adequate coverage is not within their means. This credit would apply to the purchase of level-premium policies or paid-up policies during their younger years which would provide health insurance coverage for their later years.

In providing for a credit instead of a deduction, the bill would still permit the taxpayer to use the tax tables or to take advantage of the standard deduction. The standard deduction—which is reflected in the tax tables—is the equivalent of a deduction of 10 percent of the adjusted gross income. This use of the tables makes it unnecessary for the taxpayer to itemize all his personal deductions. It is in lieu of any other deductions permitted under our tax laws—such as charitable deductions, interest payments, personal taxes, and nonbusiness casualty losses. If medical insurance premiums are treated as an additional personal deduction, the 37 million taxpayers who today elect to use the standard deduction and the tax tables would either lose the benefit of the insurance deduction or the simplicity of the standard deduction and the use of the tax tables. They would have to account for each and every item of personal expense allowable as a deduction. This would materially complicate the filing of returns, particularly for those in the lower tax brackets.

On the other hand, with a 20-percent tax credit for medical insurance, the taxpayer who had an income of $5,000 would still be entitled to the $500 standard deduction. The tax credit provided by my bill would be taken in addition to—not in lieu of—the standard deduction. In other words, the medical insurance credit would be treated in the same manner as the 4-percent credit for dividends received and the $1,200 retirement income credit, both of which are taken in addition to the standard deduction.

In recent months, we have heard a lot about establishing a Government plan of so-called medical insurance for those age 65 and over through the social security system. The Kennedy administration's proposal, embodied in the King-Anderson bill, would be financed through an increase in the social security tax, under the control of the Federal Government.

The Kennedy administration's plan—which was voted down by the Senate—applied only to those age 65 and over. Furthermore, it offered them only limited coverage. It did not cover doctors' or surgeons' fees, drugs prescribed outside the hospital, or dental care—to name a few. It was even limited in its in-hospital care in that the individual must pay the first $20 to $90 of hospital services—$10 per day for the first 9 days, with a $20 minimum. The Kennedy administration's plan at most would only cover 25 percent of the medical needs of our elderly. The remaining 75 percent of their medical needs would go unattended.

We must recognize that medical care is not solely a problem for those under the social security system, or those 65 years of age. A major illness can befall both young and old. Legislation which limits relief to a segment of the population is deficient. A young father may be just as hard pressed to meet the expense of illness in his family as would the retired person who himself became ill. The bill I have introduced provides tax relief for meeting the medical expenses of both through private insurance. It does not attempt to socialize medical insurance as the Kennedy administration would do.

This bill makes no attempt to regiment our elderly citizens into a Government-conceived, adopted and controlled system of compulsory health insurance. It does not require that the taxpayer's insurance conform to certain standards set by the Federal Government before favorable tax treatment can be obtained. Many of our elderly citizens are at present adequately providing for themselves through private plans of their own choosing, and prefer to continue to do so. This bill recognizes that it is the right of the individual—young and old—to select the type of insurance program which best meets his needs—and to select it in a free and competitive marketplace.

H.R. 12963 approaches the problem through the encouragement of private insurance—without Government interference and control. Unlike other concepts, it realizes that it is not only the role of the Government to encourage adequate health protection among those age 65 and over, but that our Nation is faced with a problem which transcends both age and economic standards. The bill would encourage individuals of all ages and income levels to provide health and accident insurance as a means of protecting themselves against catastrophic and prolonged illnesses.

The bill advances one of the needs recognized recently in the Republican Declaration of Principles and Policy, wherein it was stated:

> Effective tax relief for medical and hospital insurance should be given to all. We support government action to increase the coverage of voluntary insurance plans and to help older citizens having difficulty meeting the costs of adequate coverage.

We have made tremendous gains in public acceptance of health and accident insurance over the past decade. The problem is that medical expenses are so treated under existing law that the taxpayer, instead of being given an incentive to enroll himself or his family in a medical plan, is penalized for doing so. Recognition in the tax laws of the desirability of private health insurance is long overdue. The tax credit I propose, by correcting this inequity, would build on the gains we have made in the field of private health insurance.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

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

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

Almighty God, our Father, with a new dawn, in a world drenched with beauty, we have awakened again by Thy mercy to toil, to gratitude, and to friendship. Grant us now, in the heat and burden of these days of deliberation and decision, a sustaining realization that our labor is not in vain in the Lord. So teach us to number these days, so crucial in the life of our own Nation and the whole world, that in national and global affairs we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

May our personal lives, freed of pettiness and prejudice, and radiant with the good will which leaps all barriers, be open channels through which Thy saving grace may flow for the healing of the nations. Thus may this land of our hope and prayer fulfill the potent ministry to all the world to which in Thy providence we believe Thou hast called us.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 18, 1962, was dispensed with.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be postponed briefly, and that the Senate resume the consideration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, House bill 11970.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on page 21, in line 10.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] may be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is withdrawn.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit, and send to the desk, an amendment, for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out "notwithstanding any other provision of law or any provision of any trade agreement," and to insert the following: "notwithstanding any provision of any trade agreement under this Act,".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment is perfectly acceptable to me. As I stated last night, it was the clear intent of the committee at the time when it adopted the committee amendment that in no way would it invalidate any past agreements and that the amendment was to apply only to trade agreements negotiated under this act. I was advised that no agreements had been entered into heretofore which would conflict with this provision.

So I enthusiastically support the amendment of the Senator from Montana as clearly carrying out the intention of the committee and my intention at the time I offered the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope the difference of opinion which developed in regard to this part of the bill can be amicably settled, and I am sure it will be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Delaware is willing to accept the amendment proposed by the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the amendment also meets with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment is similar to what I proposed last night and has the same effect.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the amendment of the Senator from Montana. It is in line with the intent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senate has given its approval to this amendment which is so important to the American agriculture. In particular this amendment is very important to the poultry industry.

The Common Market countries on July 30 through unilateral action established new and drastic trade barriers against poultry and other important agricultural products.

These barriers were highly protectionist and have for their purpose and effect the destruction of the U.S. competitive position. In other words, American poultry production, processing, and marketing have reached a point where it is able to produce and ship the product across the seas and compete with poultry produced locally in the Common Market countries. Because we are competitive the Common Market is seeking to establish a system whereby our competitive position can always be offset so that its members may preempt as much of that market as they choose. This policy is the reverse of trade expansion. It is trade strangulation.

If such measures are to be employed against our poultry and other agricultural commodities on which we are competitive—why should not such measures be employed against their industrial goods shipped to this country on which they are competitive and have the advantage because of their lower labor and other costs of production. At least we must be in a position to bargain. Trade must be a two-way street. If the Common Market countries are to have access to our market for their goods on which they can outcompete us then we in turn must have equivalent access to their markets.

These nontariff barriers which are being established against our poultry products take the form of gate prices and equalization fees. A gate price is an arbitrary price which is established below which our poultry may not come in. For example, if our price is 30 cents per pound and the gate price is 33.4 cents, the difference must be paid as a fee to the Common Market. To this is added an equalization fee of 9.6 cents per pound which purports to represent the difference between the world price of grain and the artificial grain price which is established within the Common Market. A feed conversion ration is also used which further offsets some of our efficiency. The net result is that the additional levies in the form of gate price fees and equalization fees will double and in some instances treble the existing duty barriers.

These new trade barriers are not necessary. Imports of U.S. poultry have not hurt their markets or their producers. On the contrary, they have been beneficial. The U.S. poultry industry's International Trade Development Committee has promoted the increased consumption of poultry. In the short time this promotion program has operated poultry consumption has almost trebled. Their producers as well as U.S. producers have benefited from this enlarged consumption. Consumers in these countries have responded to high quality products at reasonable prices with increased purchases. It is inconceivable, therefore, that these protectionist barriers would be proposed. It is even more inconceivable that our Government has not struck openly and hard at these barriers as being wholly inconsistent and incompatible with the whole idea of expanding multilateral trade on the basis of comparative advantage.

We are convinced that a firm policy position must be taken by our Government against these nontariff trade barriers. At the very least this should involve the authority to react to such measures and to use similar measures against the goods of such countries to the extent that such action is necessary to bring about a return of fair trading principles for our poultry and other agricultural products.

In the past 5 or 6 years we have developed a multimillion-dollar poultry export market. This trade is vital to the poultry industry, which is the third largest producer of cash farm income in the Nation. This trade is likewise vital in helping our Nation meet its balance-of-payments problems. It is also beneficial to the economy of foreign countries in that it provides needed animal protein at reasonable costs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, certain Members of the Senate wish to speak on the bill following the third reading.

With the consent of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who now is on his feet, I shall yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], because he waited so that I might submit the amendment which was agreed to a moment ago.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. I have some morning hour business to submit for perhaps 4 or 5 minutes.

(Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Senate. His remarks appear elsewhere, under appropriate headings.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I propose to vote for this bill as it is now amended. I am certain that I speak for many of my colleages when I say that I vote with some misgivings. No one knows how this is going to work out. All of us hope for success. It places in the hands of the executive branch an unusual amount of discretion. It is claimed that this discretion will be exercised in the national interest. However, I would feel more secure if the guidelines of what is meant by the national interest were more definitely specified by the Congress, for it is in the Congress and not in the executive branch, that the determination of what is or is not in the national interest primarily reposes.

Let me sound a warning, Mr. President, that this bill, coupled with the kind of sound administration which we expect from it, will not solve our serious problem of declining gold reserves and imbalance of payments. It is going to have to be accompanied by sound fiscal policies, including a balanced Federal budget, to insure preservation of the purchasing power of our money, economy in Federal spending, and improved Federal tax laws which will provide an incentive to capital formation and investment.

It is reassuring to see that the bill contains several provisions calculated to protect our agricultural industry. This is as it should be. The President of the United States gave, as one of the reasons for asking for this legislation, the preservation and growth of our agricultural exports. The Common Market then adopted a most unfortunate policy of self-sufficiency in agriculture. Our trade negotiators must therefore drive

a hard bargain if the President's policy regarding agricultural exports is to be met. These provisions in the bill are designed to make sure that they do so.

Personally, I believe that too much emphasis has been given to this legislation on the plus side. There is a minus side, and we should not try to play it down at all. Estimates with respect to the impact on employment and unemployment have been made, and I suggest that these have been calculated on the optimistic side. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Policy, written in response to my request for information regarding forecasts with respect to future levels in U.S. trade and related employment. These forecasts were not forthcoming, and it is to be noted that the Deputy advises that there are no completed authoritative studies.

He does cite figures relating to 1960 employment related to exports and imports, and I suppose these furnish some basis for making projections. However, I find it difficult to understand why this legislation would be presented to us before authoritative studies providing reasonably accurate forecasts were completed. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that the following tables be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks: From the publication "Domestic Employment Attributable to U.S. Exports, 1960," published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, tables 2, 3, 4, and 5; and from the publication "Employment in Relation to U.S. Imports, 1960," also published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, tables 2, 3, 4, and 5.

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

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1962.

Hon. JACK MILLER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MILLER: In our conversation at the end of the briefing on the trade bill arranged by Senator MORSE, you expressed an interest in the relationship between foreign trade and employment and queried whether any forecasts had been made of future levels in U.S. trade and related employment.

Earlier this year the Labor Department published two studies estimating the number of jobs attributable to U.S. exports and imports in 1960. (Please see enclosures.)

In the export study, the Labor Department estimated that 3.1 million workers were required directly or indirectly to produce, transport, and market the $20.7 billion of merchandise exported by the United States in 1960. This estimate includes all American labor involved from the raw material stage to delivery of the export at the foreign port, but does not include the employment resulting from the income-generating effects of export-related employment, i.e., employment required to produce food, clothing, housing, etc., purchased by workers whose jobs are attributable to exports. (On the basis of this, it was estimated that about 150,000 jobs are generated for each additional billion dollars of exports.)

On the import side, Labor estimated that approximately 941,000 workers were supported by activities connected with the $15 billion of products imported in 1960. This estimate includes employment in: (1) the transporting, handling, and distributing of imports from the foreign ports through the U.S. ports to domestic factories that process imported raw materials and to wholesalers that import and distribute finished manufacturers; (2) supplying fuel and supplies to the trade and transportation sectors; (3) processing imported raw materials and semimanufacturers; and (4) replacing plant and equipment used up in these stages of handling imports. The processing estimate is limited to direct employment in the first-stage processing of imports considered primarily noncompetitive. It does not include the additional indirect employment involved in providing materials, supplies, and services for the processing of these imported materials. Thus, it was estimated that over 62,600 jobs are created for each additional billion dollars of imports.

The Labor Department study did not attempt to show a "net" effect of imports on employment, weighing both the positive and negative effects. It did, however, try to answer the hypothetical question, how much employment would be required to produce in the United States the $6.8 billion of "competitive" imports in 1960; i.e., all finished manufactures and selected raw materials and semimanufactures.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 1 million workers would be required to produce, in the United States, imports of all finished manufactures and other products considered "competitive" with domestically produced goods. It is important to note, however, that such hypothetical employment does not represent jobs lost by Americans as a result of imports. Estimation of actual jobs "lost" requires a different type of analysis involving investigation of actual changes in employment related to specific imports, the degree and precise character of the competition and the concurrent effect of changing productivity and demand. Research along these lines is being undertaken by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as part of the broad investigation of the impact of foreign trade on employment.

Secretary of Labor Goldberg, testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 13, perhaps best summed up the impact of foreign trade on employment when he said: "The total adds up to something like this—and again, I want to emphasize that these are conjectures all around because under no circumstances do I believe the Congress of the United States would choke off our exports and choke off our imports totally—but if we were to assume a total program of this type, we would find that we could lose on one side 4 million jobs and we might gain on the other side at most, if we did actually gain them—which is doubtful—800,000 to 900,000 jobs. We would have a net loss from this policy of at least 3 million jobs. In other words, the price of adding one job by a policy that would revert to erecting a trade wall around the United States, the price of adding one job, would be the loss from this policy of at least three to four jobs."

Turning to your query concerning foreign trade forecasts, I have been unable to locate any completed authoritative studies on this topic that have been published either in the Government or outside. I have learned, however, that Mr. Walter Salant of the Brookings Institution is preparing for the Council of Economic Advisers a study of U.S. balance-of-payments trends, which will include forecasts of our imports and exports. The study should be completed in November and it is anticipated that a report of its finding will be made public.

Please let me know if there is anything else you need in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

PETER T. JONES,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade Policy.

TABLE 2.—*Employment attributable to exports and total employment in the private economy, by industry group, 1960*

[In thousands]

Industry group	Employment attributable to exports			Total employment in the private economy [3]
	Direct [1]	Indirect [2]	Total	
Total employment [4]	1,467.1	1,614.6	3,081.7	52,865.0
Farm	539.6	401.8	941.4	7,145.0
Nonfarm	927.5	1,212.8	2,140.3	45,720.0
Mining	28.3	61.6	89.9	709.0
Manufacturing [5]	640.6	647.0	1,287.6	16,654.7
Food and kindred products	32.9	24.3	57.3	1,778.6
Tobacco manufactures	6.0	5.8	11.7	91.8
Textile mill products	27.3	20.0	47.3	944.1
Apparel and other finished products	17.8	5.7	23.5	1,246.0
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	11.6	26.4	38.0	624.7
Furniture and fixtures	2.8	2.3	5.1	370.9
Paper and allied products	13.1	26.7	39.8	597.1
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	6.4	24.6	30.9	894.7
Chemicals and allied products	46.2	69.5	115.7	804.7
Petroleum refining and related industries	6.6	10.1	16.7	237.1
Nonfarm—Continued				
Manufacturing [5]—Continued				
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	14.0	14.2	28.2	387.0
Leather and leather products	6.0	2.9	8.9	373.4
Stone, clay, and glass products	11.8	17.7	29.5	619.0
Primary metal industries	31.4	139.7	171.0	1,187.4
Fabricated metal products	28.1	44.2	72.3	1,120.2
Machinery, except electrical	154.2	69.8	224.0	1,448.4
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	57.1	35.2	92.4	1,326.3
Transportation equipment	[6] 104.4	27.5	131.9	1,687.5
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	27.0	6.4	33.4	327.3
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	[6] 36.0	6.9	42.9	594.8
Military (indirect)		[6] 67.2	67.2	(7)
Trade	120.3	78.3	198.6	9,786.0

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Employment attributable to exports and total employment in the private economy, by industry group, 1960*—Continued

[In thousands]

Industry group	Employment attributable to exports			Total employment in the private economy [3]
	Direct [1]	Indirect [2]	Total	
Nonfarm—Continued				
Transportation, including ocean (U.S. ships)	118.1	95.4	213.5	2,565.0
All other [8]	20.3	120.6	140.9	16,005.0
Employment attributable to replacement of plant and equipment consumed [9]		210.0	210.0	(7)

[1] Covers employment in producing, transporting, and marketing goods in the form in which exported, e.g., steel, automobiles, etc. Employment required for transportation of goods is included in transportation industry, and employment for marketing in trade industry.

[2] Covers employment in the supporting industries which produce, transport, and market the materials, parts, components, etc., which are used to make the products which are then exported. For example, the indirect employment in the steel industry is the employment required to make the steel which is not exported as steel but used to make automobiles, machinery, appliances, and fabricated steel products which are then exported.

[3] Farm employment estimates for 1960 from "Farm Labor," U.S. Department of Agriculture, and "Census of Agriculture," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; manufacturing employment estimates from 1959 "Survey of Manufactures," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; employment for remaining industry groups based on 1960 employment estimates by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, contained in "Employment and Earnings," November 1961.

[4] Covers all nonfarm wage and salary employment (excluding government) and total employment on farms, including farm operators, family workers, and employees. May exceed actual number of persons employed because of dual jobholding.

[5] Includes exports of major military end items such as military vehicles, aircraft, ships, and ordnance including small arms and ammunition. Of the total military direct employment of 65,900 workers, about 39,600 are in transportation equipment industry group and 26,300 in ordnance and miscellaneous manufacturing.

[6] The indirect employment required to produce major military exports was not estimated in detail but as an overall figure and therefore could not be distributed to the individual industry groups. For this reason, the indirect employment shown for military goods industries does not refer to indirect employment in the military goods industries but to indirect employment in the industries supplying materials, parts, components, etc., to the military goods industries. Because the indirect employment resulting from military exports could not be distributed to the individual supporting industries, estimates of indirect employment in each of these industries are understated to some extent and the share of industry employment attributable to exports is also understated.

[7] Not available.

[8] Covers utilities, communications, all business services, forestry, fisheries, agricultural services, and contract construction.

[9] Employment required to replace plant and equipment used up in the course of producing, transporting, and marketing the goods exported from the United States was estimated as an overall total and therefore could not be distributed to individual industry groups. Because employment could not be distributed to machinery and construction industries, and supporting industries, estimates of indirect employment in each of these industries are understated.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, individual values may not add to total.

TABLE 3.—*Percent distribution of employment attributable to exports and total employment in the private economy, by industry group,*[1] *1960*

Industry group	Employment attributable to exports			Total employment in the private economy
	Direct	Indirect	Total	
Total employment	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Farm	36.8	24.9	30.5	13.5
Nonfarm	63.2	75.1	69.5	86.5
Mining	1.9	3.8	2.9	1.3
Manufacturing	43.7	40.1	41.8	31.5
Food and kindred products	2.2	1.5	1.9	3.4
Tobacco manufactures	.4	.4	.4	.2
Textile mill products	1.9	1.2	1.5	1.8
Apparel and other finished products	1.2	.4	.8	2.4
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	.8	1.6	1.2	1.2
Furniture and fixtures	.2	.1	.2	.7
Paper and allied products	.9	1.7	1.3	1.1
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	.4	1.5	1.0	1.7
Chemicals and allied products	3.1	4.3	3.8	1.5
Petroleum refining and related industries	.4	.6	.5	.5
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	1.0	.9	.9	.7
Leather and leather products	.4	.2	.3	.7
Nonfarm—Continued				
Manufacturing—Continued				
Stone, clay, and glass products	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.2
Primary metal industries	2.1	8.7	5.5	2.2
Fabricated metal products	1.9	2.7	2.3	2.1
Machinery, except electrical	10.5	4.3	7.3	2.7
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	3.9	2.2	3.0	2.5
Transportation equipment	7.1	1.7	4.3	3.2
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	1.8	.4	1.1	.6
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	2.5	.4	1.4	1.1
Military (indirect)		4.2	2.2	(2)
Trade	8.2	4.8	6.4	18.5
Transportation, including ocean (U.S. ships)	8.0	5.9	6.9	4.8
All other	1.4	7.5	4.6	30.3
Employment attributable to replacement of plant and equipment consumed		13.0	6.8	(2)

[1] Percent distribution based on table 2.
[2] Not available.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, percentages may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Direct and indirect employment as percent of total employment attributable to exports, by industry group, 1960* [1]

Industry group	Employment attributable to exports [2]	
	Direct	Indirect
Total employment	47.6	52.4
Farm	57.3	42.7
Nonfarm	43.3	56.7
Mining	31.5	68.5
Manufacturing	49.6	50.4
Food and kindred products	57.5	42.5
Tobacco manufactures	50.8	49.2
Textile mill products	57.8	42.2
Apparel and other finished products	75.7	24.3
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	30.6	69.4
Furniture and fixtures	54.8	45.2
Paper and allied products	32.8	67.2
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	20.5	79.5
Chemicals and allied products	39.9	60.1
Petroleum refining and related industries	39.5	60.5
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	49.6	50.4
Leather and leather products	67.7	32.3
Nonfarm—Continued		
Manufacturing—Continued		
Stone, clay, and glass products	40.0	60.0
Primary metal industries	18.4	81.6
Fabricated metal products	38.8	61.2
Machinery, except electrical	68.8	31.2
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	61.8	38.2
Transportation equipment	79.2	20.8
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	80.9	19.1
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	83.9	16.1
Military (indirect)		100.0
Trade	60.6	39.4
Transportation, including ocean (U.S. ships)	55.3	44.7
All other	14.4	85.6
Employment attributable to replacement of plant and equipment consumed		100.0

[1] Percent distribution based on table 2.
[2] Total employment attributable to exports equals 100 percent.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

TABLE 5.—*Employment attributable to exports as percent of total employment in the private economy, by industry group,*[1] *1960*

Industry group	Employment attributable to exports			Total employment in the private economy
	Direct	Indirect	Total	
Total employment	2.8	3.1	5.8	100.0
Farm	7.6	5.6	13.2	100.0
Nonfarm	2.0	2.7	4.7	100.0
Mining	4.0	8.7	12.7	100.0
Manufacturing	3.8	3.9	7.7	100.0
Food and kindred products	1.8	1.4	3.2	100.0
Tobacco manufactures	6.5	6.3	12.8	100.0
Textile mill products	2.9	2.1	5.0	100.0
Apparel and other finished products	1.4	.5	1.9	100.0
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	1.9	4.2	6.1	100.0
Furniture and fixtures	.8	.6	1.4	100.0
Paper and allied products	2.2	4.5	6.7	100.0
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	.7	2.8	3.5	100.0
Chemicals and allied products	5.7	8.6	14.4	100.0
Petroleum refining and related industries	2.8	4.2	7.0	100.0
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	3.6	3.7	7.3	100.0
Leather and leather products	1.6	.8	2.4	100.0
Nonfarm—Continued				
Manufacturing—Continued				
Stone, clay, and glass products	1.9	2.9	4.8	100.0
Primary metal industries	2.6	11.8	14.4	100.0
Fabricated metal products	2.5	4.0	6.4	100.0
Machinery, except electrical	10.7	4.8	15.5	100.0
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	4.3	2.7	7.0	100.0
Transportation equipment	6.3	1.6	7.8	100.0
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	8.3	2.0	10.2	100.0
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	6.1	1.2	7.2	100.0
Military (indirect)	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Trade	1.2	.8	2.0	100.0
Transportation, including ocean (U.S. ships)	4.6	3.7	8.3	100.0
All other	.1	.8	.9	100.0
Employment atrributable to replacement of plant and equipment consumed	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]

[1] Percent distribution based on table 2.
[2] Not available.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, percentages may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated employment attributable to imports, 1960*

[Thousands]

Item	Employment
Total employment related to imports	941.2
Employment related to U.S. ocean and other transportation to U.S. port [1]	26.3
U.S. cargo insurance [2]	3.0
Domestic transportation	67.4
Wholesale trade	98.2
Activities of supplying industries [3]	60.4
Employment involved in 1st-stage processing of "supporting" imports [4]	618.7
Employment related to replacement of plant and equipment consumed [5]	67.2

[1] Covers transportation of U.S. imports on U.S. planes, trains, and flag-flying ships; and unloading of U.S. imports.
[2] Covers insurance of U.S. imports by U.S. insurers.
[3] Covers employment indirectly generated through U.S. transportation, insurance, and trade of U.S. imports. This employment was estimated as an overall total and, therefore, could not be distributed to individual industry groups.
[4] "Supporting" imports as defined by U.S. Department of Commerce. See definition in technical note.
[5] Covers employment required to replace plant and equipment used up in the course of U.S. transportation, insurance, and trade of U.S. imports and in first-stage processing of "supporting" imports. This employment was estimated as an overall total and, therefore, could not be distributed to individual industry groups.

