the contributions of small business to the American economy and to evaluate the policies of the Federal Government designed to enhance those contributions. In a study submitted to the President, the Committee has summarized its conclusions. In brief form, the study undertakes to review the contributions and values of small business, the obstacles it faces, and the areas in which the Federal Government can play a helpful and legitimate role in assisting small business to prosper. These are the highlights of the study.

The social and economic value of small business

The existence of a large number of small independent businesses helps to preserve competition, thus insuring increased efficiency and high quality and reasonable prices for consumers. As the Committee concluded, "If we accept as our objective a system in which the decisions of the marketplace are dictated by the selective mechanism of competition rather than by the exertion of economic power, our principal goal must be to preserve competition. It seems clear that the existence of a healthy small business community substantially increases the likelihood of maintaining a system in which free and open competition provides the basis for economic decisions."

A large number of small independent businesses decreases the likelihood of excessive economic and political control. The Committee observed, "A truly open society in which equality of opportunity is actively encouraged is characterized by the distribution of economic power among several elements of the business population and by the diffusion of political power to a broad range of the citizenry. A disproportionate amount of economic power leads with distressing regularity to a grossly unequal distribution of political power."

Small business offers opportunity for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment. The Justice Department succinctly summarized the conclusions of the study: "It is the theory of our society that the maximum degree of individual freedom to make choices and exercise judgment will afford the greatest opportunity for individual initiative and expression and, by those means, secure to society the maximum contribution of all. A system which limits the opportunities for economic activity or determination by the individual may very well be losing a good deal of ability and talent."

Small business is frequently the source of new products and new methods. The committee's examination of the major inventive contributions of this century led it to the conclusion that the small business community is "a vast seedbed for technological

development and innovations." Finding the contribution of small business in the field of inventions to be of "overwhelming significance," the study concluded that "the benefits to the Nation of retaining and expanding this inventive force are obvious."

Small business constitutes a large and diversified source of employment opportunities. Approximately one-half of total non-agricultural employment falls within the broad concept of small business in the United States. This broad range offers to a worker not only a depth, but also a considerable variety of employment opportunities. In addition, small business provides opportunities for continued contributions by those who may be unemployable under the rigid requirements of many large organizations. Further, in times of national emergency, the Nation benefits from the fact that small businesses constitute a vast and widely dispersed source of personnel, facilities, and materials.

Certain services essential to the economy can be performed best by small business. The committee concluded that in some instances small business has an actual advantage over large business in technical efficiency. "A number of factors—some inherent in the size aspect itself and others the result of fairly recent developments in technology—contribute to a peculiarly effective role which small business can play in the national economy," the committee noted. The particular attributes of small business which contribute to this role include its strength in personal service, specialization, adaptability, and inventiveness.

The role of the Federal Government

Despite the significant contributions of small business to the economy, the committee observed, "the balance between large and small business is, from the point of view of the small businessman, generally a precarious one. The Congress has wisely recognized this fact, and has attempted in several areas to guard against the possibility of an imbalance. The committee believes that the Federal Government has a legitimate concern in maintaining this balance in such a way as best to serve the national interest."

The committee therefore turned its attention to an analysis of the factors which tend to limit the role of small business in our economy, and to some suggested guidelines for the development of a positive policy toward small business.

The Committee asserted its "basic belief that the competitive market mechanism, if given a chance, will produce a socially desirable result in the long run in most markets. Our concern is that the competitive mechanism will not be allowed to work and, in particular, that the salutary competition of small firms and of new firms will be unduly restricted."

Two types of limitations on the participation of small business in our economic life are noted in the study. The first type is that arising from an inadequacy or inefficiency within the small firm itself. This may properly be referred to as a real cost disadvantage of small business—as, for example, those cases in which the actual resources to produce a particular product or service are greater in a small firm than in a large one. Another type of disadvantage of small business is the institutional barrier to the participation of small firms in our economic life. This may arise either through the intentional exclusion of small firms from some markets by the individual or collective action of other organizations, or through the routine conduct of affairs so as to favor large firms over small ones.

Based upon its analysis of the differing implications of these two forms of barriers to small business success, the Committee concluded: "An important element of a positive policy toward small business is the

elimination of discrimination against the small firm."

A second element should be an effort to enable small firms to help themselves, both in the direction of better internal management and in group activities which will achieve some of the advantages of larger scale operations while maintaining the independence of the small firm.

In conclusion, the Committee affirmed that it is in the public interest to support policies which create equal opportunity in the market and which create a climate in which efficient small firms can be born and grow in activities to which they are well suited. As the Committee observed, "It is our opinion that there are a substantial number of ways in which the participation of small business in the economy can be significantly increased, and dynamic competition of the economy thereby strengthened, without incurring significant real or money costs. Let it be emphasized that we have no interest in increasing the number of uneconomic small firms in the economy. * * * Such an exercise would be futile and irresponsible. We do, however, have a strong interest in increasing the entrance opportunities and survival rates for small firms. We believe that in many instances this can be accomplished by the removal of institutional barriers to small business success and to the improvement of small business performance in an open, competitive economy."

"Small Business in the American Economy" White House Committee on Small Business, May 1962.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

Based upon its studies during the past year, the Committee believes that these are the problem areas presently facing small business:

1. Market structure or competitive conditions as they affect equality of economic opportunity.
2. The adequacy of managerial ability and experience, and the awareness of information available to small business.
3. The ability of small business to obtain capital on reasonable terms.
4. A consideration of the place of small business in governmental programs and activities.

It is in these areas that the Committee has directed its attention during the past year.

The procedure which the Committee has used in studying these problems has varied. In some cases, ad hoc study groups were appointed to evaluate a problem and to make recommendations as to the most effective disposition. In other cases, authorities from other Government agencies or from outside sources have appeared before the Committee in a consultative capacity. In still other cases members, whose area of responsibility included the problem under discussion, were assigned primary responsibility for developing the material necessary for a decision by the Committee.

1. Market structures or competitive conditions as they affect equality of economic opportunity

A. Expediting the investigation of unfair trade practices: When faced with an unfair trade practice on the part of a competitor, the typical small businessman is likely to be uncertain as to the most effective means of redress. Since the Federal Trade Commission has only 10 field offices, he may well be at a considerable distance from the nearest representative of that agency. To expedite action on complaints of unfair trade practice, the Small Business Administration and the Federal Trade Commission, on the basis of a Committee recommendation, have entered into an agreement designed to make it more convenient for the small businessman to file his complaint and to speed the handling of such communications. SBA field offices located in 60 cities throughout

the country will now accept such complaints and forward them directly to FTC headquarters in Washington for appropriate action.

This innovation, hailed in the House of Representatives as "a reform in the administration of unfair trade practice complaints," has already shown promise as a means of speeding and improving a process which in the past has frequently been slow and ineffective.

B. Authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders: Despite efforts on the part of the Federal Trade Commission to remedy the problem, law enforcement by the FTC has been frustrated by delays and by an increasing backlog of cases. The Committee concluded that "protection of the competitive system and the place of small business in that system requires that the inevitable delays in litigation shall not be employed to permit the continuance of the very practices against which the FTC Act and the antitrust laws have been enacted." Unless the practices which the FTC alleges to be violative of the law can be stopped while their legality is finally determined, the litigation may prove futile. The small businessman who is the victim of the practices may well have been irreparably injured or destroyed during the course of the proceeding. As a measure to protect and assist small business, the Committee therefore recommended to the President that he give full support to the objectives of pending legislation providing for issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders by the Federal Trade Commission.

Shortly thereafter the President expressed his strong support for such legislation. Noting that the White House Committee had studied the proposed measure and recommended its approval, the President concluded that such legislation "will provide essential protection for small businessmen and thus strengthen competition throughout the Nation's economy."

The Committee reaffirms its endorsement of this proposed legislation.

C. Strengthening the power of documentary demand: The Committee studied pending legislation empowering the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence in civil antitrust investigations and concluded that such legislation would be a significant assistance to small business. The Committee advised the President that "it is frequently the case that remedial legal action comes too late to be of any assistance to the businessman who is the victim of anticompetitive practices. Legislation of this character would allow the Department of Justice to proceed with the speed which is necessary in order to enforce antitrust laws. In this regard, such legislation contributes to the welfare of small business."

The bill has now been passed in somewhat differing forms by both Houses of Congress, and has been referred to conference for the reconciliation of the differences.

2. The adequacy of managerial ability and experience, and the awareness of information available to small business

A. Increased liaison between the Small Business Administration and other Government agencies: One of the Committee's earliest recommendations was for the institution of more effective liaison between SBA and the other agencies represented on the Committee. Working relationships on a continuing basis have now been developed along the lines recommended by the Committee. Among the relationships established have been those with the Department of Commerce's Business and Defense Services Administration, Office of Distribution, and Office of Technical Services; the Department of Labor, to channel workers to small businesses and to make available to small business the facilities of the Bureau of Employ-

ment Security; the Department of Defense, to encourage small firms to organize pools and joint ventures for the purpose of engaging in research and development; the Area Redevelopment Administration, to gear the programs of ARA to small business, and the Urban Renewal Administration, to encourage and assist local officers to extend technical relocation services to displaced businesses and to encourage local agencies to consider the impact on small business in the delineation of urban renewal areas.

B. Tax guidance for small businessmen: The Committee recommended that the Small Business Administration and the Internal Revenue Service jointly explore the feasibility of conducting tax clinics for small businessmen. The first two such clinics have now been conducted, in conjunction with Syracuse and Bradley Universities, and were enthusiastically received. The purpose of the clinics is to alert small businessmen to the tax aspects of managerial decisions. It is expected that the two agencies will expand the program considerably in the coming months.

C. Antitrust guidance for small businessmen: It is the belief of the Committee that many small businessmen are not adequately familiar with laws relating to antitrust violations and unfair trade practices. The Committee therefore recommends that the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission and the Small Business Administration explore the feasibility of conducting legal clinics devoted exclusively to an examination of these laws, the remedies provided thereunder, and the impact of these statutes upon small business.

D. Expanding the role of small business in foreign trade: The Committee recommended that the Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration devise a program for providing advisory assistance to individual small business firms, informing them of the possibilities in the field of foreign trade. The two agencies have now developed coordinated programs to avoid duplication of effort in this area. The Commerce Department is responsible for the actual servicing of the technical needs of business in the development of trade opportunities. The SBA's activities to increase interest in exporting include conferences, meetings, courses, publications, research, counseling and the stimulation of small business participation in trade fairs, centers, and missions.