TABLE 3.—*Assignment of "competitive" imports to comparable U.S. industry sectors, 1960*

[Millions]

Type of "competitive" import	Value
U.S. port value of imports of finished manufactures and other products considered competitive with domestically produced goods [1]	$6,808.6
Distribution to comparable U.S. producing sectors:	
Farm	241.5
Nonfarm	6,567.1
Mining	147.1
Manufacturing	6,247.4
Food and kindred products	429.9
Tobacco manufactures	25.5
Textile mill products	797.4
Apparel and other finished products	422.2
Lumber and wood products, excluding furniture	174.9
Furniture and fixtures	34.3
Paper and allied products	98.7
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	43.3
Distribution—Continued	
Nonfarm—Continued	
Manufacturing—Continued	
Chemicals and allied products	$435.9
Petroleum refining and related products	97.0
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	183.1
Leather and leather products	142.3
Stone, clay, and glass products	263.9
Primary metal industries	570.8
Fabricated metal products	239.2
Machinery, except electrical	398.1
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	389.5
Transportation equipment	844.8
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	247.2
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	409.4
All other [2]	172.6

[1] "Competitive" imports are all finished manufactured products and other selected raw materials and semimanufactured products considered directly "competitive" with American-made goods.
[2] Includes forestry and fisheries.

Source: "U.S. Commodity Exports and Imports as Related to Output, 1958," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1962).

TABLE 4.—*Hypothetical employment required to produce and market in the United States all finished manufactures and other products considered "competitive" with domestically produced goods* [1]

[Thousands]

Industry group	Employment		
	Direct [2]	Indirect [3]	Total
U.S. employment required to produce imports	439.5	550.4	989.9
Farm	87.1	103.9	191.0
Mining	4.0	19.3	23.3
Manufacturing	332.1	256.6	588.7
Food and kindred products	12.7	7.8	20.5
Tobacco manufactures	1.6	.5	2.1
Textile mill products	48.9	26.6	75.5
Apparel and other finished products	37.0	8.8	45.8
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	13.6	12.8	46.4
Furniture and fixtures	2.7	1.4	4.1
Manufacturing—Continued			
Paper and allied products	3.8	11.8	15.6
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	2.1	11.5	13.6
Chemicals and allied products	12.4	27.9	40.3
Petroleum refining and related industries	1.2	2.4	3.6
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	12.8	7.2	20.0
Leather and leather products	13.3	4.1	17.4
Stone, clay, and glass products	23.3	10.4	33.7
Primary metal industries	18.8	50.2	69.0
Fabricated metal products	12.8	18.4	31.2
Machinery, except electrical	22.8	17.3	40.1

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—*Hypothetical employment required to produce and market in the United States all finished manufactures and other products considered "competitive" with domestically produced goods* [1]—Continued

[Thousands]

Industry group	Employment		
	Direct [2]	Indirect [3]	Total
Manufacturing—Continued			
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	23.5	12.5	36.0
Transportation equipment	25.0	11.7	36.7
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	14.3	5.1	19.4
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	29.5	8.2	37.7
Trade		26.2	26.2
Transportation		31.3	31.3
All other [4]	16.3	39.4	55.7
Employment attributable to replacement of plant and equipment consumed		73.7	73.7
U.S. employment necessary to transport and distribute imports from factory to wholesalers	62.7	20.3	83.0
Trade	42.5		43.5
Transportation	20.2		20.2
All other [5]		20.3	20.3
Total	502.2	570.7	1,072.9

[1] See technical note for U.S. Department of Commerce definition of "competitive" imports.
[2] Covers employment which would be required to produce, transport, and market goods in the form in which imported.
[3] Covers employment in the supplying industries which produce, transport, and market the materials, parts and components, etc., which would be used to make the products imported.
[4] Includes employment in insurance, forestry, fisheries, and agricultural services.
[5] Represents employment estimated as an aggregate and not distributed among separate industries.

TABLE 5.—*Employment attributable to exports and total employment* [1] *in the private economy, by industry group, 1960*

[In thousands]

Industry group	Employment attributable to exports			Total employment in the private economy [4]	Percent of employment attributable to exports		
	Direct [2]	Indirect [3]	Total		Direct	Indirect	Total
Total employment [1]	1,467.1	1,614.6	3,081.7	52,865.0	2.8	3.1	5.8
Farm	539.6	401.8	941.4	7,145.0	7.6	5.6	13.2
Nonfarm	927.5	1,212.8	2,140.3	45,720.0	2.0	2.7	4.7
Mining	28.3	61.6	89.9	709.0	4.0	8.7	12.7
Manufacturing [5]	640.6	647.0	1,287.6	16,654.7	3.8	3.9	7.7
Food and kindred products	32.9	24.3	57.3	1,778.6	1.8	1.4	3.2
Tobacco manufactures	6.0	5.8	11.7	91.8	6.5	6.3	12.8
Textile mill products	27.3	20.0	47.3	944.1	2.9	2.1	5.0
Apparel and other finished products	17.8	5.7	23.5	1,246.0	1.4	.5	1.9
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	11.6	26.4	38.0	624.7	1.9	4.2	6.1
Furniture and fixtures	2.8	2.3	5.1	370.9	.8	.6	1.4
Paper and allied products	13.1	26.7	39.8	597.1	2.2	4.5	6.7
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	6.4	24.6	30.9	894.7	.7	2.8	3.5
Chemicals and allied products	46.2	69.5	115.7	804.7	5.7	8.6	14.4
Petroleum refining and related industries	6.6	10.1	16.7	237.1	2.8	4.2	7.0
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	14.0	14.2	28.2	387.0	3.6	3.7	7.3
Leather and leather products	6.0	2.9	8.9	373.4	1.6	.8	2.4
Stone, clay, and glass products	11.8	17.7	29.5	619.0	1.9	2.9	4.8
Primary metal industries	31.4	139.7	171.0	1,187.4	2.6	11.8	14.4
Fabricated metal products	28.1	44.2	72.3	1,120.2	2.5	4.0	6.4
Machinery, except electrical	154.2	69.8	224.0	1,448.4	10.7	4.8	15.5
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	57.1	35.2	92.4	1,326.3	4.3	2.7	7.0
Transportation equipment	[6] 104.4	27.5	131.9	1,687.5	6.2	1.6	7.8
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments	27.0	6.4	33.4	327.3	8.3	2.0	10.2
Miscellaneous manufacturing and ordnance	[6] 36.0	6.9	42.9	594.8	6.1	1.2	7.2
Military (indirect)		[6] 67.2	67.2	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)
Trade [8]	120.3	78.3	198.6	9,786.0	1.2	.8	2.0
Transportation, including ocean (U.S. ships)	118.1	95.4	213.5	2,565.0	4.6	3.7	8.3
All other [9]	20.3	120.6	140.9	16,005.0	.1	.8	.9
Employment attributable to replacement of plant and equipment consumed [10]		210.0	210.0	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)

[1] Covers all nonfarm wage and salary employment (excluding government) and total employment on farms, including farm operators, family workers, and employees. May exceed actual number of persons employed because of dual jobholding.
[2] Covers employment for producing, transporting, and marketing goods in the form in which exported, e.g., steel, automobiles, etc. Employment required for transportation of goods is included in transportation industry, and employment for marketing in trade industry.
[3] Covers employment in the supporting industries which produce, transport, and market the materials, components, etc., which are used to make the products which are then exported. For example, the indirect employment in the steel industry is the employment required to make the steel which is not exported as steel but used to make automobiles, machinery, appliances and fabricated steel products which are then exported.
[4] Farm employment estimates for 1960 from "Farm Labor," U.S. Department of Agriculture, and "Census of Agriculture," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; manufacturing employment estimates from 1959 "Survey of Manufactures," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; employment for nonmanufacturing industry groups based on 1960 employment estimates by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, contained in "Employment and Earnings," November 1961.
[5] Includes exports of major military end items such as military vehicles, aircraft, ships, and ordnance including small arms and ammunition. Of the total military direct employment of 65,900 workers, about 39,600 are in the transportation equipment industry group and 26,300 in ordnance and miscellaneous manufacturing.
[6] The indirect employment required to produce major military exports was not estimated in detail but as an overall figure and therefore could not be distributed to the individual industry groups. For this reason, the indirect employment shown for military goods industries does not refer to indirect employment in that industry but to indirect employment in the industries supplying materials, parts, components, etc., to the military goods industries. Because the indirect employment resulting from military exports could not be distributed to the individual supporting industries, estimates of indirect employment in each of these industries are understated to some extent and the share of industry employment attributable to exports is also understated.
[7] Not available.
[8] Excluding eating and drinking establishments.
[9] Covers utilities, communications, all business services, forestry, fisheries, agricultural services, and contract construction.
[10] Employment required to replace plant and equipment used up in the course of producing, transporting, and marketing the goods exported was estimated as an overall total and therefore could not be distributed to individual industry groups. Because employment could not be distributed to machinery and construction industries and supporting industries, estimates of indirect employment in each of these industries are understated.

NOTE: Because of rounding, individual values may not add to total.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review, March 1962, p. 277.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE AT 1:30 P.M.

During the delivery of Mr. RANDOLPH'S remarks,

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to cooperate with the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request I am about to make be printed before the address by the Senator from West Virginia, so that his address will not lose its continuity. It is too fine an address to be interrupted in its printing, but I believe the request I have to make is important.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the question of

passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 be held at 1:30 this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Without objection, the normal quorum call will be waived.

Without objection, the agreement is entered into.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if perchance any Senator seems to be foreclosed, the leadership will feel free at that time to ask for an extension.

UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION THREATENS AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL AIR CARRIERS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members of this forum will, within a few hours, exercise affirmative action on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I am sure that Senators on both sides of the aisle, although differing in their approach to this problem, realize the vital importance of increased international trade to international peace and prosperity, and to our country's economy.

I shall support the pending measure. During my service in the House my approval was given to reciprocal trade legislation. The results of such programs have not been completely satisfactory. In fact, I was almost persuaded to join in support of one or more amendments which were before us for decision during the past 2 days.

We desire—all of us—a bill incorporating provisions which are, insofar as possible, aimed at providing equitable treatment.

The pending proposal has been discussed in terms of its provisions for the lowering of U.S. tariffs on foreign goods. This is only one of its features, but it is misleading to emphasize this one objective while ignoring the more fundamental purposes of the legislation.

Mr. President, actually, we are considering a new venture in international trade relations which we believe would provide greater flexibility in the setting of tariffs on foreign products in exchange for the comparable removal of foreign barriers against American goods. Our hope is to increase total international trade and to expand U.S. exports.

The principle of reciprocity is basic to the Trade Expansion Act. It is not a giveaway program; nor is it a unilateral lowering of our defenses against oversea competition. It will provide for a business-like and realistic relationship between the United States and those nations of the world with which we now trade or might trade in the future.

I am interested in the welfare of the workers and the industries of the United States. Fundamentally, pertinent provisions of the pending measure represent a recognition of this interest—which I know is likewise shared by my colleagues.

But I am concerned that the interest in the welfare of U.S. workers and industries contemplated to be a characteristic of the trade expansion program might be ignored in the area of international aviation.

Mr. President, we must not overlook the fact that international aviation is a vital element of world trade. It is important because of its role in transporting commodities and persons in furtherance of world travel and commerce. It is necessary that we understand that the exchange of international air services represents as direct an impact on our balance-of-payments position as does the exchange of a physical commodity.

The sale of U.S.-flag airline services to an American citizen has the same effect as the purchase of a U.S. product rather than the purchase of a foreign manufactured item. Such air passage sales conserved $305 million in 1961. Similarly, the sale of U.S.-flag airline services to a foreign traveler or shipper has the identical beneficial effect as the sale abroad of any commodity produced or manufactured in this country. In 1961, these purchases amounted to an estimated $150 million. Thus, the combined balance-of-payments contribution of the U.S.-flag airlines last year was nearly one-half billion dollars.

While the Congress has been considering the President's trade expansion bill, this administration has been conducting a study of U.S. international aviation policies. Such an analysis is critically needed because of the seriously declining share of international traffic being carried by U.S.-flag airlines.

In 1961, over 61 percent of all international travelers were citizens of the United States. Notwithstanding this fact, our airlines carried less than one-half of all international air travelers. The two U.S. passenger air transport companies serving the North Atlantic market in competition with 18 foreign airlines, carried only 34 percent of the commercial air traffic. This downward trend is a warning to all citizens of our country that such a condition must be remedied if our carriers are to build a strong system and provide for its constant improvement. In fact, the very existence of U.S. international or American-flag ship lines is threatened.

Mr. President, the situation has come about despite the fact that international aviation services are operated on the basis of agreements between the United States and foreign nations that provide for the equal exchange of economic benefits.

Has there, in effect, been an equal exchange of economic benefits? I respond to this question by presenting the following facts and figures.

If a person took the time to think these facts through, he would realize the consequences are shocking to a republic such as the United States of America in a time of mobility, not only in the movement of products and people in this country, and on the international air routes of the world. Therefore, I ask Senators to be concerned with me when I indicate that the U.S.-flag airlines earned $149 million for transporting citizens of other countries last year, but American citizens paid $299 million for transportation on foreign flag airlines. This resulted in a balance-of-payments deficit of $150 million in the year 1961.

Will our air travel be dissipated as has our oceanic surface transportation?

I set down the uncontested truth as follows:

In 1961, U.S. sea carriers earned only $18 million for transporting foreign citizens, while U.S. citizens paid $216 million to foreign carriers for a balance-of-payments deficit of $198 million last year.

The problem is critical. I do not call, however, for restrictionism or protectionism for U.S. air carriers on international air routes. I urge only that the principle of reciprocity that characterizes the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 be held to apply to international aviation matters.

I would hope that while Senators are acting favorably on President Kennedy's trade expansion plan that the international aviation policy study group, established by the Chief Executive, will keep intact in its thinking the principle of the trade bill in focus during its deliberations and in making its recommendations. To do less would be to do acute damage to our American air carriers which fly the world routes.

The problems facing the United States and its international airlines have, in fact, become of increasing concern to the Congress. Under the leadership of the knowledgeable Senators who are the chairman and ranking minority members of the Aviation Subcommittee—the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]—the subcommittee has begun to come to grips with the issues which cannot be postponed 10 years or 5 years, but issues which must be faced by our Government immediately. The ranking majority member of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], likewise has for years been alert in bringing these issues to the attention of the Congress. Under a resolution by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], hearings were held last year by the Aviation Subcommittee to define and focus attention on the broad problems involved in the international air picture. Disclosures emphasized the destructive foreign-flag airline capacity and rate practices.

Troubles of this type cause the industry to suggest that additional tools be given the Civil Aeronautics Board to deal with these practices. Two bills introduced by the capable chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator MAGNUSON, would clarify and strengthen the Board's authority in the capacity and foreign rate fields. Both of these steps are urgently needed as desirable.

These measures are necessary as initial steps if our Government is to have the virile air transport system it requires for its national defense and to build its economic strength.

Our American air carriers are faced with the inequity of competing with the airlines of foreign nations which have created discriminatory or unreasonable obstacles to U.S. carriers. This is not a generality. I propose to spell out these discriminations and unreasonable obstacles. Hearings before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee in 1961 revealed that the following countries discriminatorily limit or restrict our air carrier schedules: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Finland, India, In-

donesia, Japan, Korea, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Philippines, Portugal, Turkey, and Venezuela.

In addition to these 18 countries there are instances where foreign governments do not permit U.S. airlines to serve routes between their country and ours and thereby preserve monopoly routes for themselves.

The danger of excess capacity, particularly on the North Atlantic route, is becoming critical, partly because of scheduling by some carriers in excess of that provided for in the bilateral agreement. It is also being aggravated by the increasing number of airlines desiring access to the heavy traffic on this route, most of which is U.S. generated. As I have indicated, in 1961 there were 18 foreign carriers on this route outnumbering our country's passenger carriers by a ratio of 9 to 1.

There are approximately a dozen other countries which already have rights which have not yet been exercised. For example, Greece, Egypt, Mexico, Turkey, Portugal, Austria, Lebanon, and Nationalist China are among those which have negotiated rights to fly to and from the United States over the Atlantic, but have not activated them.

There are also 16 emerging countries in Africa that were not independent a couple of years ago. Most of them want their own international airlines. Their patriotic fervor and their eagerness to fly their flag are understandable. I sometimes wonder, when we help a nation which is barely in the concept of the 20th century, to acquire jets for intercontinental air service to London and New York, whether we have fully considered that the same expenditures on our part to improve their standards of living, might not have been more useful to them and to all mankind.

I am not saying these countries do not have the right to operate international airlines. However, it does seem ironic for the United States, directly or indirectly, to subsidize such operations in competition with our own carriers. Moreover, the fact is that most of these nations are sorely in need of capital for domestic economic growth. It does not seem prudent to squander their resources to operate, for prestige purposes, uneconomic airlines which will benefit relatively few of their people.

Another major problem brought into focus by the Aviation Subcommittee's hearing results from destructive rate practices. Assistant Secretary of State Martin said the condition "has become critical in recent years" and "the effect of these rate-cutting practices has been to divert passengers from U.S. carriers." This result has two aspects, the one related to International Air Transport Association carriers; the other to non-IATA carriers.

The first of these arises from rate cutting by IATA members who charge rates that have not been approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Machinery to deal with this problem already exists, and, in fact, is being effectively dealt with as a result of the recent annual general meeting of IATA in Dublin. The second and more difficult problem stems from practices by non-IATA carriers over which our Government has failed to exercise control.

The legislation introduced by Chairman MAGNUSON, to which I have referred, would give our Government the necessary tools to deal with these rate and capacity problems. It would not erect any artificial barriers to trade and commerce for the sake only of protecting our carriers. It provides our Government with added bargaining power comparable to that provided under the pending trade bill, which will shortly be passed by the Senate.

There is need for our country to have improved negotiating power, because, beside the problems of rate and capacity, we have the fact that U.S. carriers must compete against foreign government-owned or subsidized airlines, both individually and in pools.

We are told that $2 billion in U.S. farm exports to Europe are at stake in the avowed plans of the European Common Market to integrate its agriculture. We are also informed of the efforts of the United Kingdom and additional European states to join that Economic Community within the next 6 months. Therefore, Mr. President, we must consider the avowed plans of the Common Market countries, especially France, Italy, Germany, and Belgium, to integrate international airline operations. They propose to pool routes and traffic, interchange equipment, concentrate sales, overhaul and maintenance facilities, and accentuate efforts to penetrate the rich U.S. travel market even more deeply than at present, while cutting operating costs in the process.

In the Dutch Parliament in recent weeks, legislation providing some $10 million in direct loans to KLM Royal Dutch Airlines has been approved, along with loan guarantees for a much larger sum. In the course of debate, it was stated that KLM would eventually join Air Union, the combine of Air France, Sabena, Lufthansa, and Alitalia. Why? we can ask. And the answer is because integration would inevitably be necessary to more effectively compete and slash operating costs.