In addition, SBA and FTC are examining the antitrust exemptions under the Webb-Pomerene Act and evaluating the adequacy of the existing provisions.

E. Managerial assistance to small business: The Committee examined the availability and use of managerial information and guidance for the small businessman. The Committee concluded that there is a need for more such information and guidance, and that the small business community is as yet largely unaware of the services which are available. The programs of the Small Business Administration in this regard were discussed and evaluated. The Committee endorses these management programs and recommends that they be given greater emphasis.

3. The ability of small business to obtain capital on reasonable terms

A. A program of guaranteed leases: A recurring complaint of small retailers is their inability to obtain leases in desirable locations. Small concerns are in many cases precluded from acquiring prime space in such areas as shopping centers, downtown locations, and industrial parks. It is asserted that in some cases financiers of such developments require that tenants have a credit rating beyond the potential of most small businesses. It is further alleged that other landlords or promoters are reluctant

to make space available to small concerns, since such leases do not provide a basis for financing. One method proposed for overcoming this resistance is to guarantee the rental of a small business, thus enabling the promoter to obtain financing and thereby assisting small concerns in securing space. The Committee discussed the problem, considered the proposal of a guaranteed lease program by the Federal Government, and has taken the matter under advisement.

B. Tax proposals to facilitate expansion and modernization: Small business has traditionally found difficulty in obtaining outside capital to provide for expansion and modernization of facilities. This difficulty is aggravated by inadequate tax treatment of the use of internal funds for such purposes. The Committee studied a number of proposals, directed at the latter problem, including the investment tax credit contained in the proposed Revenue Act of 1962. The Committee endorses the credit as a particularly attractive means of stimulating the growth, stability, and vigor of small business in the American economy. A position paper, explaining the salutary effect the proposal would have upon small business, has been prepared and distributed by the Committee to appropriate sources.

C. A simplified method of financial assistance to small business: The Committee recommended, and the Small Business Administration subsequently adopted, a simplified bank loan participation plan. The plan is designed to encourage bank participation in SBA's lending program by minimizing the paperwork required in processing a loan and by relying on the bank itself for credit guidance. Use of the plan has resulted in a greater flow of private lending funds to small businesses, increasing and expediting assistance to a greater number of small businesses. The acceptance of the plan by banks was almost immediate, and has continued at a gratifyingly high rate.

4. The place of small business in governmental programs and activities

A. Familiarizing the small businessman with the services of the Federal Government: The Committee, together with the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and the Small Business Administration, has cosponsored a publication entitled "Federal Handbook for Small Business." Designed to bring together the various activities performed in behalf of small business by 13 Federal agencies, the book discusses financial and technical assistance, Government sales and procurement, foreign trade, labor-management relations, research and marketing assistance, taxes, unfair trade practices, and other matters of concern to the small business community. About 80,000 copies are being printed and will be distributed to small businessmen throughout the country.

B. Avoiding duplication of effort in providing services to small business: The Committee has studied the variety of services available to small businessmen and concludes that the Small Business Administration has come to be regarded by the small business community as its spokesman within the Government. It is the consensus of the Committee that the SBA, in accordance with the act creating it, should be encouraged to continue its educational programs and pursue vigorously its activities in behalf of small business. The Committee further concludes that the most direct way in which assistance to small business can be carried out with maximum effectiveness and a minimum of duplication is by a clear recognition of the SBA as the appropriate agency to serve as a center of information on Government services available to small business.

C. The place of small business in a program of Government procurement: The Committee is presently concluding a study of the

impact of Government procurement programs upon small business. The particular focus of the Committee has been upon the weapons system method of procurement, but the implications of the study will extend beyond that subject. It is hoped that the study will result in a number of recommendations for revisions in the existing Government procurement programs. When he appointed the Committee, the President directed the organization "to devise means for assuring small business a larger share of Government contracts and subcontracts." It is hoped that the study now being completed will make a significant contribution toward that objective.

D. Small business set-asides. The set-aside program, authorized by the Small Business Act, provides in essence for limiting those who may bid on procurement contracts to small firms in cases where there is reasonable expectation that bids or proposals will be obtained from a sufficient number of responsible small business concerns so that awards will be made at reasonable prices. The Committee has studied the program and found it to be a useful tool in fulfilling the policy of Congress that "a fair proportion of the total * * * contracts and subcontracts for property and services for the Government" shall be placed with small business firms. The Committee feels that the present program should be continued substantially as it is, adding to it only through education and emphasis. Particular attention was devoted to the allegation that the cost to the Government under a set-aside program exceeds the price which would be paid if the program were not in effect. While acknowledging the possibility of a slightly higher price in a particular procurement, the Committee affirms its belief that the overall set-aside program contributes to the likelihood of continuing the small business competition which is essential in achieving substantially lower prices in the long run.

CONCLUSION

President Kennedy has said that "one of the great challenges of the 1960's will be to strengthen the small independent businessman." The last year has witnessed a number of significant steps to meet that challenge.