The Government-owned British Overseas Airways Corp. has acquired Cunard's airline on a 70- to 30-percent ownership basis. The purpose: to make BOAC and associated British Commonwealth long-haul carriers better able to compete vigorously in the aggressively competitive transatlantic market. Air France is receiving supplemental appropriations from the French Government—and we know the French Government is beset with many problems—to increase its working capital from 100 million new francs to 400 million new francs.

We lift our sights beyond the immediate but critical horizon and we see the rising of the red star of the Communist airline, Aeroflot, already the largest airline in the world. I repeat: The Soviet Union, through Aeroflot, operates the largest airline in the world. Aeroflot is introducing nonstop service between Havana and Moscow, using the turboprop TU–114, the huge plane which brought Chairman Khrushchev to Andrews Air Force Base from Russia a few years ago. Those of us who have traveled in Europe in the past 4 years have become accustomed to seeing twin-jet TU–104's at airports in many Western capitals.

The Soviet economic and political penetration is symbolized by the expansion of Soviet airline operations, an expansion which is a fact. We witness as well the use of Soviet military and commercial aircraft equipment, including engines and airframes, in many areas of the world. This is a danger signal. Will we heed it?

I have outlined some of the problems, and have shown the similarity between our trade policy and our international air transport policy.

To be successfully implemented, both the trade policy and the international air transport policy required the strong and active support of the U.S. Government, the Government acting through an awakened understanding on the part of all our citizens of the situation in which we find ourselves. Both policies require reciprocal international concessions. Both require the lifting of foreign restrictions imposed on American goods and services. Both require equal market opportunity between nations. Both require strict compliance with agreements between nations. Both require effective bargaining. Both require safeguards to protect the national interest of the United States. Both require dedicated and resourceful negotiators. Both require the strongest possible negotiating position. Both require energetic and imaginative American salesmanship, which today is being stifled because of practices which, as I have indicated, are unfair in marked degree.

The Interagency Committee on International Air Transport Policy must not fail to understand these fundamental similarities between our overall foreign trade policy and our international air transport policy.

Mr. President, Americans are supposed to be good businessmen. I believe that, by and large, we have proved that to be true. It has been said in rather plain language that we are good horse traders. Sometimes we wonder at the results, but we do know that we are more than willing to go to great lengths to help less fortunate peoples raise their economic standards and enhance their personal freedoms. But we must not abandon our national interest in the process. I submit that this is a time of crisis, and we must be resourceful and realistic in meeting the challenge. To do less is to fail. That we must not do.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the trade expansion bill. I do so because I believe this proposed legislation represents a balanced program for a national trade policy. As a Senator from a State which grew on trade, but has felt the adverse effects of foreign competition, I can appreciate the advantages of expanded trade, and, at the same time, I understand the problems which such trade can create.

I do not need to remind my colleagues of the benefits of international trade. Even those who have doubts about the present bill agree, I believe, that our Nation must trade, in order to continue its economic growth. We need raw materials from other lands; we shall benefit

from expanded markets overseas; healthy competition between domestic and foreign manufacturers can bring us improved products at lower prices; and the strength of the free world, I am sure, will be increased by the bonds of commerce.

But to sing the praises of trade expansion is not to ignore the prices it exacts. Wherever there is competition in the marketplace, someone must adjust. Not everyone can win. Someone may be hurt.

Because we are concerned about the human cost involved in economic competition, we have devised ways and means of softening the blows of economic adversity in domestic legislation. We have unemployment compensation programs, aid for small business, and area redevelopment legislation, for example, all of which are designed to help individuals and businesses adjust to changing conditions of competition.

The administration's trade bill, as introduced, recognized that international trade would involve adjustments. Under the Trade Agreements Act, escape-clause proceedings were included, to enable the President to provide protection for domestic industries when the going was too rough and the competition from abroad impossible to meet in the normal play of the market.

The trade expansion bill added a new program comparable to our area redevelopment program, under the adjustment assistance provisions of the bill. For the first time, the Federal Government indicated that it was prepared to assume the responsibility of direct assistance where economic injury was traceable to national trade policy.

The House of Representatives improved upon the original bill, particularly in the field of general negotiating authority for increases in duties and quotas, the escape clause, and in the prenegotiating protection procedures.

Even so, I felt that H.R. 11970 fell short of meeting particular problems which industries in my own State and in other States confronted in the field of foreign trade. In the State of Maine, many of our communities have a single industry. Individual plants are faced by consistent competitive pressure from overseas, especially from the low-wage countries. This competition is severe in textiles, shoes, forest products, and electronics. As small businesses, these companies have narrow survival margins.

In recent years they have found that not only the volume of imports but also the rate of expansion of imports has disrupted markets and threatened them with economic ruin. What they need is not gigantic walls of protection, shielding them forever from the world market, but sufficient protection to shelter them while they adjust to changing conditions.

Some have said that such industries are inefficient, that they might as well be allowed to go out of business quickly, rather than lingering. This is a proposition I cannot accept. Maine industry and Maine workers can compete if they are given a fair chance.

In towns where there is but one industry, where economic resources are limited, adjustment assistance may come too late to restore the economic health of the community. Our experience with the area redevelopment program, while encouraging, demonstrates that the road back to prosperity is a long and hard one.

It has been my belief that neither high tariffs of extreme protectionism nor adjustment assistance after the loss of industries represented a complete and adequate answer to the problem of economic injury resulting from changes in trade patterns.

Almost a year and one-half ago, I introduced S. 1735, the Orderly Marketing Act. This legislation was designed to give the President specific authority to negotiate orderly marketing agreements with foreign countries where such agreements could provide reasonable protection against sudden increases in imports, without closing the door against reasonable import competition from abroad. This legislation, which was cosponsored by Senators TALMADGE, CHAVEZ, SMATHERS, BUSH, LONG of Louisiana, BARTLETT, WILEY, MCCARTHY, BIBLE, and MCGEE, had the support of the shoe industry, in particular.

I want to pause here to pay tribute to the shoe manufacturers and to the shoe workers who have supported this concept, not as an impassable barrier to trade, but as a reasonable approach to an orderly sharing of our domestic market, even under difficult conditions.

S. 1735 was directly related to the problem of low-wage-cost competition. It offered a formula for negotiating with foreign countries agreements which would relate the level of imports of a given commodity to the share of the domestic market currently enjoyed by such imports. The marketing agreements would permit an increase in imports in line with expanding domestic consumption. This proposal was comparable in principle to the Geneva Textile Agreements, concluded earlier this year.

Subsequent to the introduction of the Orderly Marketing Act, the Trade Expansion Act was submitted to the Congress. I urged that the principle of orderly marketing be incorporated in the trade legislation. To accomplish this purpose, on August 2, I submitted an amendment to H.R. 11970. The new amendment was designed to carry out, within the framework of the general trade bill, the intent of the Orderly Marketing Act. I was pleased to have bipartisan cosponsorship of this amendment, including Senators BARTLETT, CHAVEZ, COTTON, DODD, MURPHY, PASTORE, PELL, WILEY, LONG of Missouri, and RANDOLPH.

An August 14, I testified before the Senate Committee on Finance, urging that the orderly marketing agreement principle be incorporated by the Committee on Finance in H.R. 11970. I was deeply gratified, 1 month later, on September 14, when the committee adopted an amendment adding section 352 to the bill.

Section 352, as the committee report points out, gives "the President discretionary authority to enter into orderly marketing agreements with foreign countries, limiting the export of certain articles to the United States where such agreements offer an appropriate device to prevent or remedy serious injury to domestic industries found to be injured under the escape clause procedure."

The committee also has improved the escape clause, to make clear that trade agreements need not be the sole cause of injury, in order for an industry to seek relief. This was accomplished by the amendments which require that injury result only "in major part" from trade concessions. Furthermore, the industry need not be "down and out," to be eligible for relief. The committee language notes that the Tariff Commission take into account the "inability to operate at a reasonable profit."

In effect, the Senate Committee on Finance has recognized that international trade and the conditions of such trade are changing. With the development of modern industrial plants overseas, we no longer have an absolute advantage in industrial efficiency, especially in areas where wage costs represent a substantial part of the costs of production.

Under the bill, as reported by the committee, an industry injured or threatened with injury from imports has three kinds of relief available to it under the escape-clause procedures. The first is the imposition of tariffs or other import restrictions. The second is the orderly marketing agreement. The third is adjustment assistance.

The second alternative, that of the orderly marketing agreements, represents meaningful protection for the substantial group of industries confronted with low-wage competition from highly industrialized and efficient operations overseas. At the same time, it will not shut the door to foreign trade; but it will assure foreign manufacturers an opportunity to share in the orderly growth of our domestic market.

Traditionally, American industry has maintained a substantial advantage over foreign competition, even in low-wage areas, because of the relatively higher productivity of American labor. Since the end of World War II, we have seen that advantage whittled away as foreign companies have acquired modern plants and equipment—many times, equivalent to our own.

The experience of the shoe industry illustrates what happens when an efficient, highly competitive domestic industry is hit by efficient, highly competitive imports from countries where labor output is high and wages are low.

Imports of footwear, leather, and nonleather types, have increased 234.5 percent since 1957—from 11 million pairs in 1957 to 36.8 million pairs in 1961. For the first 6 months of 1962 they have more than doubled the rate of the comparable period of 1 year ago. While imports have been increasing, our exports have dropped from 4.4 million pairs in 1957 to 3 million pairs in 1961.

The impact of such competition must be measured, not only in terms of the volume of imports, but also in the rate of expansion and the ability of the foreign competitor to concentrate on certain lines of production and to shift rapidly from one line to another. The key to the problem is market disruption.

The orderly marketing agreement procedure under section 352 provides a tool for the President to use, in cases in which the device as practicable, in halting market chaos and in giving domestic manufacturers a breathing space in which to adjust to changing competitive conditions.

As the committee report has noted, the orderly marketing agreement approach is particularly applicable "when industries concerned have relatively low capital investment, high labor input, and manufacturing techniques which are easily transferred and labor skills which are easily acquired, and in which there is a tendency to overproduction for the world market. In such industries rapid expansion is possible and these industries are frequently characterized by substantial wage differentials as between countries."

Mr. President, I believe this amendment represents a constructive contribution to the cause of realistic and meaningful trade expansion. It has the enthusiastic support of the shoe industry. I have here seven telegrams from the industry indicating its reaction to the incorporation of section 352 in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SUMMIT, N.J., *September 18, 1962.*
Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on Finance Committee acceptance of principles of your amendment for orderly marketing. This represents a sound and constructive achievement. We believe shoe manufacturing industry will welcome this measure as providing basis for ultimate import relief.

MERRILL A. WATSON,
Executive Vice President, National Shoe Manufacturing Association.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

BOSTON, MASS., *September 18, 1962.*
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our association extends heartiest congratulations to you on Senate Finance Committee's acceptance of your amendment providing for orderly marketing arrangements by the President. This action is a constructive achievement and culminates months of personal effort which have proven successful. We believe shoe manufacturing industry will welcome this measure as providing basis for ultimate important relief by the administration.

Your support of the shoe industry is deeply appreciated by fellow officers.

MAXWELL FIELD,
New England Shoe and Leather Association.

PORTLAND, MAINE, *September 18, 1962.*
Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My personal congratulations to you upon acceptance by the Senate Finance Committee of your amendment for orderly marketing arrangement. Your support is greatly appreciated by the shoe manufacturers in your State.

Regards,

ABE W. BERKOWITZ,
Songo Shoe Manufacturing Co.

AUBURN, MAINE, *September 18, 1962.*
Hon. EDMUND MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I just learned that your orderly marketing amendment has been accepted by the Senate Finance Committee, to be considered by the Senate when voting on the proposed tariff bill.

May I express for my own company and in behalf of shoe manufacturers in Maine my congratulations and sincere appreciation of your efforts in our behalf. Also in recognition of the probable advantage to shoe workers in your State.

LUCIEN FRENCH,
Charles Cushman Co.

WATERVILLE, MAINE, *September 18, 1962.*
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I appreciate everything you have done in supporting the orderly marketing arrangement amendment.

Sincerely,

HAROLD ALFOND,
Norrwwock Shoe Co.

DEXTER, MAINE, *September 18, 1962.*
SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The shoe manufacturers of Maine appreciate the support which you have given to the orderly marketing arrangement amendment.

DEXTER SHOE CO.,
HAROLD WOLFF.

LYNCHBURG, VA., *September 18, 1962.*
Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Congratulations on the adoption of the principles of your orderly marketing amendment. This is a great step forward for the shoe industry, and we welcome it as a necessary basis for ultimate import relief.

PERCY N. BURTON.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank those who have worked with me for a year and one-half in perfecting this proposal, those of my colleagues who have supported me in this fight, and the members of the Finance Committee who made it possible for this principle to be adopted. I believe this legislation will be of benefit, not only to the State of Maine, but also to many other sections of our country. I am honored to have been able to play a role in making the orderly marketing agreement approach an integral part of our Nation's trade policy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I did not have the opportunity to be here yesterday; I was engaged in some rather important business in Buffalo, N.Y., where I had the honor to be nominated as the candidate of my party for reelection to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, as I have listened to the debate on this subject of trade over the years, both when I was a Member of the House, and, more recently, since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have noted with great satisfaction that a number of major suggestions which I have made have been incorporated in trade legislation, including the pending bill as reported by the Finance Committee.

However, before I speak of that subject, I wish to say that I believe the bill which will be passed today—and I shall support it—will represent one of the most important steps in the foreign policy of our Nation, both in this administration, and, in my opinion, also in the previous administration. It will represent not only the affirmative step of coming abreast of the developments in connection with our economic leadership of the free world, in terms of the opportunities for expansion of its trade, but, even more, it will represent our acceptance of, and our determination to work in partnership with, the European Common Market, which probably is the most extraordinary and striking example of initiative successfully undertaken by the free world in the struggle against communism in the cold war.

All of us know only too well that unless some untoward event, which might occur anywhere—it might be in Berlin or in Cuba, or might come about because of the pressing of a button by a mad man—were to result in a war, the issue of world trade will be of very great importance in the years to come. It is my opinion that the integration of the free world, particularly insofar as its industrial power is concerned, is absolutely indispensable to victory in the struggle against communism. In my opinion, the pending bill marks a most signal achievement in connection with such integration, second in importance only to the European Economic Community itself, in view of the fact that our trade program is collaborative in the free world and bipartisan in our Nation.

I realize that those who, like myself, have been devoted to the bipartisan foreign policy of our country have always considered it to be the greatest evidence of the essential unity of the United States of America when we face a crisis of any kind on the world scene.

So, first and foremost, the Congress is to be congratulated on producing a measure which, in my view, represents the most signal achievement, since the establishment of the European Economic Community itself, for the integration of the economic power of the free world, in order to make it possible to cope with the very grave menace to all our institutions by communism, through its economic arm which has proved to be so attractive to many of the newly developing countries. The action contemplated by this measure will rebut—and will do so very effectively, I am sure—that Communist menace.

I take great satisfaction, Mr. President, in the fact that although the President will be given, by means of the bill, large grants of authority, he is also being given a grant of authority which shows that we are maturing and are awake to the possibilities of danger to our trade and to our economy, as well as to the possibility of good. The European Economic Community has a great potential for the expansion of the standards of living of the whole of Western Europe, making it an unparalleled market, second only to our own in the whole free world. It also could become a closed corporation with a protectionist character itself.

The fine amendment offered in committee by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—an amendment which I urged before the committee when I testified before it—will go far toward enabling us to

have a piece of equipment in reserve which can deal with any idea which Europeans might have of making the Common Market a protectionist enclave.

The second point of major importance is the fact that, in terms of trade, we have been taking an undue proportion of the exports of Japan, for example, and of other countries which have come back after World War II, after having been heavily damaged as a result of the war.

Also, we have been taking a large proportion of the exports of newly developing nations like India and Pakistan, which have an industrial potential of their own. It is extremely important that the production, whether it is of Japan, Hong Kong, or any other newly developing nations, should be properly shared by all the industrial nations of the world. The way in which the most-favored-nation treatment accorded by us, as basic to the policy, is treated in section 251 of the measure. Section 252(c), enables the President to act in the way of suspending, withdrawing, or preventing the application of the benefits of trade agreement concessions where U.S. commerce is substantially burdened, either directly or indirectly, because of unreasonable import restrictions—even against third countries—maintained by a foreign country. Again, we give the President a weapon in reserve to deal with that critically important situation.

Here, too, I had recommended to the committees a similar way of proceeding. I am very pleased this has been done.

Also, Mr. President, with respect to my suggestions relating to congressional veto of Presidential action on Tariff Commission recommendations in escape-clause cases, and retention by the Tariff Commission of authority to make findings and recommendations with respect to injury from imports to industry and workers—both in the escape clause and in the so-called adjustment clauses—I take great satisfaction in seeing them incorporated.

Also, I had urged upon the committees broadening the President's authority to eliminate tariffs, not only with the European Economic Community, but also with other industrialized nations, in view of the fact that the bill, as presented by the administration, assumed the entry into the European Common Market of the United Kingdom. I am very pleased to see that the extension of the President's authority in this respect to countries of the European Free Trade Association now has accomplished at least in large part the intent of my suggestion.

I think Congress can take great satisfaction in what has been done here. I have lived with foreign economic policy ever since I was in the other body, and in this body also. As a matter of fact, in my last 2 years in the House, I was chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee. I am confident we are taking here one of the most critically important steps required to equip us effectively to deal with the challenge and to throw back in his teeth Khrushchev's boast that he will bury us, which was later defined to mean that he will bury us economically.

I look for a new burst of trade and enterprise. I look for the Atlantic Community to help in granting more aid to the less developed nations. I look for help from them in the Alliance for Progress program. I look for Europe to help in the associated African territories. I look for help in world consortiums like the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, and in moving into areas of southeast Asia in a developmental way.

We are not doing enough. Governments have their limitations. We have not done enough in bringing the free enterprise system into the relationship it ought to occupy to foreign aid development. This is a struggle for tomorrow, which I hope to undertake here strongly, if my people send me back to the Senate. But today we are striking an enormous blow, in terms of governmental action, in the field of trade which is more important even than aid itself. A drop in the price of coffee, for example, might eliminate in an afternoon all the aid that we might give to Brazil for a year or more. We are striking a blow for freedom which has been unparalleled in the last few years and which is the greatest economic development since the European Common Market.

Mr. President, two amendments were presented in my name yesterday, one by the junior Senator from Illinois, and one by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. I am grateful to both of those Senators, and I am grateful to the Senate for the consideration it gave to those amendments.

One amendment provided for a Council of Advisers, composed of business, labor, and agricultural people who could be of assistance to our negotiators in relation to tariff and other negotiations, but would not actually serve as negotiators. This is something that could be done by way of administration. I know, and I state as a fact, that it represents a very important way of tying private enterprise and the great expertise which resides there into our negotiations. It will help the President restore confidence of the business community in this administration if he, himself, is responsible for establishing such a Council of Advisers. I hope he will do so, and I invite him to do so. My amendment is not needed. The President can do it. I hope very much he will, and strongly urge it upon him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a revised version of this first amendment which was rejected by the Senate yesterday. The junior Senator from New York has expressed the desire to join me in this revised version. I hope that it may serve as some guidance as to what could be done administratively in this respect.

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

On page 18, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"(c)(1) The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations shall appoint a Council of Advisers which shall consist of not to exceed fifty appointive members to be selected from the major organizations in the United States representing industry, agriculture, and labor. In addition, the congressional delegates to negotiations, selected pursuant to section 243, shall, during any period in which they are accredited members of a United States delegation to any negotiation under this title, serve as ex officio members of such Council. The Special Representative shall serve as Chairman of such Council. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. 583) shall apply to members appointed to such Council.

"(2) Members of the Council of Advisers shall give advice and counsel with respect to products of direct interest to them to members of any United States delegation to negotiations under this title, and to the United States delegates to any other international meeting dealing with modifications of existing trade restrictions. The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations shall provide members of the Council with such information with respect to such negotiations and meetings as he determines will enable such members to fully and effectively discharge their functions under this subsection."

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to the other amendment, designed to ease the burdens of certain agricultural producers and of American manufacturers, the principal cost of whose products results from the high prices of commodities protected under our price-support programs, I believe that the way in which the orderly marketing agreement provision in section 352 of the bill is administered will go a long way toward helping the people we were trying to help by my amendment. Again, the President can do it. I urge that he do it. He can do it, with propriety, in an administrative way, as long as the Senate did not accept my amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the past several months the United States has become much more conscious of the role of foreign trade and its importance to this Nation and to the free world. Many first became aware of the importance of trade when public attention was given to our imbalance in international payments and the unprecedented flow of gold from our shores.

The problem was clarified when it was explained that the balance of trade—American exports as against American imports—has been in our favor, but that our economic and military assistance programs have more than offset our trade surplus and caused the loss of U.S. dollars and gold. Since we are necessarily committed to continuing these aid programs, it has become clear that the only solution to the situation is through a substantial increase in our exports.

The present administration has moved firmly in this direction, with no little amount of success. Yet, in order to keep pace with changing economic conditions throughout the world, and to enable this country to increase its share of world markets, additional bargaining authority is needed to place our Government negotiators on a par with their counterparts from other trading nations.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, proposed by the President, should provide the necessary impetus to our trade program. I believe that this legislation will help provide new and greater markets for our products, strengthen our domestic economy, and thereby give added

strength and endurance to our free world trading partners.

I have been concerned, however, by the emphasis which has been placed on our future trade relations with the European Economic Community. There is an apparent effort to tie the need for the Trade Expansion Act in with the probable increase in membership and economic importance of the Community. Without depreciating the importance of the Common Market as a purchaser of American products, I submit that there are further considerations impelling enactment of this legislation.

We cannot make the fatal error of directing all of our attention to Europe. Our allies and friends in Asia, Latin America, and Africa are of equal importance to our military and economic strength. As I see it, the United States should act as a bridge between the Atlantic Community and other free nations of the world who are not connected with the Common Market.