As is typically the case, the small businessman was the first to be hit and the last to recover from the 1960 downturn in the economy. The last several years have seen a steady increase in the rate of business failures recorded. The total number of business bankruptcy cases filed with the courts in the last fiscal year was well above the level during the last decade.

But, by the end of 1961, small business appeared to be making a recovery of its own. Growth of the business population, slowed during the recession, has accelerated in recent months. In the second and third quarters of 1961, the number of businesses in operation increased by 15,000 in each quarter compared with increases of 10,000 in the first quarter of the year and only 5,000 in the fourth quarter of 1960. By the end of the third quarter of 1961 the business population had reached a new high of 4,775,000 firms of which approximately 4½ million were small businesses. For the year 1962 to date, business failures have been about 5 percent lower than last year.

It will require concerted effort on the part of private industry as well as the Government to assure that small business retains its place in the American economy in the years ahead. The impact of the recessions of the 1950's has been most severe on small business. The problems connected with launching and operating a small business have become more difficult in the last several years. Mounting costs, intensified domestic

and foreign competition, improved methods—all these have contributed to a need for high levels of managerial and technical knowledge, as well as for sufficient funds.

In order to strengthen the competitive position of small businesses, the Committee believes that it is necessary to insure free entry into the marketplace; to preserve equality of economic opportunity for those already established; to supply appropriate information and assistance to individuals who desire to establish new businesses; to augment existing sources of equity and long-term capital, and to preserve to small business a fair and equitable place in the programs and policies of the Federal Government.

In the past year several steps have been taken in this direction. An increase in the revolving fund authorization of the Small Business Administration was effected by an amendment to the Small Business Act. That agency has virtually doubled its services, most notably in the field of business loans. The Small Business Investment Company program has made a significant contribution toward channeling the flow of private funds to small business. A small business subcontracting program provided for in the 1961 amendments to the Small Business Act has been developed cooperatively by the Small Business Administration, the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration with a view toward expanding the share of subcontracts under Government prime contracts received by small business. The President's order that the small business share of military purchases be increased by 10 percent is a promising beginning. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have stepped up their efforts to deter and control anticompetitive practices.

But much remains to be done. In a society in which so many voices are raised in their own behalf, a continuing evaluation of the position of small business is essential. Certainly, no such appraisal can be complete without a careful study of the role of the Federal Government in assisting small business to grow and prosper. It is the Committee's hope that its recommendations to date will make a significant contribution toward such an evaluation, and that its recommendations in the coming months will augment that contribution.

ASW: What We Have—What We Need— Where We're Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was written by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], for Data, the magazine of research and development management. The gentleman is well qualified to write on the subject of anti-submarine warfare through his naval experience, his continued activity in the Naval Reserve, his personal interest in the subject and as a Member of Congress. I commend the reading of this article to all of my colleagues.

The article follows:

ASW: WHAT WE HAVE—WHAT WE NEED—
WHERE WE'RE GOING

(By Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Republican Representative from the Sixth District of Maryland)

Since its advent as an effective military weapon in World War I, the submarine has presented the classic obstacle to free world control of the seas for commercial and military purposes. Near disastrous experience in two world wars indicates the potency of enemy submarine fleets in the face of an inadequate operational antisubmarine warfare system. Today the nuclear submarine and its marriage with the ballistic missile has changed the threat from one of primarily local defense aspects to one of a global and strategic nature. The challenge is formidable and is generally recognized to be among the most difficult technical problems facing the Navy. The new submarine has unlimited cruise capabilities and underwater operating speeds in excess of our ASW vessels. To combat this threat ASW must be able to concentrate all necessary resources and research, and control all phases of technology and implementation.

National security demands that the control of the seas be retained in the hands of the free world and that enemy forces be denied the use of these seas for mounting or supporting assaults they may plan against the United States or our allies anywhere. We must increase our capabilities in detection and localization of enemy submarines, and strengthen our potentiality in seeking out and killing these submarines.

As a member of the Naval Reserve, I have been impressed with the rapid advancements in the potentialities of our nuclear submarine; I am gravely concerned about the equally important problem concerning how best to combat the threat posed to our coastal centers and the rest of the free world by parallel Soviet advances. My concern deepened on a tour of active training duty last January during which I was assigned to Carrier Division 16, an ASW hunter/killer task group in the Atlantic Fleet.

The Soviet force of over 400 submarines is composed of a large number of the long-range snorkle types, equipped with torpedoes, and a small number of nuclear-powered submarines, some missile equipped, whose recent appearances may be expected to increase. Beyond question, the Soviets will soon have missiles greatly exceeding their present 350-mile range maximum.

ASW efforts to meet this challenge and to minimize Soviet advancements are a never-ending, around-the-clock, all-weather operation. Our ships and planes are on the watch 24 hours a day while men in the Pentagon continuously search for improvements in ASW defense and coordination. The Navy, however, has been overly modest concerning the tremendous effort it is making in this area, and I wish to make known some of the aspects of the ASW problem. It is the purpose of this article (1) to discuss the broad functions of ASW, (2) to outline current capabilities and development, pinpointing problem areas, and, finally, (3) to focus on the requirements and teamwork necessary for a fully effective ASW force.