Such tariff reductions as may be achieved in future negotiations between this Nation and the Common Market should also be available to other friendly nations. Reductions granted to Europe will likewise apply to those nations to whom we have granted most-favored-nation recognition. Moreover, and most important, we must make every effort to convince the Common Market to open its doors to the products of these other nations.

Recently, the Committee on Commerce began a series of hearings looking into the trade patterns in the Pacific area. This vast region includes nations on every level of the economic scale. Japan, for example, is recognized as one of the foremost industrial nations, and is the second biggest customer for American goods and products, following only Canada. Particular attention must be given to the millions of people in the Pacific area who have only recently become independent and are now seeking to improve their way of life. They are no longer content to be have-nots in this age of technology, and are searching for opportunities to raise their standard of living.

Our aid programs are designed to provide self-help for these people, and those in the underdeveloped countries in Africa and Latin America. At the same time, by increasing our trade with these nations, we will materially benefit their economies as well as our own.

The greatest potential for future markets for American products is not in mature Europe, but in those nations now experiencing their first growing pains. We on the west coast, and particularly in my own State of California, have long recognized this potential. We know that our goods will continue to find growing markets in the Pacific Ocean area. Therefore, we will not be satisfied with any trade program which does not give equal emphasis to both the Pacific markets and the Atlantic Community.

I believe that properly implemented, the Trade Expansion Act will enable us to continue to develop and expand our markets in the Pacific. Moreover, we should be able to help these nations find additional markets for their own products.

It is with this in mind, looking beyond our relationship with the Common Market, that I intend to vote for the Trade Expansion Act. The importance of this bill to the underdeveloped nations of the entire free world, as well as to our own economy, cannot be overemphasized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to state my firm support for the Trade Expansion Act. I am frank to say that I have not favored the reciprocal trade program in the past. But, in the words of a familiar hymn, "New occasions teach new duties." In the last few years a powerful new factor has entered the balance; a factor which has altered fundamentally the old circumstance of international trade. In Europe, the common suffering of World War II and subsequent recovery forged the bonds of common purpose which link countries of Western Europe in new understanding, mutual cooperation, and a common market. Our most important trading partners—France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg—have banded together to form a European Economic Community. Several other nations have already applied for membership.

Already, the EEC, or Common Market, has taken steps that affect us here and now. It is in the process of forming a free trading area, within which goods produced in any member country may be sold to any other member free of tariff. At the same time, the member countries are equalizing the tariff rates they charge to outside countries.

These are the same steps taken by the Thirteen American Colonies to permit a free flow of trade across State lines when they formed a federation under the Constitution in 1793. The wisdom of our colonial forefathers set the stage for the vigorous development of our country as a single economic unit and was a crucial factor in making the United States the richest and most powerful country in the world today.

In Europe, the same process has fostered a booming 7½-percent rate of growth of industrial production in the last few years and has increased imports among the member countries by approximately 70 percent since 1958. The Common Market within the framework of free enterprise has created a climate which encourages cautious businessmen to unleash their capital, energy, and ingenuity. We should be proud of our role in Europe's recovery and welcome the Common Market's positive contribution to the economic strength of the free world, even as Mr. Khrushchev condemns and fears it as a further bulwark against the spread of communism. More that that, the phenomenon of European unity, driven forward by the momentum of its own success, confounds the Marxist theory of the warring capitalist empires and undermines Communist efforts to split the West.

At the same time, we should look realistically at the changes which the Common Market will thrust upon our own trading position. The creation of an industrialized trading unit with a population approximating our own and a vigorous rate of economic expansion cannot fail to affect our own commercial prospects.

In the first place, a strong new market for consumer and industrial sales is being born. The gross national product of the Common Market as a whole is expected to rise by 50 percent in the next 10 years. As the incomes and the standard of living rise, and industrial expansion progresses, demand for more products correspondingly will rise sharply. The EEC's consumption of such goods as automobiles, radios, television sets, refrigerators, and washing machines is now only a fraction of what we have consumed in the United States and is bound to increase enormously. For example, in order to reach our own standard of living, the population of the Common Market countries will have to buy about 50 million more refrigerators and 50 million more washing machines.

These are goods we produce best and are used to producing—electrical machinery, office equipment, other plant machinery, home appliances, and the like. And, Europe now is facing a severe shortage of labor, and most of her plants are operating near full capacity. In the years ahead, we can expect that she will have to turn to imports to satisfy a sizable proportion of her bursting demand.

This market is vitally important to us as a nation—to our businessmen, workers, farmers, and other American producers. Last year we sold $3½ billion worth of U.S. goods to the Common Market. That is $3½ billion of orders that our producers would not otherwise have obtained. It accounts for an estimated half million American jobs that we could not otherwise offer. And subtracting a $2¼ billion of U.S. imports from the Common Market, trade in that area alone gives us $1¼ billion of credit on our currently nagging balance-of-payments account.

And this market is vitally important to my own State of West Virginia. Exports of manufactured goods from West Virginia amounted to $156.1 million in 1960; $125.3 million of this total was reported by 71 establishments, exporting $25,000 or more. These exporting establishments employed 58,489 workers, and their exports represented nearly 7 percent of their total value of shipments.

In addition, West Virginia has some of the Nation's richest deposits of bituminous coal. Seventeen hundred mines employ 51,000 of our workers, and exported in 1960 some $100.3 million, amounting to 17 percent of our local production.

I have sketched some of the encouraging prospects which the Common Market will open up for American exporting industries. But we can take advantage of them only if our products are not fenced out of the Common Market by the tariff disadvantages we now face. The Common Market countries are gradually abolishing entirely the tariffs charged on goods sold among themselves. Meanwhile, they are harmonizing their tariff rates on goods that enter from nonmember countries, such as the United States. In not many years, therefore, our European competitors will be able to send their products throughout the Common Market duty-free, while American firms will have to pay duties.

In many cases, this tariff disadvantage will be substantial, and could be crippling

to our trade. Our ball bearing manufacturers, for instance, will be charged an 18-percent duty, as opposed to no duty at all for German competitors. Automobile and truck parts from the United States will be levied at 14 percent, or $1,400, for every $10,000 order, while French or German equipment passes duty free.

This would be a severe obstacle, and this is the main reason for the urgency of negotiating the Common Market's external duty rates downward. The Trade Expansion Act would give us the instrument needed to make such bargains. It lowers no U.S. duties in itself; it simply authorizes us to bargain for foreign tariff reductions by offering cuts of our own.

I have been skeptical of reciprocal trade in the past; but if we fail to enact the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, mushrooming markets abroad will be increasingly protected against American goods; we might face the foolish spectacle of our flourishing allies and ourselves engaged in price wars and dumping fights on world markets, offering for exploitation by the Communist bloc a division of immense proportions. With the possibility of steadily rising domestic prices and a declining base for our exports juxtaposed with the widening horizons of our international obligations, the effect of inaction on the trade front could be catastrophic.

In contrast to this dismal picture of increasing frustration and division stands the prospect of the first meaningful partnership in history between the Old World and the New. United, we are a force so powerful as to deal Soviet cold war efforts their severest blow; the underdeveloped countries, in their own self-interest, would be drawn closer to the dynamic partners of the Northern Hemisphere.

I know that this trade legislation will not automatically solve all the problems of American domestic life, nor all the problems of our international relations. But it is a tool that we cannot afford to neglect.

As the President said in his message on trade early this year:

> At rare moments in the life of this Nation, an opportunity comes along to fashion out of the confusion of current events a clear and bold action to show the world what it is we stand for. Such an opportunity is before us now. This bill, by enabling us to strike a bargain with the Common Market, will strike a blow for freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). All time has expired, according to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in line with the request granted earlier today, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 15 minutes be allotted to debate on the bill, the time to be divided between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH].

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will merely ask for 15 additional minutes. so that there may be a vote soon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I was necessarily absent. There is one subject in the bill that has caused me grave concern. I should like to have 5 minutes to discuss it before the final vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall do our best to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I point out that I have been waiting since 12 o'clock for an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we cannot have a unanimous-consent agreement, we must vote now. I am trying to obtain an additional 15 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Why could we not vote now and have the explanations afterward? I am in the unfortunate position of having to catch a plane in 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has been waiting very patiently.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would be perfectly willing to speak after the vote if any Senator has made his plans to get away. I would like an opportunity to express the view of large segments of the fresh fruit and vegetable industry with reference to certain provisions in the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the majority leader if it would be feasible for any Senator to insert his statement in the RECORD or make a statement and have it appear in the RECORD prior to the vote. Would that be feasible?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is not unknown.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would be feasible but not practical.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a question or two to ask. It will not take more than 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the request is granted, the Senator may then ask his question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I know that the able Senator from Kentucky has been waiting some time to speak. I shall be brief.

I shall vote in favor of H.R. 11970, the Trade Expansion Act.

I have given long and studied attention to this bill and to the challenge which it is designed to meet.

It is only in recent years that America's trade position in the world has received the consideration of the public.

For long a favorable balance of trade was considered a fact of life. For long, the supremacy of the competitive position of most American goods was unquestioned.

With the rebirth of industrial Europe, the formation of the Common Market, and the staggering growth rate of Japan, the situation has changed. American products must now actively compete—both abroad and at home—for their markets.

And they are competing—competing successfully:

In the year 1961 alone, our merchandise exports exceeded our merchandise imports by close to $5 billion, including all shipments of goods from the United States.

COLORADO EXPORTS

In my own State of Colorado, it has been authoritatively estimated exports of manufactured goods in 1960 amounted to $48.4 million. Agricultural exports, from Colorado alone, amounted to $81.7 million.

This means that Colorado sells $130.1 million of its produce abroad every year.

This oversea market is important to my State. It is important to the estimated 9,300 agricultural workers and the estimated 19,130 industrial workers who receive their livelihood from export sales.

As the able Governor of our State, Steve McNichols, has well pointed out:

> No longer can the centennial State be viewed as an area rich only in scenic mountain beauty and fertile plains. The world's attention is focused upon the phenomenal industrial growth and unlimited potential of this colorful manufacturing region. Not only is Colorado an ideal site for industrial expansion, but it is a great storehouse of manufactured products available for export to industry.

The world trades with Colorado, and Colorado trades with the world.

This is why I support this legislation—it will provide the President with the negotiating powers he needs to insure that America trades from the very best competitive position possible. This bill puts the intent of the Congress clearly by stating:

> The purposes of this act are, through trade agreements affording mutual trade benefits (1) to stimulate the economic growth of the United States and maintain and enlarge foreign markets for the products of U.S. agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce.

Some people have misunderstood parts of this measure.

CONGRESS RETAINS POWER

It is said by some that Congress has totally abdicated its tariff making authority. This is not so.

The Congress may revoke any or all of this bill at any time.

Should the President not choose to act upon a recommendation for higher tariffs made by the Tariff Commission because of domestic injury caused by foreign imports, the Congress by a constitutional majority vote may require him to do so.

The bill prevents the cut of any tariff on any article for which there is an outstanding proclamation of the President under the escape clause provisions of current law.

This means that the domestic lead and zinc industry will in no way be affected by this legislation except as it may stimulate exports of products made from lead and zinc.

The President may not reduce the tariff on any article which the Tariff Commission has found under existing law by majority vote that imports were seriously injuring the domestic industry.

The bill retains the national security provisions of the present act. This means that our domestic oil industry will not in anyway be affected by this legislation because of national security reasons.

IMPROVEMENTS IN PRESENT LAW

In many ways this legislation improves upon existing law in this field:

First. This bill retains a strong escape clause, which provides that an industry is entitled to a "reasonable" profit. Thus, to qualify for escape-clause protection, it will not be necessary that all companies in an industry be operating in the red.

Second. This bill embodies the principles of the Muskie orderly marketing amendment, giving the President authority to negotiate itemized trade restriction agreements. This provides an alternate method of obtaining relief from excess foreign imports.

Third. This bill embodies the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], which gives the President unlimited power to raise tariffs and to impose import quotas if he deems it in "the national interest."

Fourth. It includes the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which empowers the President to ban imports on farm products in retaliation against foreign bans on American farm products.

Fifth. This bill adopts an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which gives the President specific tariff-raising authority with which to counter the protectionist actions of other countries. It is thought that this will give the President the wherewithal to see that the Common Market accepts Japanese goods, so as to relieve to a reasonable extent the burden which such goods have caused in recent years on some of our domestic markets. This amendment will also assist the President in his efforts to obtain fair tariffs from Europe for American farm products.

Because of the foregoing safeguards, Mr. President, I am supporting this measure. It will strengthen the authority of the President and of the country at the bargaining table. It is my confident expectation that it will enable him to obtain meaningful concessions that will assure the maintenance—and, I hope, the expansion—of U.S. manufactured goods and agricultural products.

LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

It is most important that in these negotiations full regard be given to the interests of American producers who must meet the competition of foreign imports on our domestic market.

In this regard, let me call the attention of the Senate to the problems of our domestic livestock industry. The U.S. market has long been available to foreign producers who have had to overcome only moderate import duties levied on their products. American producers have been faced with increasing competition from imports during recent years.

Imports of beef and veal in 1961 totaled 1,038 million pounds, carcass weight, compared with 775 million in 1960, and 1,063 million in 1959. Imports during the first half of this year continue at these high levels.

Imports of boneless mutton in 1961 totaled 55.8 million pounds, an increase over the 37.3 million brought in during 1960. Mutton imports continued to increase in 1962. In the case of lambs, while current imports are below the high levels of recent years, they continue substantial.

I have consulted with officials in the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce in my efforts to insure that the bill before us contains adequate safeguards for the legitimate interests of the American livestock industry. I am assured that the bill does contain such safeguards and I look for their proper implementation to carry out the intent of the Congress.

ECONOMIC SAFEGUARDS

There are three safeguards embodied in this measure. The first is the investigation of economic peril which must be undertaken by the Tariff Commission before the President can enter into tariff negotiations with foreign governments. The Commission must hold public hearings, gather full information and then advise the President as to the probable economic effect upon domestic industry of a modification of the duty upon incoming articles.

The second safeguard is the escape clause, which I have mentioned above. The bill before us makes a change in the present law that is of particular interest to the U.S. livestock industry. Existing law lays down a narrow standard for determining whether an imported article is directly competitive with a domestic article. For example, the Tariff Commission turned down an application for escape clause relief filed by domestic sheep growers because it considered that under existing law, imported lamb and mutton were not directly competitive with domestic live sheep. Under section 405(4) of the bill before us, this imported article would be deemed "directly competitive" with the domestic article even though it might be at an earlier or later stage of processing.

The third safeguard available is that embodied in section 352 which gives to the President discretionary authority to enter into orderly marketing agreements with foreign governments, limiting their exports to the United States where such agreements offer an appropriate device to prevent or remedy serious injury to domestic industries found to be injured under the escape clause procedure.

Mr. President, the industries of my State, their executives and their workers have studied this bill. I have consulted with labor leaders, business executives and government officials of my State.

I believe that the great majority of all of those with whom I have consulted endorse the purposes and intent of this bill. It is not perfect, but this is not the last word. We, in the Senate, and I am sure our colleagues in the House, intend to keep close watch on our international trade position and on the sales of foreign made products upon domestic markets.

I am determined, and I am sure the Congress joins me in this determination, to see that American products are marketed in the best of possible circumstances; that our competitive position is improved, our markets expanded and our trade with other nations conducted in a healthy and vigorous manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a few of the many thoughtful and enlightening letters which I received from interested persons in Colorado may be printed in the RECORD at this point, for the benefit of Senators.

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

DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Denver, Colo., August 10, 1962.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Attached is a copy of the report of the national affairs committee of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, subject: H.R. 11970. The report was approved by the board of directors of the Denver chamber at its regular meeting on Friday, August 10, 1962. A telegram regarding this action has been forwarded.

Respectfully yours,

SHELBY F. HARPER,
General Manager.

AUGUST 1, 1962.

Report to: The Board of Directors of the Denver Chamber of Commerce.
From: The National Affairs Committee.
Subject: Trade expansion bill, H.R. 11970.

The European Common Market is one of the most significant developments among the nations of the free world since World War II.

It has helped to strengthen economics of those nations signatory to the Rome treaty to such an extent that during the period 1955 through 1961, the average growth rate in gross national product in Europe was 4.2 percent. The growth rate in the United States for the same period was but 2.2 percent.

This new economic vitality of our European friends is bound to be a major defense against economic aggression from the Soviet bloc.

The European community also presents new economic competition to U.S. products and services—a challenge to our industry, leading us to innovation, research, cost reduction, improvement of efficiency in every direction.

For our own economic welfare as a nation, the United States must trade, compete, and invest worldwide.

In competing with our friends and allies, one of the essentials is the progressive lowering of trade barriers—both our own and those erected by others. This is the road to expanding world markets for our industrial and agricultural products.

The Denver Chamber of Commerce believes that the administration's Trade Expansion Act proposal, as embodied in H.R. 11970, is the first step toward this Nation's successfully meeting the challenges of Europe's Common Market nations.

The chamber's support of the administration's trade bill is made with the realization that Colorado has a substantial interest in foreign trade. Exports of manufactured goods from Colorado in 1960 (the last year for which statistics are available) amounted to $48.4 million. Twenty-one Colorado establishments each exported more than $25,000 in the same year.

Colorado's agricultural products exports in the 1960–61 crop year amounted to $81.7 million. It is estimated that about 9,300 Colorado farmworkers may be attributed to the production of these farm products that were exported.

We have one serious reservation with respect to this bill—that part providing for the federalization of unemployment payment to workers in industries damaged by the lowering of tariffs. We strongly recommend that all unemployment payments be administered under existing State laws.

In considering our needs to expand our worldwide trade activities, including foreign investments, certain tax proposals pending in Congress relative to the taxation by the United States of earnings of U.S.-owned foreign corporations, seem contrary to the encouragement of such foreign investment. Particular reference is made to a proposal to tax foreign earnings not distributed as dividends but reinvested for expansion of foreign facilities. Such proposals would make it impossible for American business to compete with their foreign counterparts.

Such tax proposals defeat the principle of competing worldwide with our Common Market friends.

In endorsing the passage of H.R. 11970, the Denver Chamber of Commerce also recognizes that Congress should be consistent in its intent to encourage our worldwide trade activity, by opposing those tax proposals that are mentioned as contrary to meeting our foreign trade obligations.

Respectfully submitted.

ROY ERICKSON,
Chairman, National Affairs Committee.

PUEBLO, COLO., *July 2, 1962.*

Hon. JOHN CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: The League of Women Voters of Puebo urges your support of the Trade Extension Act of 1962 soon to be presented on the floor of the Senate.

As you know, this bill has had bipartisan support and recently passed in the House by 298 to 125. It will give the President broad tariff-cutting powers for bargaining with the booming European Common Market. It would also carry out a new program of trade adjustment assistance for workers and businessmen injured by increased competition due to imports.

The league has for many years supported a more liberal trade policy for the United States.

Yours very truly,
Mrs. ROBERT L. MARSH,
Foreign Policy Chairman,
League of Women Voters.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Boulder, Colo., July 4, 1962.

Hon JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Having studied foreign trade for several years, the members of the League of Women Voters are very happy to see the Trade Expansion Act pass the House of Representatives. We shall be watching its progress through hearings and debate in the Senate very closely. Although our community is not as actively engaged in foreign trade as some, we are very much aware of the importance of trade to the whole economy and to the national interest.

We hope that you will be among those Senators who support the Trade Expansion Act and urge its speedy passage, so that trade negotiations with the Common Market countries will not be any longer delayed.

Sincerely yours,
SYBIL S. DOWNING
Mrs. Mancourt Downing,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN
VOTERS OF DENVER,
Denver, Colo., July 31, 1962.

Hon. JOHN CARROLL,
Senator From Colorado,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: The League of Women Voters of Denver strongly urges your support of the Trade Expansion Act. Our membership, after a year of nonpartisan research and study, hope to see the following basic principles incorporated in our trade legislation:

1. A liberal trade policy which reduces tariffs and all other barriers on a systematic basis.

2. Presidential authority for across-the-board, long-term powers to negotiate.

3. A continuation of our most-favored-nation clause and the principal of reciprocity (exceptions being made for developing nations if needed).

4. Trade adjustment assistance for industries and workers proved hurt by import competition.

In our opinion, the U.S. economy will thrive under the stimulus of increased foreign trade—more jobs, dollars, and productivity will result. Equally important, the Trade Expansion Act will unify and strengthen the Western alliance and win approval among developing nations who urgently need access to world markets.

The United States will undoubtedly suffer some pains of adjustment and shifting of resources in the face of increased imports. Yet our Nation has traditionally believed in free enterprise with its element of competition. Our businessmen have accepted change also and have capitalized on it. With this same ingenuity and energy, Americans can find opportunities in our new trading position—especially with the Common Market.

We sincerely trust that our legislators will consider the new trade bill not on behalf of Democratic or Republican constituents, or local businessmen or workers, but from the standpoint of what is best for our Nation—whose welfare is, in the long run, synonymous with the peace and prosperity of our free world partners.

Sincerely yours.
CAROLYN STARBUCK,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
CHERRY HILLS VILLAGE, COLO.,
August 1, 1962.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: As you know, the League of Women Voters has concluded its current portion of the trade study with a strong consensus in support of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We think you will be interested to know that the Cherry Hills League, in its own study, concurs in this stand.

We have given serious thought to all aspects of the trade question. For example, we have noted that Colorado's equivalent share in U.S. total exports of $4.9 billion of agricultural products was $81.7 million in the 1960–61 crop year, and that exports of manufactured goods from Colorado amounted to $78.4 million in 1960. Were we to lose our foreign markets for these products, our economy would suffer severe hardship. The six countries of the Common Market are among our best customers and offer an increasing potential. U.S. exports to the Common Market in 1960 soared 42 percent over 1959 levels.

We are enclosing a flyer on trade prepared by Colorado leagues for distribution at the trade conference held May 24 at the University of Denver. We hope you will find it of interest.

We strongly urge your support of the trade bill.

Sincerely,
Mrs. DONALD F. MARLER,
President.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN
VOTERS OF DURANGO,
Durango, Colo., June 17, 1962.

Hon. JOHN CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for taking the time to visit with the league when you were in Durango during May. The membership was very pleased to have had this opportunity to meet you and hear some of your views. You will always be a welcome guest when you are in this area.

I am enclosing a pamphlet which contains an insert showing the importance of foreign trade to the mountain plains region. You are well aware that the league has supported an expanded trade policy with decreasing barriers through the years. During the past 2 years, local leagues all over the United States have been engaged in another concentrated study of trade. Our support position is printed on the back of the enclosed folder.

The Durango League recognizes that certain local enterprises might be hurt by this act; however, the proposed Trade Expansion Act does provide for adjustment assistance. In the league view, such assistance when limited in time and scope is preferable to measures which restrict trade.

It is our hope that you will support the Trade Expansion Act.

Sincerely yours,
MARJORIE VLASMAN
Mrs. Andrew Vlasman,
President.

THE EVERSMAN MANUFACTURING CO.,
Denver, Colo., August 31, 1962.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: In receipt of your letter dated August 22 concerning the Trade Expansion Act, H.R. 11970, we here have been completely sold on the objectives of the Trade Expansion Act and so has the exporting fraternity in Denver. I am attaching hereto a copy of the letter the World Trade Club of Denver, of which I am president, sent to Mr. Charles P. Taft, general counsel, Committee for a National Trade Policy on March 21. We polled the membership of the trade club, per attached of March 14, and roughly 100 members gave complete endorsement with only 1 dissent. All manufacturers in Colorado appear to be strongly in favor of the objectives of H.R. 11970. Even among the mining fraternity a majority of the commercial producers particularly Climax, which exports such a very large percentage of its product, approves of the legislation. In this sector only the mine lease brokers seem to be opposed to the legislation.

In answer to your specific questions:

1. Eversman exports between 15 to 23 percent of its product.

2. In our particular field, foreign imports have in no way affected us. We welcome, on the other hand, an influx of foreign goods since competition from foreign sources enables us to considerably improve our purchases of supplies going into our products on the one hand and also gives us a bigger choice and selection in manufacturing tools, enabling us to utilize our capital to better advantage, by purchasing lower cost and more productive machinery as is commonly available at this time in the United States.

3. Under the circumstances, we are completely sold on the objectives of the Trade Expansion Act and hope that same will be enacted without enfeebling riders. I trust that you are well aware of the fact that our position in world markets is, by no means, as strong as some of us may wish it to be and the very drastic and painful reaction by the EEC Council in June in retaliation to recent duty increases on carpets and plate glass imposed by the United States sets a precedent which cannot be ignored. Prompt levying retaliatory duties should give warning to the United States of European determination. This highlights also the damage which pressure groups, serving their own limited interests, can do to the country as a whole. For this reason I urge you not to let narrow parochial considerations damage the grand concept of the bill by enfeebling riders, exceptions, etc.

4. Colorado already has a very considerable stake in the flourishing of export markets. There are very few if any industries which could be hurt by foreign goods coming into this State, excepting the mining and wool industries, which appear to me at least to be amply protected already. Every industry in Colorado has a definite strong self-interest to see the Trade Expansion Act become a law as quickly as possible.

I wish to thank you for giving us an opportunity to express our thoughts to you.

Very sincerely yours,

F. L. BLIGH.

THE MONAGHAN CO.,
Denver, Colo., August 31, 1962.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: I wish to thank you for your recent letter, concerning my views on the Trade Expansion Act, bill H.R. 11970.

First, and in general, I would like to say that I am in basic accord with the statements made by William L. Clayton and Christian Herter that our country must be closely linked economically with the industrial European Community (the Common Market).

Our own company manufactures medical equipment—more specifically anesthesia and respiratory equipment, having been started shortly after World War II.

Our company grosses somewhat less than a million dollars in sales a year from all sources, with approximately 5 percent derived from foreign sales. Needless to say, our main foreign competition is German and British in oversea markets. Price and credit are the principal factors in these markets. American-made equipment in those markets is generally well regarded and is considered to be of high quality.

As of this time, it does not appear that either British or German equipment would pose a serious threat in the home market, even if tariffs were substantially reduced. Generally, we have a very protective rate—45 percent. However, our industry would have to continue to make substantial technological progress to offset any threats.

Needless to say, our company is making a substantial effort to increase foreign sales. Our methods being to grant as liberal discounts and to extend as favorable credit terms as possible. We would welcome a lowering of European tariffs, but in addition, there must be a lowering of other import quotas and restrictions imposed on American equipment or the mere lowering of tariffs will have little or no beneficial effect. These latter are probably more restrictive than tariffs per se. For example, in Great Britain there is a basic import duty of 22 percent on our type of equipment, but within the discretion of the customs department there is an add-on proviso so that the British importer can never be sure how much his cost will be until he actually receives the goods. That is a very strong deterrent to importation.

In any reciprocal bargaining granted the executive branch, such corollary programs of the OEC must be taken into consideration.

Being too protectionist will certainly be against American self-interest, but being naive will be equally so.

Yours very sincerely,

PIERRE CHAPPELL,
President.

B. K. SWEENEY MANUFACTURING CO.,
Denver, Colo., September 4, 1962.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Thank you for writing to us in regard to the Trade Expansion Act which is now under consideration by the U.S. Senate.

From a national point of view there seems to be very little disagreement with the act as proposed and it is hoped that the Congress will not cripple the act with a series of disabling amendments.

The question of the federally sponsored unemployment insurances does not seem to have any particular connection with trade expansion and should probably be handled elsewhere.

As regards to industry in Colorado, with two major exceptions, the majority of firms are so highly specialized that the expansion in trade will be a great deal more benefit than hindrance.

Because of competition from the rest of the country, it has been pretty well rationalized by most manufacturers that they must either live under the freight umbrella here in Colorado or must be so specialized that freight does not enter into the picture. The brick manufacturers are a good example of those who live under the umbrella, and I believe that our operation is a typical example of those who have taken the specialty route.

For example, most of our goods are shipped out at from $2 to $10 per pound and can be sold in Australia or South Africa without freight making much difference in the delivered selling price.

I know that the issue is not freight, but it has an important byproduct. In so designing our products, we have put a large percentage of the cost into engineering and a relatively small percentage into labor. Thus, if we are selling in Italy in competition to German-made goods, the labor factor is so small that we can compete very favorably because of our superior design. In fact, in many cases our design is so far advanced that there is no active foreign competition at all. Thus, the reduction of tariffs and trade barriers could only be a benefit to us and to the many firms in Colorado that have followed this course.

The obvious exceptions mentioned above are the steel industry and the sugar industry, but these are special cases and I am sure their views are well presented to the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. SWEENEY,
President.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I support the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, as I have supported extensions of the Trade Agreements Act in the past.

It has occurred to me that in some respects the task of enacting the extension and revision of the Trade Agreement Act 4 years ago was more difficult than the passage of the present act. This is true, I believe, because at the time the Common Market was unformed, and its powers and influence on U.S. trade were not clearly seen. Yet I do not derogate the work that has been done in the passage of the present bill. The members of the Senate Finance Committee under the leadership of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as well as the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House deserve full credit and congratulations for their work. The passage of the bill is a signal achievement of the administration and the Congress during the present session.

Today the Common Market is a reality. Its present members buy $3.5 billion of the total of $20 billion of U.S. exports. If Great Britain and the Outer Seven enter the Common Market, they could account for $7 billion or $8 billion of the total of $20 billion of products exported by the United States—33½ percent to 40 percent—and in time a larger proportion of our dollar exports.

I think, therefore, it is imperative that the President of the United States be armed with the necessary power to negotiate with the Common Market countries, as the bill provides.

Maladjustments will occur. Perhaps the adjustments provided in the bill may not be wholly effective. But, if so, amendments can be offered in the future to make the provisions of the bill more adequate. But even with maladjustments, unfavorable to some industries and to workers, there is no reasonable alternative to the enactment of this bill. We must provide this opportunity for the expansion of industry and jobs in our country, for, if we cannot trade, we shall be isolated economically.

I strongly support the bill because I believe it will give great opportunity to make gains in the field of foreign policy. Our military strength and advancement in space and, in fact, our leadership in the world, depend upon our economic strength. and therefore upon trade for if we cannot trade—and that means export trade—we shall be isolated economically. The gross national product of the United States and the Common Market countries, when combined, is twice that of the Soviet Union and the Communist Chinese bloc.

The importance which Russia attaches to this development and to fear of its strength can be seen in the strictures and fulminations of Mr. Khrushchev against the Common Market, against the entry of the United Kingdom, and the association of the United States, which the bill proposes.

The Common Market, with the association of the United States and the Outer Seven, will represent a center of attraction to the developed areas as well as to the undeveloped countries of the world. It can provide an example of a healthy, progressive economy, which is most attractive to the world, developed and undeveloped.

We hope that this association will be more than an example. We hope that from this center of economic strength, its members will provide to less developed countries, a part of the burden of aid which the United States now provides.

What of the future? We do not yet know whether these objectives will be realized. But, in addition to the economic growth and development which we have witnessed in Europe as a result of the Common Market, and which we anticipate will increase when the United States becomes more closely associated with it, I think it is important to note the possibilities of growing political association in Europe, and in tune with our country and hemisphere.

Under the Marshall plan the European countries joined in OEEC, and worked together in the preparation of plans to participate in the aid furnished by the United States under the Marshall plan.

In 1950, at the second Council of Ministers of NATO, I had the honor of proposing the admission of the Republic of Germany to the OEEC as a step toward West Germany's union with NATO and the European countries. Later, we saw the development of the Steel and Iron Community, Euratom, and other associations in which European countries have given up a portion of their sovereignty. The entrance of the Outer Seven

into the Common Market may signal an even larger political association in Europe.

I am not here today to say that the association of the United States with the Common Market will lead to our political association with Europe. But who can say that in time it will not gradually develop in some limited form? I am persuaded that the security of the United States and Europe, and free countries everywhere, freedom and any chance for a true peace, will depend in great part upon some type of union between the democratic countries of Europe, the United States, and Canada, and, we hope, the countries of the Western Hemisphere. I may be looking too far into the future. But today in addition to the immediate objective of assuring an economic growth in the United States, I see economic association and unity leading to a larger political association in Europe. And it is entirely possible that in time the association of the United States with the Common Market will develop into some kind of a limited political association, which I believe may be essential to guarantee the survival and growth of liberty, freedom, and democracy in the world.

Our policy must embrace concepts larger than the aims of one nation. It must form the resources, skills, democratic spirit of the free countries of Europe, the United States, Canada, and other free countries in the Americas—and ultimately, perhaps, free nations in some type of political association or union in which democratic power—as well as spirit—can be reborn.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my individual views, as printed in the committee report.

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

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS ON H.R. 11970

This measure goes far beyond the existing trade agreements program and I do not favor its enactment in its present form.

The European Common Market is a very desirable entity. It will lead to greater unity among the nations of Europe; it will elevate their economies and strengthen their political ties. It is a fortress against international communism and our national policy should be to encourage and to cooperate with the Common Market. The bill presented by the committee will not, in my opinion, be mutually advantageous to the United States and to the European nations. Both need each other and whatever weakens the United States weakens Europe.

Under the trade agreements program existing for more than a quarter of a century the Congress has delegated its constitutional powers to levy, modify and repeal taxes, and its powers to regulate portions of our commerce to the executive. In the past there have been certain limitations in this delegation of power. In most recent years the Congress has provided for safeguards such as the peril-point and escape-clause procedures. The measure before us departs from all these previous concepts.

Our reciprocal trade program of the past is not free of criticism. The United States has allowed foreign countries to impose many nontariff barriers against us such as quotas, embargoes, import licenses, unreasonable inspection, variable import fees, currency manipulations, and other harassments. In the past the Congress has authorized the President, in his negotiations, to lower tariffs by 50 percent. Under the successive acts passed, the United States has bargained away 80 percent of its tariffs and bargaining power. The result is not praiseworthy. The average U.S. tariff on dutiable goods at present is 11 percent while the average for other major industrial nations is 14 percent. Many important examples are in greater contrast—for instance, the tariff on European cars sold in the United States is 6½ percent and the tariff on American cars, under EEC proposals will soon be 22½ percent. Many other unfair situations can be cited especially in connection with our agricultural products. Candy is a widely consumed item and is made entirely from agricultural products. We permit candy to come in from Switzerland, France, Germany, or England under a tariff of 14 percent. American-made candy shipped to many of these nations faces a tariff of 30 percent. The farmers want to trade with the Common Market countries. We are the world's most efficient and lowest cost producers of agricultural products. Under the variable duties now in effect within the Common Market countries, the products of American farmers face a tariff in the Common Market countries, as of August 1, 1962, at least six times as high as corresponding tariffs on identical items imported from the Common Market into the United States. In addition to the inequality of tariffs facing the United States, we meet continually countless instances of the imposition of nontariff barriers mentioned above.

It is my belief trade negotiations can be carried on that would be mutually advantageous to the United States and to other countries. It must be a two-way street. The only safeguards remaining in the bill before us are ineffective. Discretionary power is given to the President, without limitation, to raise tariffs, to any level or to impose any other trade restriction. These provisions are not guidelines for negotiation. They will be applied, if at all, after the fact. They will subject the President to innumerable requests and pressures from deserving industries at home and will create ill will for the United States within foreign countries if they are ever applied.

The bill before us eliminates the peril-point procedure. No longer will the Tariff Commission, after it has made its studies, advise the President before the negotiations at what point injury might occur. This measure abandons the policy of economically sound increased trade and proceeds upon an admission that negotiations will be consummated to the injury of segments of our economy. The escape clause is shorn of effectiveness in existing law.

The powers delegated to the President are vastly greater than the powers heretofore delegated. He may, through negotiation, lower all tariffs from their present level, a level lower than almost any other country, by an average of 50 percent. An additional list of commodities is subject to being lowered more than 50 percent—in fact down to zero. The President is specifically authorized to negotiate away all tariffs now less than a 5-percent ad valorem equivalent. In these two latter categories of additional power will rest many of our agricultural products.

Prior acts had, as their goal, an expansion of trade and an increase of jobs. This measure substitutes a Government-managed economy for the United States and for foreign countries with shocking disregard for business and employment results. The bill sets up a superunemployment compensation system in addition to individual programs of our 50 States. It is another major step toward federalizing our unemployment systems. The bill permits workers or management to seek a finding that they are injured by imports. A worker so found to be unemployed by the reason of imports will be entitled to unemployment compensation for 52 weeks at approximately 65 percent of his salary. This will amount to almost twice the average rate of unemployment compensation paid by our States. He will receive these benefits for 52 weeks, a longer period than is provided by most State unemployment compensation systems.

If this Federal unemployment compensation system becomes the law it will bring about many inequalities and many instances of unfairness. A person whose unemployment is caused by the Executive granting concessions to destroy his job will draw a higher rate of unemployment compensation, for a longer period, than his neighbor who is secondarily unemployed because his employment was based upon goods or services provided to the business which closed because of imports. Attention is called to the testimony in the hearings of longtime, well-qualified administrators of State unemployment compensation systems who testified against this provision of the bill.

This measure is defective in its unprecedented and far-reaching delegation of power. It is lacking in that it fails to provide guidelines before agreements are entered into with foreign nations to protect the United States from arbitrary barriers or to protect the U.S. domestic market from excessive and uneconomic imports. The measure should be materially revised or delayed until January when such revision could be made.

CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senator.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Several Senators are addressing the Chair, the Senator from Minnesota among them. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I speak in support of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It is needed as a vital part of our domestic and foreign policy.

Without our fully realizing it, the movement toward European economic and political unity has snowballed until today it is one of the most prominent—if not the most prominent—feature on the international landscape. The accelerated momentum of the European idea has taken the United States somewhat unawares, despite our warm sponsorship of European integration ever since World War II.

In the immediate postwar era, the United States must have appeared, in relation to Europe, like a mother hen standing guard over a brood of frightened, wet, bedraggled chicks. Exhausted by mankind's greatest conflict to date, Europe was in no condition to stand up by itself to aggressive communism or to give itself the needed impetus to economic recovery.

Now all that is a thing of the past. Yesterday's chicks have come of age. Individually, the nations of Western Europe have demonstrated enormous productive and managerial capacity. Some countries—such as West Germany and Italy—have expanded their economies at a rate more than twice that of the United States. Others, such as politically troubled France, have used their internal resources so effectively that U.S. experts are inquiring as to whether the European success story can be emulated on this side of the Atlantic. Overshadowing all other achievements has been the flourishing European Common Market—that great area of progressively freer trade which now comprises six

nations in the industrial and cultural heart of Europe.

Proceeding gradually—and not without controversy and heartache—the Common Market has evolved into an economic trading bloc which already stands on its own feet as a formidable economic entity. Early this year, the six agreed upon their transition to the second stage of the Common Market, which means the eventual formation of a genuine free trade area, with a common external tariff policy and no internal trade barriers. In view of this development the United States has had to consider vigorous measures—measures not of reprisal or resistance but measures of adjustment and accommodation. Foremost among these has been the President's proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962, a progressive new departure from the old Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which the Trade Expansion Act is designed to supplant. The new trade expansion bill has successfully—indeed, with flying colors—hurdled partisan obstruction in the House of Representatives and now awaits favorable action by the Senate. Of all the principal measures of the 1962 Kennedy program, the trade bill stands the best chance of passage in the form desired by the administration.

The Trade Expansion Act as reported by the Finance Committee merits strong support and adoption by the Senate. H.R. 11970 merits this support because of what it will do to strengthen our own economy and to help realize a number of important goals in our relations with friendly countries. In the past, the trade agreements program, which has been extended on 11 occasions under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has contributed immeasurably to the strength and growth of our economy and to the economies of our free world trading partners. It has become a true national policy. The Trade Expansion Act retains the basic principle of the trade agreements program—that the growth of open and nondiscriminatory trade is beneficial to all nations—but provides the means to implement this principle in the light of the challenges and opportunities facing us in the 1960's. This new legislation deserves the same bipartisan support.

Rather than describe in general terms the merits of the bill before us and the benefits which will flow from its enactment, I would like to discuss three aspects of the measure which I feel are of outstanding importance. These are the necessary additional authority granted to the President, the economic opportunities available to us in the European Common Market, and the trade adjustment assistance program.

With regard to the first—the new authority which this act would delegate to the President: There are those who charge that the Trade Expansion Act would result in the full and complete abandonment of the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate tariffs. This act would do nothing of the kind. What it does is to continue for a limited fixed period the delegation of authority to set tariff rates within limits defined by Congress and with well-established safeguards that has been in effect since 1934. The Trade Expansion Act does increase the President's authority to reduce tariffs in negotiations designed to achieve reciprocal benefits and increase trade. But the Congress has clearly defined in detail the procedures necessary to develop a negotiating list of goods and by which various items may be reserved from negotiations. The Congress has also retained the right to review the President's decisions on escape-clause actions and to overrule these by a majority, not a two-thirds vote as exists in current legislation. It could well be argued that these limitations are more detailed and more stringent than under the reciprocal trade program.

What have been the results of this delegation of authority; and why must it be continued.

The United States has not achieved its commanding position in foreign trade by cowering behind high tariff walls. We began long ago to negotiate down our trade barriers and let the commerce of the world come to our doors. In return for our concessions, other nations have made it possible for our own goods to reach their markets more easily. The results of these reciprocal moves are easy to see; the United States is now the greatest trading country in the world; our imports have increased tenfold, from $1.4 billion in 1933 to $14.4 billion in 1961, while our exports have multiplied 12 times, from $1.7 to $20.1 billion. There is no segment of our economy which does not in some way benefit from foreign trade. There can be no doubt that the present trade agreements program has served this country well. But this 30-year-old law shows the strain of coping with the trade of the sixties in terms of the thirties. Now is the time to replace the old trade agreements mechanism by a plan tailored to today's realities and tomorrow's expansion. We must act quickly if we are to retain our leadership in our relations with our free world trading partners.

Among these trading partners none will be of greater importance to us in the future than the new community of nations arising across the Atlantic, the European Economic Community.

I have heard it said that while we welcome the emergence of the Common Market, it creates problems for us. It does create problems, but it will create a great many more problems if this bill is not enacted. Consider for a moment the tremendous economic potential opening up on the European continent for American producers, who know no equal in producing for a mass market. The six present members of the Common Market already have a population approximating our own and a gross national product about half ours. Negotiations will shortly be resumed looking toward membership of the United Kingdom in the Common Market; and several other European countries have applied for membership. I am confident that within the foreseeable future the result will be an integrated economy comprising from 250 to 300 million people with a productive capacity approaching our own.

These European countries are now experiencing the explosion of demand for consumer and other goods we have long known, and this will continue. If we are really interested in selling, and I believe we are, there is tremendous opportunity there, for someone will have to sell a great deal of merchandise before the Community reaches our level of saturation. According to recent statistics 95 out of every 100 Americans have a radio; in the EEC the corresponding figure is 23 out of every 100. For passenger cars the comparative statistics are 34 against 7, for television sets 29 against 4, refrigerators 28 against 6, and washing machines 27 against 6. Any salesman viewing these figures would have no difficulty in determining where to direct his sales efforts.

To capitalize on this opportunity, to expand the $3.55 billion in exports which we shipped to the EEC last year, it is essential that the negotiating authority contained in H.R. 11970 be granted to the President. For if this is not granted our exporters will be faced with an ever-increasing cost disadvantage as tariffs within the Community move toward total elimination.

My examples so far included only manufactured items, but I would be a poor representative of my State if I did not also mention the great interest of farmers in world markets.

AGRICULTURE AND THE TRADE BILL

Mr. President, I wish to make some observations on the Trade Expansion Act and the effects it can have on U.S. agriculture and agricultural exports.

Several factors—including a vigorous market promotion program carried out jointly by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and industry groups—redoubled efforts to negotiate favorable trade access terms—prosperity in dollar markets abroad—were responsible for our agricultural exports setting new records in both value and volume in the fiscal year ending June 30.