THE BROAD FUNCTIONS OF ASW

The primary functions of ASW operations are detection, classification, tracking, communications, command/control, and attack. It is relatively easy to locate a submarine today, but the real difficulty is the ability to identify nationality and intent. Most development efforts have been focused in these areas, and future progress may utilize space technology.

Detection and tracking data must be transmitted to those who must make evaluations and decisions. All ASW activities involve this command/control without which ASW forces and operations cannot be fully effective. Command/control integrates all functions supporting the ASW operations, from intelligence and warning to fleet readiness, from the correlation of pertinent environmental data to insuring the availability of navigational assistance. Its substance is the men and organization who, supported by information, procedures, and machines, make evaluations and decisions. It is this function which must solve the dilemma posed by the requirement for instantaneous reaction time as opposed to the need for positive control of any preemptive action which might be premature.

Finally, the execution of any order for ASW attack requires the availability of effective weapons. There has been promising development in this area, but technology has produced submarines whose performance characteristics outmode many available weapons.

CURRENT CAPABILITIES AND PROBLEMS AREAS— DETECTION AND CLASSIFICATION

Overshadowing the entire ASW picture is the problem of submarine detection and classification. Steady advances in detection are promising, but the Navy has difficulties in distinguishing "friendlies" from enemy submarines, and snorkels from nuclear types. There are further problems in differentiating submarines from uncharted pinnacles rising from the ocean floor, schools of fish, and whales, all of which seem to conspire not only to sound like submarines but to act like them.

Sonar remains the primary solution to the area surveillance problem, and the sonar now going into our surface ships and submarines has given tenfold range improvements over those in the fleet 5 years ago. Helicopters now have sonar domes which dip into the ocean and give increased detection ranges. A new Lofar sonobuoy also gives increased detection ranges.

Experimental infrared gear has detected submerged submarines at night for a number of hours after passage, and new equipment is under development to provide lightweight sensitive infrared equipment for patrol and carrier-based aircraft.

Other exploratory projects include Artemis, consisting of a net of hydrophones on the ocean floor to take advantage of the quietness of deep waters, and Project Trident, directed at the development of new devices.

For surveillance of restricted waters, the Navy is developing active barrier equipment composed of transducers which can readily be deployed into areas of strategic or tactical interest. Tests conducted the past year showed excellent results by detecting a large percentage of the passages of submerged submarines over the barrier.

Aircraft surveillance is a very important supplement to sonar equipment. W-2F and P-3V aircraft are currently being tested. The W-2F early warning aircraft has been found effective in detecting surfacing and snorkle subs. The land-based P-3V, a long-range ASW surveillance aircraft similar in configuration to the commercial Electra, is the follow-on replacement for the P-2V series. The P-3V Orion has a better working environment for its crew and has room for incorporating new electronic and radar developments. The ability of this plane to get to the target area twice as fast as its predecessor is an obvious advantage.

Evasive deep-diving submarines can take advantage of such diverse conditions as faults in the ocean floor and deceptive oceanic thermal layers. Although most of our conventional devices are still stymied by these problems, development of the precision graphic recorder (ASPECT) for destroyers

and helicopters has resulted in successful trials. Another item under development is MAD (magnetic anomaly detection), implemented through flying patterns which can sweep faster than any other system.

A major area of research and development is oceanography in which the monumental task of charting vast unknown areas of the ocean floor and the differing characteristics of the various oceans themselves must be undertaken and solved before any ASW program will be effective. A recently formulated 10-year Navy plan for oceanography, TENOC 1961, sets forth detailed plans for all phases of military oceanography, surveys, basic and applied research, ships, facilities, and instrumentation and training.

Also in TENOC are plans for the development of an ASW environment prediction system called ASWEPS by which the Hydrographic Office predicts oceanographic conditions for fleet commanders, giving accurate data and advice of the sonar conditions to be expected in any given area. Further plans include the nuclear propulsion programs, a quiet snorkle program, improved submarine communications, improved propulsion and hull design and structures, and submarine air defense capabilities.

COMMUNICATIONS

The threefold problem of the communications area involves (1) communications between submarines, (2) shore-sub-shore communications, and (3) the collection and transmission of surveillance data. A most important aspect is the ability to communicate without enemy detection. It is possible to talk acoustically between submarines and surface ships but not without enemy detection. No communications development yet allows intersubmarine communication without the disclosure of their positions.

Current techniques do not permit communication from surface or shore to submarines below 14 fathoms, an indispensable type of communication in time of enemy attack. Blackouts caused by nuclear detonation and fallout add further complications. Developments in VLF transmission techniques and ocean floor netted communications provide a partial solution, but not complete answers.

ATTACK

Tangible advances have been realized in the ASW attack in function. As a result of the Berlin crisis 40 destroyer-type ships and 18 aircraft squadrons were recalled from the Ready Reserve for augmentation of ASW forces. The ASW capability of these World War II vintage destroyers is being increased by fleet rehabilitation and modernization, including when possible the FRAM program.

Supplementing the procurement of new and improved vessels is a development program aimed at providing advanced vehicles for detection, tracking, and the payoff—weapon delivery. This program includes hydrofoil vessels which provide increased speed and flexibility to arrive at the target area.