These exports reached $5.1 billion, and significant in this is that sales for dollars accounted for most of the gain over the $4.9 billion exported during the previous fiscal year. Our dollar sales were approximately $3.5 billion, which also is a record. Food-for-peace exports were valued at $1.6 billion.

With the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, we will have the machinery to further expand our agricultural exports. With this expansion we will be taking the most desirable, the most efficient, the best of all possible roads to reducing and eliminating our own agricultural surpluses—raising the income of our farmers and those dependent on farm income for their livelihood—and helping our less fortunate friends abroad who are suffering and dying because they have little or nothing to eat.

But the passage of this act, Mr. President, does not carry with it an automatic increase in agricultural exports, just as it does not mean more sales abroad for industry. It can be our most important legislative measure designed to benefit our agricultural areas.

The act itself is a ray of hope, a bright shining light which must be put to use before we can gain by it. It is like a

waterfall, which is a great potential source of energy but without the powerplants it cannot provide light for the smallest bulb.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will give the United States the flexibility it needs to deal with other nations on trade access matters, including agricultural trade. But with its passage we must devote our full efforts to market development, which is one of the big challenges and opportunities for putting the Nation's agricultural abundance to use.

The teamwork which has developed so rapidly and so well in recent years between Government and the private agricultural and trade organizations must continue and be coupled with the greatest ingenuity and skill in order to take full advantage of the potential that exists. It is highly interesting and significant that foreign markets are going to expand much more rapidly than markets in our own country.

Between 1950 and 1960 domestic markets grew about 14 percent while farm exports increased 84 percent. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert at this point in my remarks a chart showing major increases in fiscal year 1962 over the 1961 fiscal year. I call particular attention to the phenomenal rise of 30 percent in feed grains, 33 percent in poultry meat and 47 percent in protein meal.

All of these commodities are of major importance to the economy of my State of Minnesota. And I would like to see these figures even higher next year and the year after that and the following years. This can be done because this act will give us the machinery to do it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the exports of commodities which show major increases in fiscal year 1961–62, compared with 1960–61.

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

[Dollars in millions]

Commodity	1960–61	1961–62	Percent rise
Wheat, including flour	$1,151	$1,286	12
Feed grains	531	691	30
Tobacco	385	398	3
Soybeans	344	372	8
Fruits and preparations	254	280	10
Vegetable oils	148	171	16
Vegetables and preparations	127	135	6
Poultry meat	57	76	33
Protein meal	45	66	47

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this act can provide a strong economic boost to the farmers of Minnesota and the Nation. It represents sound economic policy, enlightened foreign policy and the legal framework for a vast expansion of trade.

In Minnesota alone during the 1960–61 season a total of $163,700,000 worth of farm products were exported, and an estimated 23,700 farmworkers in the State were kept busy in the production of farm goods for export. Minnesota food and related products industries, employing 13,807 workers, exported products worth $49,400,000 in 1960.

Minnesota's economy, as related to foreign trade, is linked far more to exports than to imports and the tariff-cutting authority in this bill would bring an increase of trade which will mean tremendous benefits to Minnesota and its people and the other States in this country and their people.

Agricultural exports make up about one-fourth of all U.S. exports. A nationwide study completed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture this year showed that each of our States has a significant share of total exports of farm products to world markets. The study is a clear indication that continuation of high-level exports is essential to our agricultural economy.

During the 1961 fiscal year the output of 60 million acres of U.S. cropland moved abroad, or 1 acre out of every 6 harvested. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President to insert at this point in my remarks the study to which I have referred, showing the value of agricultural exports and competitive agricultural imports by region and State for the 1961 fiscal year.

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

Value of agricultural exports and competitive agricultural imports, by region and State, fiscal year 1960–61

[In millions]

Region and State	Principal exports	Agricultural export equivalents [1]	Competitive agricultural import equivalents [1]
New England		$56.1	$17.2
Maine	Potatoes and poultry products	25.6	6.3
New Hampshire	Dairy and poultry products	2.7	1.1
Vermont	Dairy products	4.8	2.2
Massachusetts	Apples and dairy and poultry products.	9.9	3.8
Rhode Island	Dairy products	1.6	.5
Connecticut	Tobacco and dairy and poultry products.	11.5	3.3
Middle Atlantic		136.0	54.7
New York	Apples and dairy and poultry products.	59.1	24.3
New Jersey	Apples, poultry products, and vegetables.	19.9	8.3
Pennsylvania	Wheat, tobacco, and dairy products	57.0	22.2
East North Central		746.3	272.3
Ohio	Soybeans, wheat, corn, and livestock products.	117.7	42.4
Indiana	do	149.3	53.1
Illinois	do	320.1	112.0
Michigan	Wheat, corn, soybeans, and dairy products.	94.9	33.7
Wisconsin	Corn, tobacco, and dairy products	64.3	31.1
West North Central		1,105.3	448.3
Minnesota	Soybeans, corn, and livestock products.	163.7	59.8
Iowa	do	248.0	126.6
Missouri	Soybeans, wheat, cotton, and livestock products.	154.4	58.0
North Dakota	Wheat and livestock products	111.7	31.9
South Dakota	Wheat, corn, and livestock products	46.4	27 9
Nebraska	Wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and livestock products.	176.9	73.2
Kansas	Wheat, grain sorghums, soybeans, and livestock products.	204.2	70.9
South Atlantic		597.0	193.0
Delaware	Soybeans and poultry products	9.7	2.4
Maryland	Tobacco, soybeans, and poultry and dairy products.	27.0	8.5
So. Atlantic—Con.			
Virginia	Tobacco, soybeans, and apples	$63.4	$21.2
West Virginia	Tobacco and livestock products	7.0	4.0
North Carolina	Tobacco, cotton, soybeans, and poultry products.	210.5	50.9
South Carolina	Tobacco, cotton, and soybeans	75.4	20.2
Georgia	Cotton, tobacco, and poultry products	102.8	28.9
Florida	Oranges, tobacco, and vegetables	101.2	56.9
East South Central		402.9	114.9
Kentucky	Tobacco, wheat, and livestock	101.4	31.6
Tennessee	Cotton, tobacco, soybeans, and livestock products.	93.0	27.8
Alabama	Cotton and poultry products	71.6	20.4
Mississippi	Cotton, soybeans, and livestock products.	136.9	35.1
West South Central		802.9	236.3
Arkansas	Cotton, soybeans, and rice	171.2	41.5
Louisiana	Cotton and rice	81.9	22.0
Oklahoma	Wheat, cotton, and livestock products	103.3	35.8
Texas	Cotton, grain sorghums, wheat, rice and livestock.	446.5	137.0
Mountain		390.5	147.1
Montana	Wheat and livestock products	67.9	24.3
Idaho	do	95.1	28.6
Wyoming	do	16.3	9.4
Colorado	Wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and livestock products.	81.7	35.0
New Mexico	Cotton, wheat, and livestock products	35.4	12.7
Arizona	Cotton, grain sorghums, and livestock products.	74.2	26.5
Utah	Wheat and livestock products	15.6	7.5
Nevada	Livestock products	4.3	3.1
Pacific		702.9	269.7
Washington	Wheat, fruits, and livestock products	113.0	38.2
Oregon	Wheat, fruits and nuts, and livestock products.	68.1	25.6
California	Cotton, rice, fruits and nuts, and livestock products.	477.5	194.8
United States		[2] 4,946.6	[2] 1,810.3

[1] The equivalent shares were derived from the States' contribution to national sales or output as determined from agricultural census data. They do not show actual exports or imports, though they reflect the common stake of the States in total U.S. trade based on Bureau of Census trade data.

[2] Total U.S. agricultural exports based on Bureau of Census data exceed the export totals for the States while total U.S. agricultural imports exceed the import totals for the States because of the exclusion of certain beverages and nursery and greenhouse stock in the State items and because Alaska and Hawaii are included in the national total.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I have said, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is but the machinery to increase our agricultural and other exports. We all are aware of the reason why this legislation has taken on a high priority and why it is of the utmost importance that it be passed this year. The reason, of course, is the emergence of the European Economic Community, or Common Market.

The biggest area dollar outlet for our agricultural exports in fiscal year 1962 was the Common Market, with a value of about $1.2 billion. This was one-third of the value of our agricultural exports to all dollar markets last year.

But while the Common Market is good for American agriculture—and particularly for those commodities not produced within the Common Market but which the United States has available for export, such as cotton, soybeans, hides and skins—there are some special problems we must face in our negotiations with the Common Market for sales of agricultural commodities.

With respect to such commodities as grains, rice, and poultry, which are important U.S. export products, there are protectionist tendencies at work in the Common Market.

The Common Market is developing an internal agricultural market which will be protected against imports from outside countries by variable import levies. These levies will equalize the price of the imported products with the Common Market's internal domestic prices. Under such a system Common Market domestic producers of those commodities which are subject to variable levies could have absolute protection against imports, depending upon price support levels.

If the United Kingdom should become a member of the European Economic Community our problems in this area would increase substantially, since our agricultural exports to the United Kingdom in the fiscal year 1962 approached $500 million. This, then, is the immediate problem for American agriculture—how to meet the trade challenges posed by the Common Market.

For those items with a fixed duty we can use the traditional tariff bargaining, or exchanging reductions of U.S. duties for comparable reductions of Common Market duties. I am encouraged that the Common Market already has indicated its willingness to negotiate on these commodities.

But with the highly complex variable import levy items we are going to face problems. This is a system not adaptable to the usual tariff bargaining.

The Department of Agriculture already has taken steps to meet these problems with the establishment of a new agricultural attaché post in Brussels, Belgium, the so-called capital of the Common Market. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and others in the Department of Agriculture have had numerous discussions with Common Market officials and the Secretary has personally visited the Common Market to present the case for American agriculture. The efforts of the Secretary in this regard deserve great commendation.

The passage of the Trade Expansion Act will provide more flexibility and strength at the bargaining table for American agriculture. The Common Market has agreed to keep the door open for continuing negotiations on certain agricultural commodities which are affected by variable import levies, such as wheat, corn, grain sorghum, rice, and poultry. The Trade Expansion Act will enable the United States to make concessions to gain improved access for these farm products.

But there must be concessions on both sides and it is important that this bill authorizes the President to increase duties as a further bargaining tool to regulate trade.

The President could deny the benefits of U.S. trade agreements to countries maintaining such nontariff trade restrictions as unlimited variable fees which substantially burden U.S. commerce in a manner inconsistent with provisions of trade agreements. In this way the United States will be carrying out a truly reciprocal trade policy and will not merely stand by if its agricultural export markets are eroded by unwarranted foreign governmental actions.

Mr. President, I am for the Common Market and I am for a liberalized trade policy. But this policy must do justice to American agriculture—a vital part of our economy and a part that has suffered all too much in the past.

American agriculture needs markets now and it will need them even more so in the future. It is essential that we keep in mind that liberalized trade policies include agriculture.

In this act we have the machinery—the sunlight of a freer trade has broken through the clouds of protectionism. We must now make use of this light and so doing must not forget American farmers, whose efficiency, industriousness, and good, honest hard work have made a valuable contribution to the high standard of living shared by all of us in the United States today.

TRADE EXPANSION FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

As an inalienable part of his program, the President envisages broad safeguards to American industry. However, in cases where unavoidable damage through imports is suffered by companies, farmers, and workers, the trade bill provides effective trade adjustment assistance—in the form of financial help and training to displaced workers or advice, tax benefits, and loan guarantees to businessmen and farmers.

This is a subject in which I have been interested for some time and about which I feel very strongly. Several years ago the President, then a Member of this body, and I sponsored proposals for an adjustment assistance program. In July 1958 the then Senator John F. Kennedy, Senators Douglas, Javits, Neuberger, and I introduced amendments that would have added a trade adjustment assistance program to the 1958 renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. It is, therefore, with a sense of satisfaction that I see this bill before us today incorporating such a program—a program which has now been accepted as an integral part of the trade bill by our colleagues in the House and by our own Finance Committee.

I support this program because I feel it adds to the import side of an expanding trade policy a new approach consistent with that applied to the export, or negotiating side. I say "adds," for the bill retains the traditional technique of restricting imports through tariffs and quotas when the President, acting on the advice of the Tariff Commission and other informed sources, determines that such restrictions will best prevent or remedy injury to a domestic industry. And it adds:

First. A new dimension for firms—authority to extend technical, financial, and tax assistance; for workers—readjustment allowances, training, and relocation allowances;

Second. A new flexibility—ability to tailor assistance programs to the real needs of individual firms and workers and to aid industries through a combination of all available means of assistance; and

Third. A new initiative—constructive adjustment which will convert the competitive force generated by imports into positive energy stimulating our growth and prosperity.

Adjustment to competition is an ageless issue. In our domestic economy, and within our tariff walls, we have accepted, welcomed, even encouraged it—for competition is the lifeblood of the free enterprise system. It forces change, adjustment, and innovation, and these in turn are the bases for growth and prosperity.

But our attitude toward foreign competition, even though this is insignificant in comparison to competition from domestic sources, has failed to keep pace with our attitude toward domestic competition. And our policies, reflecting this lag, have tended to restrain import competition and to shelter some domestic producers from the need to adjust. If these policies were suitable in the past, they are as obsolete today as the Gibson Girl and the buggy whip. The question is no longer whether or not to adjust, but how best to adjust, to the impulse of foreign trade. For regardless of what tariff action we take, or if we take no action at all, domestic adjustments will be necessary.

If we raise our tariffs, we will have to adjust. Most of our tariff rates are bound in agreements with other countries who gave us concessions in their tariffs in return. If we raise certain of these bound rates, we are obligated to offer compensation to the injured country by reducing our tariffs on other items. Or if the other country refuses our compensation and elects to retaliate by raising its own tariff barriers, our exporters are forced to adjust to this loss in their foreign markets.

If we maintain all our existing tariff levels, we will also have to adjust. As the six nations of the European Common Market eliminate all duties on trade with each other, our rich export markets in the area will be jeopardized and our exporting industries will be faced with shrinking sales, unless we are able to bargain down the common external tariff of the Common Market and

preserve and expand our exports to this very promising market.

And, if we reduce our tariffs, we will have to adjust. However, in this case we will not be adjusting just because of the impact of increasing imports, we will also be adjusting to the increased opportunities for our exports which are made possible by the exchange of tariff concessions with other countries. Only in this case then does adjustment offer real opportunities for expanding sales, production, profits, and employment.

How then can we best adjust to the impulse of foreign trade? We can best adjust if we adopt policies which experience tells us will succeed. And in formulating these policies we can profit from our own experience as well as from that of other countries.

Since 1934 the United States has pursued a trade policy which has resulted in expanding exports and expanding imports, and we have prospered because of it.

Six nations on the European Continent have elected to capitalize on the opportunities afforded by an expanding trade policy and are now eliminating all duties and other barriers to trade with each other. These six countries have established a trade adjustment assistance program to help their firms and workers adjust to an increase in competition which is far greater than any possible under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act. Tariffs on all nonagricultural products traded among the Common Market countries have already been cut in half, yet the adjustment assistance program has been used in only one case; and the six Common Market countries are prospering as never before.

The Trade Expansion Act with its trade adjustment assistance program embodies these policies which have been proven by experience. It is in short, the rational approach to the ageless issue of import competition.

In concluding his message to the Congress introducing the Trade Expansion Act, the President said:

> The purpose of this message has been to describe the challenge we face and the tools we need. The decision rests with the Congress. That decision will either mark the beginning of a new chapter in the alliance of free nations, or a threat to the growth of Western unity. The two great Atlantic markets will either grow together or they will grow apart. The meaning and range of free economic choice will either be widened for the benefit of freemen everywhere or confused and constricted by new barriers and delays.

I accept the President's challenge and have made my decision. I support the Trade Expansion Act and I ask for an overwhelming vote in its favor.

The Trade Expansion Act is a comprehensive program of adjustment to the radically changed world economic pattern of the 1960's. Although primarily designed to cope with the challenge of the Common Market, the trade bill will be of material assistance in our relations with our traditional trading partners in Latin America and the Far East, whose interests we have not forgotten.

The Trade Expansion Act is only our first reaction to the European Common Market and it is a reaction to only one aspect of the Common Market; namely, its importance to the continued health and vitality of our foreign trade. Statesmen on both sides of the Atlantic have frequently maintained that the logical result of European economic integration is a wider political unity, perhaps a United States of Europe capable of playing a role in world politics equal with that of the United States and Soviet Russia. Political unity looms as the culmination of a process of which the Common Market is the first and most significant step.

The last few years have seen the almost miraculous fulfillment of these conditions.

Through the help of the United States and the marshaling of its own genius, Europe has more than regained its prewar prosperity. The necessity to guard Western civilization against Communist imperialism has made close allies of countries which only a few years before had been at each other's throats.

NATO has given each country a sense of contribution to the common Western defense effort. Above all, the eyes of Europeans have been opened to the economic possibilities of cooperation. Through trial, error, and patient persistence, through the experience of the Common Market, the European Coal and Steel Community, Euratom and other institutions, nations have learned that their pooled efforts far outweigh their individual capacities.

As a result, the goal of political unity has been an implicit and explicit corollary of European cooperation in the economic sphere. In applying for full membership in the Common Market, Great Britain, too, has in effect resolved to merge her separate political destiny with that of her continental neighbors. To do so required a great effort of will, a conscious divorce from exclusive imperial tradition. Even today, conflict rages in the the chancelleries of Europe as to the nature and the timetable of European unity: Should Europe be, as the Germans seem to be saying, a closely knit fraternity of club members prepared to accept all the rules of membership and abide by the collective will? Or should it be, as in the French view, a looser union of "fatherlands" in which each country surrenders a minimum of sovereignty while retaining a maximum quantity of national grandeur. Should the European club be made exclusive, for the sake of a more perfect and efficient union, or should weaker, smaller nations be allowed to partake of the advantages of membership even though constitutionally or otherwise they are unable to shoulder the full political burden of membership?

To a large extent these are the questions facing the architects of European unity today. They cannot be resolved quickly, nor is there any guarantee that they will be resolved at all. It should be clearly understood, however, that they are the last remaining obstacles to the formation of a single political entity numbering close to 300 million souls, with an economic and military potential equal to or surpassing our own. Furthermore, there is a firm will in Europe to overcome all problems.

For instance, on July 18, 1961, a European summit conference at Bonn, Germany, declared that the six Common Market countries intended to give "shape to the will for political union already implicit in the treaties establishing the European Communities." Day before yesterday in Paris—July 5—President de Gaulle of France and Chancellor Adenauer of Germany—whose views on this question are known to differ at least superficially—declared that it was "desirable to bring the discussions on the creation of a political federation, which would consolidate achievements already made in the economic field, to a conclusive agreement with their partners."

Given this will to cooperate in Europe, it was singularly appropriate that President Kennedy should have chosen the Fourth of July in Philadelphia's Independence Hall to make his historic and ringing call for a declaration of interdependence between the United States and a united Europe. President Kennedy drew a consistent parallel between the experience of the United States in forging a workable Federal constitution out of the raw material of independence and the slow, sometimes painful stages by which a similar process would have to take place in Europe. Yet he left no doubt that he expected the European movement to be crowned with success, and equally clearly, he staked out the claim of the United States to have a special, mutually beneficial relationship with Europe.

The President left no doubt that he conceives of a partnership between Europe and America which would consist of more than sentimental ties and less than the ties between vassal and suzerain. On the contrary, the proposed relationship would be one of equality—a relationship in which both Europe and the United States could provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and carry out their mutual obligations for the emerging nations and the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The President likewise left no doubt that a united Europe must not become a "third force" counterpoised between the United States and the Soviet Union. In his own words:

> We do not regard a strong and united Europe as a rival but as a partner. To aid its progress has been the basic objective of our foreign policy for 17 years. We believe that a united Europe will be capable of playing a greater role in the common defense, of responding more generously to the needs of poorer nations, of joining with the United States and others in lowering trade barriers, resolving problems of currency and commodities, and developing coordinated policies in all other economic, diplomatic and political areas. We see in such a Europe a partner with whom we could deal on a basis of full equality in all the great and burdensome tasks of building and defending a community of free nations.

In short, what the President proposes, and what every American should welcome, is a discussion between the United States and Europe—once its unity has been established—as to "ways and means of forming a concrete Atlantic partner-

ship." Already, this partnership exists in more or less solid form—in the shape of institutions such as the Organization for Economic Development, the Development Advisory Group, NATO, and others. But the West needs a much more comprehensive, a much more detailed and institutionalized instrument of cooperation, the more so as relations between North America and Europe become less and less multilateral and more and more bilateral. We need a true Atlantic charter for the sixties and seventies.

The President, says the Times of London, has advanced "an imaginative idea, typical of his sense of style and history." His speech, I would say, makes a double contribution of unsurpassed value to the cause of Western unity. First, he frankly admits that the goals of international justice, domestic tranquility, defense against aggression, general welfare, or the blessings of liberty can be achieved by any one nation in today's world. This would seem to answer the fear of some who might object that the United States is trying to horn in on Europe and establish Anglo-Saxon domination over continental institutions. Secondly, he states just as frankly that his grand scheme is not a blueprint for tomorrow but a goal to be striven for over the years:

All this—

He says—

will not be completed in a year, but let the world know it is our goal.

The United States, therefore, will neither withdraw from Europe nor will it seek to reestablish hegemony over Europe. It is going to cooperate closely with Europe once the latter has solved its constitutional problems. If this remains our goal, despite all the setbacks and disappointments which may be encountered, then the West will have found nine-tenths of its answer to the Communist threat.

This, then, is the environment in which the Trade Expansion Act must be considered and passed.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. President, I would like to discuss the reasons why I have so strongly supported the Kennedy trade bill.

I have done so knowing that there are older industries in my State which have been hurt by foreign competition in the past and which may feel even greater pressures from it when this program goes into effect. I believe, however, that in the long run Massachusetts gains in new markets and trade opportunities will more than offset its losses through foreign competition. Furthermore, I believe that this bill provides new and better safeguards for the older industries.