DASH, a destroyer-controlled drone helicopter carrying a torpedo or nuclear depth charge, is being installed on a number of ships. This small, lightweight, remotely controlled device was begun under the FRAM program but is now receiving top priority, and the current plan is to be able to install two such drones per destroyer this year.

Naturally, torpedoes are of primary importance. The development of the lightweight homing torpedo MK-46 for aircraft and destroyers and the wire guided torpedo EX-10 has led to increased production of these types, but they have not been widely implemented in the fleet. These new torpedoes and their successors are designed to overtake and destroy nuclear-powered subs which may in the future conceivably attain speeds of 60 knots and depths of 2,000 feet.

To give quick reaction standoff weapon deliveries compatible with the increasing sonar ranges, rocket-propelled asroc (anti-submarine rocket) has already appeared in the destroyer fleet while subroc is being developed for use by submarines.

In test and evaluation the Navy has found that present ranges and evaluation techniques are inadequate as new and expensive weapons become faster, go deeper, and frequently are irretrievable after firing. A new adequately instrumented test and evaluation range is contemplated under Project AUTEC in the Bahamas. It will contain accurate facilities for the plotting of new long-range antisubmarine warfare weapon trajectories, as well as an acoustic range for accurate noise measurement.

REQUIREMENTS AND NECESSARY TEAMWORK

The ASW problem necessitates a total approach incorporating research and development, requirements determination, system management, test and evaluation, and the development of operation procedures. Navy teamwork has produced significant advancements to date. First, the formation of the ASW advisory committee to bring together the best qualified individuals of the military and industrial communities is typical of the coordinated effort. Other examples of actions taken by the senior command echelons are the creation of an ASW Executive Readiness Office under CNO, and, third, the formation of the Undersea Warfare R. & D. Planning Council.

A fourth important area of executive action is the development of operation teamwork with the Nation's allies, which has led to the establishment of a much stronger strategic position for ASW with respect to potential enemies than existed relative to the Axis at the beginning of World War II. Geographical location of our allies allows us to maintain a ring around the Soviet Union. The advent of the deep-diving nuclear submarine, has reduced this tactical advantage for detection purposes. We must regain this advantage through implementation of advanced defensive techniques.

Both modernization and new construction are needed in proper balance to extend present ASW capabilities and overcome obsolescence of our forces. Necessary procurement to provide the products of research and development to our operating forces must be emphasized. Manpower levels must be increased to insure that trained maintenance and operational personnel are abroad to utilize these products. In fiscal year 1962, ASW research, development, testing and evaluation appropriations amount to \$231 million of which approximately 26 percent is devoted to defense and surveillance measures. In fiscal year 1963, the budget request will be increased \$286 million with the largest increase, 35 percent, devoted to the 65 projects in detection, localization and classification. Such increases appear sufficient to support the research, development, test and evaluation (R.D.T. & E.) objective, but even greater increases should be considered for procurement and implementation, maintenance and operations, to attain an up-to-date ASW posture.

SUMMARY

Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, testifying before a House subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations summarized the current state of ASW in a manner with which I totally agree. "We have not yet developed any little black boxes that will infallibly pinpoint the location of their [Soviet] submarines in any particular area, positively identify them as enemy submarines and launch a lethal missile toward that spot within minutes after they have been located. There is no astounding breakthrough immediately expected, and we do not anticipate one in the immediate future, although our research efforts are certainly

aimed toward that end. What is required is a most extensive team effort involving not only our forces but those very capable ones of our allies as well. There are no illusions that our answers will come easily, but I am confident that with the talents of industry and the abilities of our own navymen, we ultimately will solve this problem successfully."

Increasing support from Congress and the public is necessary to enable the Navy to keep pace with this silent Soviet threat. We, in the Congress, must recognize the gravity of the situation and provide the Navy and the public with the proper incentives and leadership and funds to close the ASW gap.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.

Representative CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland, is serving his first term in the 87th Congress. Previous to his election in November 1960, he had served in the Maryland House of Delegates; as assistant attorney general of Maryland; and as city attorney of Frederick. He presently serves on the House Committees on the Judiciary and the District of Columbia. He is also a member of the executive committee of the Republican Congressional Committee, being the only "freshman" Member of the 87th Congress to receive this distinction.

Mr. MATHIAS received his law degree in 1949 from the University of Maryland, having previously attended Yale and Haverford College where he received an A.B. degree as a member of the class of 1944.

Active in civic life, "MAC" MATHIAS, as he has been known since boyhood, has been president of the Historical Society of Frederick County, is on the executive committee of the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission, and an officer in the Maryland State Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Children's Aid Society of Frederick County, and a trustee of the Episcopal Free School and Orphan House. He serves as a vestryman of Frederick's All Saints' Church.

He served during World War II as gunnery officer on sea duty in the Pacific and is a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

Mr. MATHIAS was born July 24, 1922, in Frederick, Md., and is married to Ann H. Bradford of Cambridge, Mass. They have two sons, Charles Bradford and Robert Fiske.

Summer Intern Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has recently established a summer internship program in Government agencies. This program has brought several thousand students to Washington for the summer and has given them a valuable practical experience in the workings of the Federal Government.

As part of the program, the White House has set up a seminar series so that the students may hear leaders of all the branches of Government. Last month the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, spoke at one of these seminars and gave a remarkable insight into the nature of

Congress. Mr. MANSFIELD's address follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD BEFORE THE SUMMER SEMINAR OF COLLEGE STUDENTS, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 10, 1962

A textbook will reveal how our system of government operates in theory. Only a direct contact such as you are now undergoing can provide the beginnings of an insight into its operation in practice. I say the beginnings of an insight on the basis of personal experience. Twenty years in the legislative branch, roughly divided between House and Senate have given me, I believe, some understanding of that branch as well as the executive branch and the Court. Yet hardly a day passes even now without additional awareness—some new appreciation of the vitality of the Constitution or some new apprehension at the fearful complexity of the system which has developed under it.

I am delighted, therefore, that the President has seen fit to introduce a formal summer internship in government for students. It is typical, may I say, of his dedication to the cultivation of excellence in the public service. You may or may not choose to pursue a career in government in the future. Whether you do or not, I have no doubt that the experiences which you and future groups obtain by firsthand practice will act as a leaven throughout the Nation for improvement in the public service. For that reason, if for no other, I am delighted to try to contribute to your understanding of the legislative branch, particularly its Senate wing.

The Senate has been called many things—some flattering, some not so flattering. But whatever it has been called, in practice, it is a coequal half of the legislative branch of the Government. It is neither an upper body, nor a lower body. It is, with the House, a coequal body. I stress that point because popular interpretations of the Constitution tend to emphasize the differences between the two wings of the Capitol. Thus, the House is sometimes interpreted as being the more popularly responsive body and the Senate as the upper and the more deliberative and dispassionate body. History indicates, I believe, that the Senate is at least as responsive as the House. And I assure you that the Senate can be at least as passionate as the House. If the Senate is senior to the House in any significant way, it is in the average age of membership; we are undoubtedly a little more decrepit. If it is junior in any significant way, it is in total membership; there are five in Mr. McCORMACK's organization for each one in ours.

So I repeat, the two wings of the Congress are coequal, except in certain unique functions which are stipulated in the Constitution. The reason is clear. The basic function of the Congress is to consider and to pass the legislation which becomes the basic law of the land. Congress has exercised powers which are quasi-judicial and powers which are quasi-executive, just as the other branches have exercised quasi-legislative functions. But, basically, Congress exists to legislate and the Congress, as we know it, has no ultimate validity except in the light of that basic function.

Neither the House alone nor the Senate alone can perform that basic function. The Congress cannot fly on one wing. Only both the Senate and the House, acting together, can perform the basic constitutional function of the Congress.

We hear much of the importance of divided power in our system of government. But even though we hear much less of it, cooperation and restraint among the elements is of at least equal importance. This importance is starkly revealed when the interplay between the House and Senate breaks down even temporarily as it has done recently between the two Appropriations Committees.

The importance of cooperation and restraint is not confined to relations between the Senate and the House. It applies equally in the relationships between the executive branch and the Congress and, even to the relationship of each with the Court. And it applies, too, even within each body. I am sure that many of you have already had some inkling of its importance as among the agencies and offices of the executive branch. Within the Senate, in the inner operations of the Senate, it is of the greatest importance. You may be surprised to learn, for example, that by far the greater part of the Senate's day-to-day business is conducted by unanimous consent or at least without objection of any Member. This is the case despite the fact that the Senate is composed of some of the most highly individualistic men and women in the Nation—100 Senators of varied personal outlooks and predilection, representing many shades of political opinion and 50 States of varied interests and concerns. This body of great diversity moves as one far more often than not.

The rules of the Senate are such, moreover, that there exists the greatest latitude for individual assertion and maximum safeguards for the rights of each individual Member to make his assertion. With rules so designed, there is a possibility of abuse by any Member or group of Members. Yet, this abuse is so rare an occurrence that it is newsworthy. It is rare because Members of the Senate, however much they may disagree on specific issues, recognize that the operations of the body—indeed, the survival of the body as a vital element in our constitutional system—depends, in the last analysis, on a basic cooperation and restraint within the body. How else would the Senate have been able to handle 46,581 confirmations of Presidential appointments, 7 treaties and 570 legislative bills which, at the last count, was the total of completed work since this session of the 87th Congress convened in January?

In terms of the problems of leadership in the Senate, this same element of cooperation and restraint is fundamental. There is, as you know, a majority leader and a minority leader, as well as assistants to both who are known as the whips and the secretaries for each party organization in the Senate. But do not let the word "leadership" deceive you. The Senate is not an army with the leader giving orders and the rest of the troops carrying them out. It is not the executive branch whose basic source of power is the President and whose chief personnel serve at his pleasure. Each Senator draws his constitutional powers directly from the people of his State and is responsible only to those people and to his conscience.

Each Senator, in effect, is a party member; but he is also an independent leader in his own right and is coequal in rights with every other Senator including the majority leader. Each Senator has one vote and in the last analysis it is that vote which counts—not a title.

As I have already pointed out, the rules of the Senate are designed to provide maximum protection for the equal rights of all Senators. Yet if all Senators asserted those rights to the maximum at all times, the body as a whole could not function. Again, therefore, the factor of cooperation and restraint is fundamental to carrying out the responsibilities of leadership in the Senate. In general, Members recognize this fact and defer to the leadership most of the time on procedural and routine matters.