In part, these safeguards consist of provisions to enable them to adjust to changing conditions and to remain competitive without traditional tariff barriers. More important, however, they give to the President more powerful and flexible tools to act swiftly to assist any industry facing unfair foreign competition. This has already been done under the Kennedy administration without the assistance of this bill. I know that this bill will enable President Kennedy to greatly expand his efforts in this area.

There are several safeguards in this bill for domestic industries threatened by foreign competition. First, tariff reductions must be spread out over a 5-year period. Second, the escape clause provisions have been clarified and strengthened. Thirdly, provisions are included for adjustment assistance to help industries hurt by foreign competition to adjust to new conditions. The adjustment assistance provisions are particularly important as they can be adapted to the needs of individual firms. They allow greater flexibility for the firms to meet the problems of foreign competition than that provided by tariffs. This bill does not by any means eliminate tariff and import quotas. It recognizes, however, the fact that a rapidly changing economy requires flexible assistance provisions. Adjustment assistance is a modern way of meeting the new economic problems of our age.

The most important safeguards, however, are those which increase the decision making powers of the President. He has been given additional authority to deal with countries which maintain unfavorable trade restrictions against the United States. He also has increased power to enter into marketing agreements to protect products covered by the escape clause provisions. In general, this bill makes it both easier for the industry to gain access to the President and for him to act on their requests.

Under the Kennedy administration, we have already seen what can be done through vigorous executive action to protect an industry hurt by foreign competition. President Kennedy took the initiative in May 1961 in preparing a broad program to help the textile industry. Since then, the United States has set up a long-term, 18-nation agreement permitting importing countries to take restraint actions to prevent marketing disruption by low cost imports. Congress then supplemented the President's powers to permit him to control nonparticipating nations.

As a result of this work, over 75 percent of the import movement of cotton textile production has been kept under control. Sixty-eight specific restraint actions have been taken against other countries in the less than 1 year that this program has been underway. Mill activity and profits in the cotton textile industry have risen and the decline in employment in that industry has been halted.

This is an example of what vigorous action has done for one industry in our country hurt by foreign competition. More can be done along these lines and will be, I am sure. There is no person in the country more knowledgeable and concerned over the problems of our older industries than our President. He represented my State on Capitol Hill for a decade and knows firsthand the problems which the older industries of Massachusetts, New England, and other parts of the country face. By increasing the President's power to deal with these problems, Congress has given him a greater opportunity to give to other industries the same relief which he gave to the textile industry.

The primary purpose of this bill is to open new opportunities for expansion abroad for American industry. This is especially important to Massachusetts. In 1960, my State sent nearly $450 million worth of manufacture and agriculture abroad. Almost a third of the working force in the Commonwealth in over 300 firms benefited through jobs from these exports. Massachusetts was the eighth largest exporting State in the Union in that year.

These exports came in a large part from industries where American industrial know-how and manufacturing skills gave us a competitive advantage. American industries have many such advantages in exporting to foreign countries and it is important that we make the best use of them. We have had long experience in many enterprises that are new to foreign countries, and possess technological methods that are the world's finest. Through advanced techniques of production and distribution, we can get our products to market quicker and cheaper than even other highly industrialized nations.

The Kennedy trade program will enable us to convert the benefits of our advanced industrial economy into jobs through expanded exports. This is of utmost importance to the country. Our economy cannot afford to stand still. If our sales do not increase, if we do not provide ourselves with the necessary tools to deal with the rapidly growing European Common Market area, we shall not only halt our growth but begin to decline. On the other hand, if we combine forces with the European Common Market we will not only bolster our own economy through this action but we will offer to the Soviet bloc an industrial might with twice their economic power. Over the long run, this is a greater threat to Mr. Khrushchev than all our armaments.

He knows this and has recently taken steps in eastern Europe to bolster the economic strength of that area. The free world, however, still has a great lead over the Communist bloc in the economic field. This trade program will be a great step toward insuring that we keep that lead. I consider it a great privilege to have served in the Senate at a time when we approved a forward looking measure such as this one.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, with a view toward clarifying the intention of the legislation by the making of some legislative history, I wonder if I could ask a few questions of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Finance. My first question refers specifically to the word "predominantly," which appears on lines 12 and 13 on page 49 and on line 24 on page 52 of the bill. Is it the intention that this means over 50 percent?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I believe that that is the intention. This is borne out by the statement in the House report appearing at the middle of page 54.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator. My next question is this: Referring specifically to the word "major," appearing

on line 7 at page 35, is it the intention that this does not necessarily mean over 50 percent?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The answer to the Senator is that that is my personal interpretation.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has rightly been called one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in several decades. It is a forward-looking and far-reaching bill which faces up to the challenges of a rapidly changing world, a world in which yesterday's formulas are no longer adequate for today's problems.

This bill puts the United States on record as announcing to the rest of the world that we are prepared to make a positive response to new situations. And the situations are new. After many years of enjoying our position of unrivaled economic supremacy, we now see that across the Atlantic the nations of Western Europe have at last discovered the potential which lies in economic union. These nations are producing—and consuming—at record rates. This is all to the good. We welcome it. There is, in fact, every reason to believe that the United States as well as Western Europe will benefit from the economic revolution which is taking place. But in order to compete effectively with West Germany, France, Italy, and the rest, in order to take advantage of the vast market which has opened up abroad and, at the same time, to enjoy the fruits of their labor, we must revise our trade laws and recognize that adjustments will be necessary.

Mr. President, the Trade Expansion Act which is before the Senate today is, in reality, a "fair trade" bill. Its aim is to insure those conditions around the world which will foster and guarantee the age-old right to exchange goods and services in a free and open marketplace. To this end, the bill gives to the President the power to reduce our tariffs—but on a truly reciprocal basis. Trade is a two-way street, and the purposes of this legislation will be accomplished only if they are accepted in fact as well as in principle by the other nations of the world.

At the same time, the bill is protectionist, in the best sense of the word. It protects the principle of the free market at home. It is designed to protect the American businessman in his right to compete fairly around the world. And it protects American workers and firms from unfair competition. Moreover, it protects them from the consequences of imports and import competition which may result from the enactment.

Once again I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act which make this a fair trade measure. With regard to the real and discretionary power given to the President to safeguard genuine competition, H.R. 11970 came from the House with the following provisions:

Section 201(b), which gives to the President, in addition to his basic authority to reduce duties, authority to increase duties to 50 percent above the level of July 1, 1934.

Section 232, which retains the present authority to adjust the level of imports when the President finds that they threaten to impair the national security.

Section 252, which requires the President to take all appropriate and feasible steps in his power to eliminate unjustifiable foreign import restrictions which impair the value of tariff commitments made to the United States, oppress the commerce of the United States, or prevent the expansion of trade. He may not, however, give concessions on U.S. duties in order to accomplish this end. Further, the President is required, to the extent consistent with the purposes stated in the bill, to prevent the application of trade agreement benefits to products of countries which maintain unwarranted nontariff trade restrictions against the United States or which engage in discriminatory acts or policies which unjustifiably restrict U.S. commerce.

To these important provisions, which are in the interest of fair trade, the Finance Committee has given the President the following general powers:

Section 353, which provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, when he finds it in the national interest to do so, increase any existing duty to the extent he finds necessary, impose a duty on an article to the extent he finds necessary, and impose such other import restrictions to the extent he finds necessary.

Section 252(c), which provides that whenever a country or instrumentality, the products of which receive benefits of trade agreement concessions made by the United States, maintains import restrictions which are unreasonable, although they may be legally justifiable, and which either directly or indirectly substantially burden U.S. commerce, the President may, to the extent consistent with the purposes set out in section 102, and having due regard for the international obligations of the United States, first, suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of benefits of trade agreement concessions to products of such country or instrumentality; or, second, refrain from proclaiming benefits of trade agreement concessions to carry out a trade agreement with such country or instrumentality.

Section 352, which provides that after receiving an affirmative finding of the Tariff Commission under section 301(b) with respect to an industry, the President may, as an alternative to the action authorized by section 351(a)(1), but subject to the congressional review procedures of the other paragraphs of section 351(a), negotiate with foreign countries international agreements limiting the export from such countries and the import into the United States of the article causing or threatening to cause serious injury to such industry, whenever he determines that such an agreement would be more appropriate than tariff relief to prevent or remedy serious injury to the industry.

The Finance Committee has also recognized the special problems which attend the continued export of American agricultural products to Western Europe with an amendment to section 252(a) which provides that the President shall impose duties or other import restrictions on the products of any country establishing or maintaining burdensome restrictions against U.S. agricultural products.

Finally, in the interests of safeguarding American agriculture, the committee has added section 257(h), which provides that nothing in H.R. 11970 shall be construed to affect in any way the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 22 is designed to protect agricultural products participating in Government price-support programs from dumping or other unfair practices on the part of foreign nations.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the various sections I have cited will, if properly administered—and I expect them to be so administered—afford adequate protection to the American businessman, worker, and farmer against restrictive and unfair practices abroad, thereby guaranteeing that the purposes of the Trade Expansion Act will be accomplished.

I stated earlier that this bill is designed also to protect American businesses and workers who might, despite these protection provisions, be injured because of this legislation. We would be foolish if we closed our minds to the fact that there will be some injuries as we liberalize our trade laws. I sincerely believe that injury to American workers and producers will be limited in scope and duration, and that the resiliency and adaptability of American industry will act to reduce the extent of injury; but I would not want to be the one to have to tell the unemployed worker and his family or the businessman who has been forced to close his plant that they represent but a small segment of the American economy, the segment that has been idled by the effects of our new trade act. Those who are injured because of the implementation of national policy are entitled to assistance. It is important, and indeed essential, that the Trade Expansion Act include provisions for their relief.

The idea of helping firms and workers who may be injured because of national trade is not new. In 1950, administration spokesmen testifying in behalf of foreign economic aid suggested that some form of compensation might be appropriate for persons who suffered economic loss as a result of the lowering of American tariffs; and in 1953, the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security submitted a report on "A Trade and Tariff Policy in the National Interest," in which the principle of adjustment assistance was endorsed. But in neither case was a specific program offered. Also in 1953, Mr. John S. Coleman, chairman of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, and president of the Burroughs Corp., told the Randall Commission that "assistance should be provided to enterprises, communities, and employees affected by reduction in import restrictions where it is needed to help them adjust to dislocation," although in his proposal Mr. Coleman emphasized assistance that would permit avoidance of

injury, where possible, rather than straight indemnification against injury.

The Randall Commission took a position against special Government adjustment assistance. However, one member of the Commission, United Steelworkers President David McDonald, formally proposed assistance, urging that "adequate provision be made in the law for sharing the costs of such adjustments as may be necessitated by increased imports." Mr. McDonald's proposal focused public attention on the problem; and in the years that followed a number of bills calling for adjustment assistance, including one that I cosponsored—S. 3803, in the 86th Congress—were introduced in Congress. One of the first of these was S. 3650, introduced in 1954 by then Senator John F. Kennedy, which the sponsor said was similar in many respects to the McDonald proposal.

In 1959 to 1960, the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, which I had the privilege of chairing, made an extensive study of unemployment conditions in the United States. One of the recommendations of the majority was the "enactment of adjustment legislation to relieve the impact of international trade policies on employees, businesses, and communities adversely affected." The minority went into more detail, stating that "we see no reason why a relatively small number of persons who are vulnerable to import competition from low-wage countries should be expected to bear the brunt of the cost of national adjustment to increased imports," and recommending assistance to firms through "loans, tax concessions or other forms of assistance to adjust to new lines of production," and assistance to workers in helping them to move to new jobs and to develop new skills.

Under the adjustment assistance provisions of H.R. 11970, workers who qualify would be eligible for, first, readjustment allowances, usually amounting to 65 percent of the worker's average weekly wage, but in no case more than 65 percent of the national average manufacturing wage, for up to 52 weeks for all workers, with provision for up to 26 more weeks for a worker in an approved training program, or a possible 13 more weeks for workers over 60 years of age who are not getting training; second, vocational education and training to help workers hurt by imports to develop higher and different skills; and, third, relocation allowances to pay for the worker's and his family's moving expenses, plus a lumpsum payment of about $230.

Firms which are hurt by import competition and which submit a sound economic adjustment proposal reflecting efforts toward self-help and consideration of the interests of their workers may qualify for technical assistance, loans, or permission to carry back a net operating loss for tax purposes to 5 years, rather than the normal 3 years.

It is not unusual for the Federal Government to make special provision for situations arising out of national policy. Congress has in the past enacted such programs as the GI bill of rights, the reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen, unemployment compensation for certain Korean veterans, reemployment rights for veterans, and hospital and other benefits for those injured in advancing the national interest.

Why is such a program of adjustment assistance necessary in an economy which retains the dynamism of ours? In the first place, adjustment assistance is intended to be complementary to the escape-clause provisions and the staging requirements also provided in the bill. Second, adjustment assistance is a more adaptable and flexible tool for adjusting to trade situations than anything heretofore proposed.

In cases where industrywide injury may not be sufficient to warrant tax relief, adjustment assistance can be given to individual firms and groups of workers who may be genuinely injured. With various kinds of assistance available, a particular program can be adjusted to the special needs of the firms and workers who may be affected. At the same time, assistance can be given in one area, without affecting our overall trade policy, and without inviting retaliatory action from abroad. The program, above all, directly promotes what Secretary Hodges called a "constructive response to the challenge of import competition."

The statement by the Secretary of Commerce is important in pointing up the fact that adjustment assistance is not a dole or a subsidy. Neither is the program expected to be very large. The best estimates are that it will affect perhaps 18,000 workers a year, or 90,000 over a 5-year period. Furthermore, maximum use will be made of existing agencies in providing assistance, so that there need be no fears about an expanding Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. President, I am confident that the Trade Expansion Act will assist the United States in meeting the new challenges of a rapidly changing world. I have emphasized my belief that this is truly a "fair trade" act, one which will contribute to the elimination of trade barriers and restrictions all over the world. I believe the bill is fair in what it attempts to do for American industry, for American labor, for American agriculture, and, indeed, for all the American people. The United States is often reminded of its special responsibilities of leadership. I believe we are here providing an instrument for the more effective exercise of that leadership of the world, while at the same time we meet and fulfill our obligations to the American people.

Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment to the inducing clause of section 252(a) which would strike the word "unjustifiably" and reinsert the word "unjustifiable" before the phrase "foreign import restrictions," which are the subject of this subsection. This would have had the effect of returning to the language of the House bill.

The change was made in the House bill not with any intent to change the substance of the inducing clause but rather as a clarification of its language. It has been brought to my attention that the inducing clause contains three situations in the alternative, in any one of which the President is required to take the action specified in the three subparagraphs of section 252(a), including paragraph 3, which is Senator WILLIAMS' amendment. If, as in the committee's bill, the word "unjustifiable" or "unjustifiably" is used to modify only one of these three alternatives, the other two alternative clauses can be read to require the President to act even though the restrictions in question are legitimate and justifiable. This would be particularly unfortunate in the case of paragraph 2 of section 252(a), which prohibits the President from negotiating U.S. concessions in order to obtain the reduction in any foreign import restriction which is the subject of that subsection. The intent of this paragraph is clearly only to make the prohibition apply to bargaining for the reduction of unjustifiable restrictions.

By the reinsertion of the word "unjustifiable" to modify the import restrictions which are the subject of section 252(a), it will be clear that, as in the case of section 252(b), the President is fully armed to take action against foreign import restrictions which are illegitimate, by virtue of being inconsistent with, or contrary to, international agreements like the GATT and treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Senator DOUGLAS' amendment, the new section 252(c), on the other hand, authorizes action against unreasonable import restrictions, that is, restrictions which, though they may be legally justifiable, unreasonably impose a substantial burden upon U.S. commerce. Taken together, sections 252 (a), (b), and (c) will thereby provide a formidable array of powers which the President can invoke, if he sees fit, to attempt to induce the reduction or removal of both illegal and legal but reasonable import restrictions which burden U.S. commerce abroad.

Accordingly, consistent with the committee's intention but in the light of a more careful reading of the inducing clause of section 252(a), I believe that this amendment, returning to the language of the House bill, is a necessary one. Since it effects no substantive change and is merely in the nature of a technical amendment, I hope that it will be adopted in conference.

Due to the fact that third reading of the bill came earlier than I had anticipated, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendments printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Amendments to section 252(a): Page 20, line 24, insert "unjustifiable" before "foreign import restrictions".

Page 21, line 1, strike "unjustifiably".

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think that one should record his impressions of the problems presented by the trade bill and give his reasons for support of same.

No one knows what will be the impact of this trade bill on both the major and minor segments of our economy. I am certain it will in some respects be upsetting, and will cause special burdens to many segments of our business and industrial life.

However great these burdens may prove to be, I am also certain that the sufferings and burdens will be worse, should we fail to act at all.

Substantial changes are rapidly coming about in the economic conditions of the world. New trade problems and possibilities come with each passing month. To a degree, this legislation is an experiment in meeting these new conditions—but at the same time it is a necessary experiment.

Tremendous power will be vested in the executive department of the Government in devising and administering the far-reaching trade policies which will evolve from this measure. I vote to grant this power because I think it is necessary to meet new conditions at home and abroad.

A major point to always remember is that to meet changing conditions we have to negotiate with other nations. Our present trade bill law has expired and it is necessary that we pass some bill in order to have a method or authority for negotiating agreements with others.

Another very significant point is that the success or failure of this measure will depend so much upon its administration. This applies to the Nation as a whole as well as every section thereof. It will be possible for the administration to favor one area of the country and to penalize another. The executive department will certainly be on trial in this respect.

I feel sure that the utmost effort will be made by all those charged with responsibilities under the bill to carry out the spirit of fairness and impartiality entrusted to them by the enactment of this far-reaching measure.

In addition thereto, it is implicit in the passage of the bill that it shall be reviewed by Congress in view of experiences gained by its operation.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO BRING BEFORE THE SENATE THE TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, ESTABLISHMENT, AND NAVIGATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GRAND DUCHY OF LUXEMBOURG

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership—and I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader—to call up, at the conclusion of the consideration of the trade bill, the Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on the treaty, and we suggest that Senators remain in the Chamber to vote on it.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, like a good many other Senators, I am about to vote for the so-called trade measure because I see hope in it, but still with some reluctance because of some of its very far-reaching provisions. I see hope in it, because we all know that the customary channels of trade, which have existed in somewhat the same form for decades or even centuries, are rapidly changing and are subject to additional change.

I realize that in view of the rise of the Common Market and other conditions known to all of us there must be more flexible machinery accorded to the executive for prompt and effective dealing with trade problems than anything now provided under current law. I am therefore voting for the bill, though with some reservations, and in the hope that in the administration of the act—which will be the real test of its effectiveness—the administration shall be vigorous and shall be insistent upon the protection of American industry, American agriculture, and American labor in those many instances in which I think those great groups will be entitled to very real recognition as the act comes into operation.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for the very sensible statement he is making on the bill. I think he speaks with the voice of many Senators who support the measure. We all have very serious reservations about what might happen under the terms of the bill, but when one looks at the other side of the coin and sees the Common Market coming into being, I think one must realize that we are confronted in the Senate with no alternative course of action to follow than to enact legislation giving to the President appropriate power to act. A failure to do so would be to bury our heads in the sand and ignore the problem we face in the European Common Market.

Therefore, as the distinguished senior Senator from Florida has pointed out, whether the bill is an effective tool in furthering American agriculture, commerce and industry will depend upon the administration of the act.

I think the overwhelming vote the bill will receive in the Senate today will indicate this mandate to the President of the United States. It will indicate that we expect the President to carry out the purposes and objectives of the act in order at the same time to preserve, protect and defend American business, agriculture and commerce.

I commend the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for his comments. I know that in the back of his mind is at least one thing which is in the back of my mind, because we have been together in many negotiations heretofore, both under the preceding administration and under the present administration, when we have felt that there was not sufficiently aggressive representation of the rights of that large segment of American agriculture which produces and markets perishable fruits and vegetables and the products of those agricultural commodities, which are so very perishable, which are not price supported, and which have depended heretofore largely upon foreign markets to absorb a large portion of the production.

I am hopeful for a much more aggressive attitude on the part of the Executive generally, and particularly the Department of State, in protecting and defending the rights of the producers of the perishable agricultural commodities I have mentioned, fruits and vegetables, to permit them to reach their traditional foreign markets and to build themselves greater in those markets. Insofar as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, we have had from that Department much more friendly treatment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that the problem we face involves not merely the matter of tariffs, since there are other barriers which are even more formidable than tariffs, such as quotas, unfair trade practices, and all the systems and devices which have been used in the past and which likely will be used in the future to make it difficult for American agriculture, commerce, and industry to enter the European and other markets throughout the world?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. To the factors which the Senator has mentioned there should be added the differences in exchange, which have proved to be quite a hurdle with respect to the rebuilding by our vegetable and fruit industries of the markets which they had before World War II and which they have been unable to reestablish, in spite of the fact that they have spent large sums of their own money, both before the war in developing the markets they then had and since the war in the effort to reestablish those markets.

I hope that we shall have a vigorous and aggressive administration of the act in all those fields. I think particularly of the industries which I have mentioned, which are not price supported and which can legitimately turn to the Federal Government for more help in the matter of getting over the foreign quotas and getting over the other restrictions which the Senator from Washington has mentioned.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I heartily concur in the Senator's reference to the devaluation of currency. The currency problem hit the lumber industry in the Northwest particularly hard. It has hit the industry in the South. I refer to the problem with Canada, since the Canadian dollar has been devalued.

I think the message to the President, when we finally vote on this measure in the Senate, is that we hope and anticipate that he will look at the problem in broad perspective, not merely from the standpoint of tariffs, but also with respect to all the other devices used to make it more difficult for our commerce, agriculture, and industry to properly compete in world markets.