In the present situation, with the executive branch and the legislative branch controlled by the same party, I view the principal function of leadership in the Senate as interpreting the President's program to my colleagues, interpreting to the President the attitudes of the Senate with respect to

his program and obtaining action—a vote, a decision—on the legislative elements of his program.

There is no guarantee that any particular part of the President's program will be approved by the Senate. There is no magic wand in the hands of the leader. There is no party discipline to insure that the 64 Democratic Members will invariably vote the President's wishes. Indeed, many measures depend for passage on the vote of Republican Members. I am not dismayed by this lack of rigidity in the party structure. Obviously any President, any majority leader would prefer the support rather than the opposition of his own party members. But we must recognize the reality that we are a vast land of contrasting interests and concerns and party labels have different meanings in different regions. In this setting, legislative action, it seems to me, is best sought by the interplay of these concerns and interests by those who know and represent them most intimately regardless of party labels.

Nevertheless, there is a minimum party role in the Senate which must be sustained or the labels lose all meaning. The majority party role in present circumstances is to bring about at least that measure of cooperation and restraint on the part of individual Members which permits decision one way or the other on legislative elements of the President's program in the Senate and the day-to-day disposal of routine business. By the same token, the basic minority party role is to see to it, that this legislation, along with alternatives, is considered fully but

without obstructing the taking of timely decisions. By and large, there has been that cooperation and restraint on the part of the individual Members in both parties in the present Senate. If you have been led to believe otherwise by press reports, I would note again that that which divides tends to receive the popular stress over that which unites. I have already alluded, for example, to the sheer numbers of Presidential appointments confirmed, the treaties and the bills on which the Senate has acted during the present session. Add to these huge numbers, the totals from the previous session which were 48,961 Presidential appointments, 10 treaties and 1,133 legislative bills. You will gain from these figures some sense of the sheer volume of activity of the Senate, a volume which could not begin to be sustained without the highest degree of cooperation and restraint on the part of the individual Members.

Or look at the record in the light, alone, of the highly significant proposals which the President has advanced since assuming office. During the present Congress—both sessions—perhaps in excess of 275 proposals of this kind have been sent to the Congress by the President. Any one of these represents a major undertaking which properly calls for the most careful and extensive consideration by the Congress. Yet, the Senate has actually passed about 60 of these proposals this session, and during the last session, enacted 124 of them into law. You hear much of the defeat in the Senate of a Presidential proposal to establish an Urban Affairs Department or the rejection of a farm bill in the

House. But you hear little of the passage of a manpower retraining bill or of an aid to higher education bill or an extension of unemployment compensation bill or dozens of other highly significant measures.

Whether or not legislation passes in the Senate in response to the President's program is a question which goes, not to the operation of the Senate or the House as such. Rather it goes to the social, economic, and political forces continuously at work throughout the Nation and the manner in which these forces are reflected in the representation in the Senate at any given time. In these forces there is much that conflicts, much that divides. It is the essence of the legislative function to deal with these forces in terms of the enactment of laws for the common good. And in the exercise of this function, I do want to impress upon you the importance of elements of cooperation and restraint.

It is as important to the internal operations of the Senate and the Congress as it is to the interrelations of the separate branches in the effective operation of the Federal Government. It is this element which makes possible agreement to act even where there is strong disagreement among strong men and women as to the proper course of action. It is this element which permits orderly and peaceful change in the structure of our society to meet the ever-changing of our people. It is this element which, though unexpressed in a constitutional cause, nevertheless, is a major source of the validity and vitality of our constitutional system.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 31, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Zechariah 4: 6: *Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.*

Eternal God, our Father, we have been privileged to enter upon this new day, unable, however, to foretell and foresee what it shall bring forth, but encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy Holy Word, we shall put our trust in Thy divine guidance and not be afraid.

We humbly acknowledge that frequently we feel anxious and are tempted to fear that our faith is too frail to remain strong and steadfast when we face questions that trouble us and difficulties that terrify us.

Gird us with a faith that will lift this heavy burden of loneliness and worry from our hearts and may we realize more fully that Thou art not with the many and the mighty unless the many and the mighty are with Thee and that one with Thee is always a majority.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers

on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H.R. 10904, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal year 1963.

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

There was no objection.

UPPER DIVISION OF THE BAKER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 730 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 575) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman

from California [Mr. SMITH]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 730 provides for the consideration of H.R. 575, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 575 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, for furnishing irrigation water to 18,000 acres of irrigable land in the Baker Valley, preventing floods, and providing fish and wildlife benefits and recreational opportunities.

The 18,000 acres of irrigable land in the upper division lie on a broad alluvial fan north of Baker, along the river in the southeastern part of Baker Valley, and in the elevated Lilley pump area in the northern part of the valley. Due to their dependence on natural streamflow, presently irrigated lands now receive only a partial water supply primarily by flooding during the heavy spring runoff. After the early part of July, in most years, these lands are without water except for a relatively small supply for some areas obtained by pumping from wells. The storage facilities in the upper division plan would regulate the Powder River to provide a full irrigation water supply to 4,010 acres of presently dry lands, and a supplemental water supply to an additional 13,990 acres.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 730.