I commend the able Senator from Florida for what I think is a commonsense analysis of the problem we face. We are confronted with a condition and not a theory. I think we are taking the only reasonable action we can take. We must give the President full power. It is up to the administration to utilize the tools wisely in the furtherance of our own national objectives.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, with reference to this one relatively small aspect of the problem, though it is very large to the people who produce fruits and vegetables and other perishable crops, I wish to call attention, if I may, to the amendment in the bill approved by the Senate, which is found as a part of section 252. It begins as follows:

(a) Whenever foreign import restrictions impair the value of tariff commitments made to the United States, unjustifiably oppress the commerce of the United States, or prevent the expansion of trade on a mutually advantageous basis, the President shall—

I call particular attention to the use of the word "shall"—

(3) notwithstanding any provision of any trade agreement under this Act, impose duties or other import restrictions on the products of any foreign country or instrumentality establishing or maintaining such foreign import restrictions against United States agricultural products, to the extent he deems such duties and other import restrictions necessary to prevent the establishment or obtain the removal of such foreign import restrictions and to provide access for United States agricultural products to the markets of such country or instrumentality on an equitable basis.

Mr. President, I am sure the committee meant in the use of the word "instrumentality" such organizations of states as the Common Market and other similar organizations that have arisen or that may arise.

I warmly congratulate the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his insistence upon the inclusion of the amendment. Though not precisely in its final form, yet in a form which will carry out the objective sought. Representing in part those who produce fruits and vegetables in this Nation, and having cooperated with Senators with similar groups of constituents in numerous other States, we believe that, in the adoption of the amendment, we have given to the Executive a tool with which he can much better serve. We hope he will use it to serve much more aggressively the legitimate interests of the fruit and vegetable producers of our Nation. They should include, of course, the producers of other highly perishable agricultural products, such as poultry and other perishables, which receive no price supports. They must be marketed quickly and carefully. We have every confidence now that they will receive the vigorous attention of the Executive and the various departments that deal with this subject in reestablishing and enlarging our markets abroad.

I am sure that Senators from States which produce these commodities in large exportable quantities will be hoping—as I hope—that the provision will prove to be an effective tool to give better protection to those products than they have had and, above all, more effective representation from the executive department, the State Department, and even the Department of Agriculture, which has been uniformly friendly and helpful.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Florida for his remarks. I agree completely with his analysis of the amendment and its importance to those engaged in the field of agriculture. For the first time we are arming the President of the United States with adequate authority to give proper protection to the export of American agricultural products. I consider this amendment one of the most important provisions in the bill. I am delighted that the Senate accepted that provision in substance as the committee approved it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. I again congratulate him warmly. He has rendered a real service to the producers of all highly perishable crops in the United States. I am talking not only about chickens from the Delmarva Peninsula, or citrus products from Florida or citrus products from Arizona and California. I refer also to the deciduous crops grown in many parts of our country. I refer to agricultural products grown in the Pacific Northwest, in Virginia, in New York, and in various other areas. I am talking about the producers of prunes and other dried fruits. I am talking about the producers of the very fine canning peach which is produced in California and elsewhere, but particularly in California.

We have had a hard road to travel. I see some friends here from States in which cherries are produced. I see Senators representing States in which milk products are produced. We have had a hard road to travel since World War II, because there has not been the aggressive representation for which we have hoped.

I now express the view that with the new tool which we are providing we shall be entitled to more aggressive representation, and that we shall get more effective results.

I yield again to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, again I concur in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida. The amendment was not directed to provide protection to just one segment of American agriculture. It is true that I had a primary interest in the amendment as it would affect the export of poultry and certain other commodities produced in our State. But the amendment is broad in its language. It covers all agricultural commodities as they are produced in any of the 50 States of the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I again thank the Senator for his quite correct remarks.

On a slightly different aspect of the situation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD section 353, which is a very great departure from anything that the Congress has ever done before by way of granting power to the Executive in the field of trade.

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

SEC. 353. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY TO INCREASE TARIFFS AND IMPOSE QUOTAS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, when he finds it in the national interest, proclaim with respect to any article imported into the United States—

(1) the increase of any existing duty on such article to such rate as he finds necessary,

(2) the imposition of a duty on such article (if it is not otherwise subject to duty) at such rate as he finds necessary, and

(3) the imposition of such other import restrictions as he finds necessary.

Mr. HOLLAND. That section, if applied other than for the protection of American industry and other than for retaliation, if such is needed against those who would impose upon us, would be an unthinkable addition to our body of legislative law. I call attention only briefly to the fact that, among other things, the President would be allowed under this section, which is a Senate amendment, notwithstanding any other provision of law, when he finds it in the national interest to proclaim "(2) the imposition of a duty (if it is not otherwise subject to duty) at such rate as he finds necessary."

In other words, in instances in which Congress had not found it to be necessary heretofore, the provision would allow the President to create a tariff.

Such a broad grant of authority would be, to the Senator from Florida, without understanding of its limitations, such an obstruction and such a hurdle that I could not cross it in voting for the bill. I understand from discussing the provision with members of the committee and from the debate that it is to be used solely for the protection of American industry and as retaliation against those who would impose on American industry in those extreme cases that would be covered by the early part of this section. I wish the legislative history to show that, at least so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he could not support the bill, including that section, except upon his understanding that it is in the bill solely as a defensive tool, for the protection of American industry, agriculture, and labor, and solely to be used when strong opposing methods are required, when others try to impose upon us and upon our products.

Mr. President, I hope—and I am sure every other Senator hopes—that the bill, including the two sections which I have mentioned and the other broad and generous grants of power, will be wisely used and vigorously used, and will make an effective contribution to building the strength of American foreign trade and to keeping that strength on as high a level as it is possible to keep it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time previously agreed upon for the vote on the passage of the bill having arrived, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll on the question of the passage of the bill.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BOTTUM], *the Senator* from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is necessarily absent, attending the Republican State convention as required by Texas law.

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BOTTUM] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator *from* Alaska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Aiken	Gore	Metcalf
Allott	Hart	Miller
Anderson	Hartke	Monroney
Bartlett	Hayden	Moss
Beall	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Hickey	Pastore
Boggs	Hill	Pearson
Burdick	Holland	Pell
Butler	Humphrey	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Randolph
Carlson	Johnston	Robertson
Carroll	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Case	Keating	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Cooper	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Douglas	Long, La.	Talmadge
Eastland	Magnuson	Wiley
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NAYS—8

Bennett	Curtis	Mundt
Bush	Goldwater	Thurmond
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	

NOT VOTING—14

Bottum	Hruska	Neuberger
Cannon	McClellan	Sparkman
Capehart	Morse	Tower
Fulbright	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Murphy	

So the bill (H.R. 11970) was passed.

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

Mr. KERR. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 11970) be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered; and that in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes and corrections, including corrections in section, subsection, and so forth, designations, and cross references thereto.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for the remainder of today and also for tomorrow, if he can inform us about it now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention to have the Senate proceed, first, to consideration of the Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation Between the United States and Luxembourg.

It is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate take up, thereafter, the conference report on the United Nations bond issue measure, which, as Senators know, has now been passed by both Houses. I understand that the conferees have agreed to the House version.

After that, it is planned to have the Senate take up the Quincy project bill, in which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are interested.

It is the intention to have the Senate take up, after that, the aquarium bill, Calendar No. 1741, House bill 8181.

That may be enough for the session today, unless there is time to take up some of the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Tomorrow the leadership will decide when to have the Senate take up the Cuban resolution, which I understand was reported today by the Armed Services Committee.

It is hoped that at some time it will be possible to comply with the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to reach the so-called maritime bills, which are piling up rapidly for want of agreement between those two Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader whether he anticipates a late session this evening.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am delighted to hear that.

I should like to ask when the independent offices appropriation bill conference report may be brought to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall try to supply that information later, for the RECORD, or to make an announcement about it. But at the moment I do not know; and at the moment I do not see in the Chamber the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KEATING. Let me ask whether it is the intention to have the conference report on House bill 10 taken up soon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that it will be taken up in the House either today or tomorrow.

Mr. KEATING. And after that to have it taken up in the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation Between the

United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Morris Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; and

Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Irving Ben Cooper, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York; and

Inzer B. Wyatt, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

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

W. Willard Wirtz, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Labor.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, ESTABLISHMENT, AND NAVIGATION WITH LUXEMBOURG

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the treaty will be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the treaty was reported unanimously from the Foreign Relations Committee. The acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], is prepared to explain the treaty briefly, and there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation Between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Treaty, Executive B (87th Cong., 2d sess.), of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation Between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, which was read the second time, as follows:

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, ESTABLISHMENT, AND NAVIGATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GRAND DUCHY OF LUXEMBOURG

The President of the United States of America and Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, desirous for strengthening the bonds of peace and friendship traditionally existing between their two countries and of encouraging closer economic and cultural relations between the two peoples, and being cognizant of the contributions which may be made toward these ends by arrangements specifying mutually accorded rights and privileges and promoting mutually advantageous commercial intercourse and investments, have resolved to conclude a Treaty of Friendship, Establishment and Navigation, and for that purpose have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries,

The President of the United States of America: His Excellency Mr. James W. Wine, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Luxembourg, and Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg: His Excellency Mr. Eugène Schaus, Minister of Foreign Affairs, who, having communicated to each other their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Each Contracting Party shall at all times accord equitable treatment and effective protection to the persons, property, enterprises, rights and interests of nationals and companies of the other Party.

ARTICLE II

1. Nationals of either Contracting Party shall, subject to the laws relating to the entry, sojourn and establishment of aliens, be permitted to enter the territories of the other Party, to travel therein freely, and to reside and establish themselves at places of their choice. Nationals of either Party shall in particular be permitted to enter the territories of the other Party and to reside therein:

(a) for the purposes of carrying on trade between the two countries and engaging in related commercial activities; or

(b) for the purpose of developing and directing the operations of an enterprise in which they have invested, or are actively in the process of investing, a substantial amount of capital.

2. Nationals of either Party and nationals of third countries en route to or from the territories of such Party shall, subject to the reservation in paragraph 1 of the present article, be accorded freedom of transit for themselves and their baggage through the territories of the other Party by the routes most convenient for international transit. In particular, they shall be free from requirements that entail unnecessary delays and impediments. They shall be subject, however, to regulations with respect to their baggage that are applicable to aliens generally in order to prevent abuse of the transit privilege.

3. Nationals of either Party, within the territories of the other Party, shall enjoy freedom of conscience; and they shall be at liberty to hold religious services, both public and private, at suitable places of their choice.

4. Nationals of either Party shall be permitted, within the territories of the other Party to gather information material for dissemination to the public abroad, and shall enjoy freedom of transmission of such material to be used for publication by the press, radio, television, motion pictures and other means; and they shall be permitted to communicate freely with other persons inside and outside such territories by mail, telegraph and other means open to general public use.

5. The provisions of the present article shall be subject to the right of either Party to apply measures that are necessary to maintain public order and protect the public health, morals and safety.

ARTICLE III

1. Nationals of either Contracting Party within the territories of the other Party shall be accorded full legal and judicial protection for their persons, rights and interests. Such nationals shall be free from molestation and shall receive constant protection, in no case less than that required by international law.

2. To this end they shall in particular have right of access, on the same basis and on the same conditions as nationals of such other Party, to the courts of justice and administrative tribunals and agencies in all degrees of jurisdiction and shall have right to the services of competent persons of their choice.

3. The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the present article shall extend and apply in the same manner to companies. It is understood, moreover, that the right of such access shall be enjoyed without any requirement of registration or domestication:

(a) in the case of Luxembourg companies not engaged in activities in the territories of the United States of America; and

(b) in the case of United States companies not established in the territories of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

4. If a national of either Party is taken into custody within the territories of the other Party, the nearest consular representative of his country shall on the demand of such national be immediately notified and shall have the right to visit and communicate with such national without unnecessary delay. Such national shall:

(a) receive reasonable and humane treatment, in no case less than that required by international law;

(b) be formally and immediately informed of the charges against him; and

(c) be brought to trial as rapidly as is consistent with the proper preparation of his defense, for which he shall enjoy all reasonable means, including the services of competent counsel.

5. The dwellings, offices, warehouses, factories and other premises of nationals and companies of either Party located within the territories of the other Party shall not be subject to searches or measures other than those permitted by law and in execution of law. Official searches and examinations of such premises and their contents, when necessary, shall be made according to law and with careful regard for the convenience of the occupants and the conduct of business.

6. Contracts entered into between nationals and companies of either Party and nationals and companies of the other Party, that provide for the settlement by arbitration of controversies, shall not be deemed unenforceable within the territories of such other Party merely on the grounds that the place designated for the arbitration proceedings is outside such territories or that the nationality of one or more of the arbitrators is not that of such other Party. No award duly rendered pursuant to any such contract, and final and enforceable under the laws of the place where rendered, shall be deemed invalid and denied effective means of enforcement by the authorities of either Party merely on the grounds that the place where such award was rendered is outside the territories of such Party or that the nationality of one or more of the arbitrators is not that of such Party.

ARTICLE IV

1. Property that nationals and companies of either Contracting Party own within the territories of the other Party shall enjoy constant security therein through full legal and judicial protection.

2. Neither Party shall take unreasonable or discriminatory measures that would impair the acquired rights and interests within its territories of nationals and companies of the other Party in the enterprises which they have established, in their capital, or in the skills, arts or technology which they have supplied.

3. Nationals and companies or either Party shall not be expropriated of their property within the territories of the other Party except for public benefit and with the prompt payment of just compensation. Such compensation shall be in an effectively realizable form and shall represent the full equivalent of the property taken. Furthermore, adequate provision shall have been made not later than the time of taking for the determination and payment thereof.

4. Nationals and companies of either Party shall in no case be accorded, within the territories of the other Party, less than national treatment with respect to the matters set forth in paragraph 3 of the present article and in paragraph 5 of article III. Moreover,

enterprises in which nationals and companies of either Party have a substantial interest shall be accorded, within the territories of the other Party, not less than national treatment in all matters relating to the taking of privately owned enterprises into public ownership and to the placing of such enterprises under public control.

ARTICLE V

1. Nationals and companies of either Contracting Party shall be accorded, within the territories of the other Party, national treatment with respect to obtaining and maintaining patents of invention, and with respect to rights in trade marks, trade names, trade labels and industrial property of all kinds.

2. The Parties deem that it is highly desirable to further, through cooperative and other appropriate means, the interchange and use of scientific and technical knowledge, particularly in the interest of increasing productivity and improving standards of living within their respective territories.

ARTICLE VI

1. Nationals and companies of either Contracting Party shall be accorded national treatment with respect to engaging in all types of commercial, industrial, financial and other activity for gain (business activities) within the territories of the other Party, whether directly or by agent or through the medium of any form of lawful juridical entity. Accordingly, such nationals and companies shall be permitted within such territories:

(a) to establish and maintain branches, agencies, offices, factories, and other establishments appropriate to the conduct of their business;

(b) to organize companies under the general company laws of such other Party, and to acquire majority interests in companies of such other Party; and

(c) to control and manage enterprises which they have established or acquired. Moreover, enterprises which they control, whether in the form of individual proprietorships, companies or otherwise, shall in all that relates to the conduct of the activities thereof be accorded treatment no less favorable than that accorded like enterprises controlled by nationals and companies of such other Party.

2. Each party reserves the right to determine the extent to which aliens may establish, acquire interests in, or carry on enterprises engaged within its territories in communications, air or water transport, banking involving fiduciary or depository functions, or the exploitation of land or other natural resources. However, new limitations imposed by either Party on the extent to which aliens are accorded national treatment with respect to carrying on such activities within its territories, shall not be applied as against enterprises which are regularly engaged in such activities therein at the time such new limitations are adopted and which are owned or controlled by nationals and companies of the other Party. Moreover, neither Party shall deny to transportation, communications and banking enterprises of the other Party the right to maintain branches and agencies to perform functions necessary for essentially international operations in which they are permitted to engage.

3. The provisions of the present article shall not prevent either Party from prescribing special formalities in connection with the establishment of companies or enterprises within its territories which are managed or controlled by aliens; but such formalities may not impair the substance of the rights set forth in paragraph 1 of the present article.

4. Nationals and companies of either Party shall be accorded national treatment with respect to engaging in scientific, educational, religious and philanthropic activities within the territories of the other Party. They shall be accorded the right to form associations under the laws of such other Party for the purpose of engaging in the aforesaid activities. Nothing in the present Treaty shall be deemed to grant or to imply any right to engage in political activities.

ARTICLE VII

1. The Contracting Parties recognize that it is desirable for conditions of competitive equality to be maintained in situations in which publicly owned or controlled trading or manufacturing enterprises are in competition within the territories of either Party with privately owned and controlled enterprises of nationals or companies of the other Party.

2. Accordingly, such state-owned enterprises should not be given special economic privileges which could injure the competitive position of such private enterprises. However, this principle shall not be construed to prevent either Party from making such special concessions in aid of state-owned enterprises as it deems necessary during periods of economic crisis, especially to relieve unemployment. This principle, moreover, is without prejudice to special advantages given in connection with:

(a) manufacturing goods for government use or supplying goods and services to the Government for government use; or

(b) supplying, at prices substantially below competitive prices, the needs of particular population groups for essential goods and services not otherwise practically obtainable by such groups.

ARTICLE VIII

1. Nationals and companies of either Contracting Party shall be permitted to engage, within the territories of the other Party, the services of accountants and technical experts of all kinds, executive personnel, attorneys, agents and other specialists of their choice.

2. Nationals and companies of either Party shall be permitted to engage the services of accountants and other technical experts regardless of the extent to which they may have qualified for the practice of a profession within the territories of the other Party, for the sole purpose of making examinations, audits and technical investigations and rendering reports in the private interest of such nationals and companies in connection with the planning and operation of their enterprises, and enterprises in which they have a financial interest, within such territories.

ARTICLE IX

1. Nationals and companies of either Contracting Party shall be accorded within the territories of the other Party:

(a) national treatment with respect to leasing land, buildings and other real property appropriate to the conduct of activities in which they are permitted to engage pursuant to article VI and for residential purposes, and with respect to occupying and using such property; and

(b) other rights in real property permitted by the applicable laws of such other Party.

2. Nationals and companies of either Party shall be accorded within the territories of the other Party national treatment with respect to acquiring, by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and with respect to owning and possessing, personal property of all kinds, both tangible and intangible. However, either Party may impose restrictions on alien ownership of materials dangerous from the standpoint of public safety and alien ownership of interests in enterprises carrying on particular types of activity, but only to the extent that this can be done without impairing the rights and privileges secured by article VI or by other provisions of the present Treaty.

3. Nationals and companies of either Party shall be accorded national treatment within the territories of the other Party with respect to acquiring property of all kinds by testate or intestate succession or through judicial process. Should they because of their alienage be ineligible to continue to own any such property, they shall be allowed a period of at least five years in which to dispose of it.

4. Nationals and companies of either Party shall be accorded within the territories of the other Party national treatment with respect to disposing of property of all kinds.

ARTICLE X

1. Nationals of either Contracting Party residing within the territories of the other Party, and nationals and companies of either Party engaged in trade or other gainful pursuit or in scientific, educational, religious or philanthropic activities within the territories of the other Party, shall not be subject to the payment of taxes, fees or charges imposed upon or applied to income, capital, transactions, activities or any other object, or to requirements with respect to the levy and collection thereof, within the territories of such other Party, more burdensome than those borne by nationals and companies of such other Party in like situation.

2. With respect to nationals of either Party who are neither resident nor engaged in trade or other gainful pursuit within the territories of the other Party, and with respect to companies of either Party which are not engaged in trade or other gainful pursuit within the territories of the other Party, it shall be the aim of such other Party to apply in general the principle set forth in paragraph 1 of the present article.

3. Nationals and companies of either Party covered by paragraph 2 of the present article shall not be subject, within the territories of the other Party, to the payment of taxes, fees or charges imposed upon or applied to income, capital, transactions, activities or any other object, or to requirements with respect to the levy and collection thereof, more burdensome than those borne by nationals and companies of any third country.

4. In the case of companies of either Party engaged in trade or other gainful pursuit within the territories of the other Party, and in case of nationals of either Party engaged in trade or other gainful pursuit within the territories of the other Party but not resident therein, such other Party shall not impose or apply any tax, fee or charge upon any income, capital or other basis in excess of that reasonably allocable or apportionable to its territories, nor grant deductions and exemptions less than those reasonably allocable or apportionable to its territories. A comparable rule shall apply also in the case of companies organized and operated exclusively for scientific, educational, religious or philanthropic purposes.

5. The provisions of the present article shall not obligate either Party to extend to nationals and companies of the other Party tax advantages accorded to nationals and companies of any third country on the basis of reciprocity or by virtue of agreements for the avoidance of double taxation. Furthermore, each Party reserves the right to apply special provisions in extending advantages to its nationals and residents in connection with joint tax returns by husband and wife and in allowing to residents of contiguous countries exemptions of a personal nature in connection with income and inheritance taxes.

ARTICLE XI

1. Nationals and companies of either Contracting Party shall be accorded by the other Party the same treatment as nationals and companies of such other Party in like situations, with respect to payments, remittances and transfers of funds or financial instru-

ments between the territories of the two Parties as well as between the territories of such other Party and of any third country. This treatment shall be not less favorable than that accorded to nationals and companies of any third country in like situations.

2. Neither Party shall impose exchange restrictions as defined in paragraph 5 of the present article except to the extent necessary to maintain or restore adequacy to its monetary reserves, particularly in relation to its external commercial and financial requirements. It is understood that the provisions of the present article do not alter the obligations either Party may have to the International Monetary Fund or preclude imposition by either Party of particular restrictions whenever the Fund specifically so authorizes or requests.

3. If either Party imposes exchange restrictions in accordance with paragraph 2 of the present article, it shall not fail, after making whatever provision may be necessary to assure the availability of foreign exchange for essential goods and services, to make provision to the fullest extent practicable in light of the level of the monetary reserves and its balance-of-payments, for the withdrawal in the currency of the other Party, of:

(a) the compensation referred to in article IV, paragraph 3,

(b) earnings, whether in the form of salaries, interest, dividends, commissions, royalties, payments for technical services, or otherwise,

(c) amounts for amortization of loans, depreciation of direct investments, and, to the extent feasible, capital transfers, giving consideration to special needs for other transactions. If more than one rate of exchange is in force, the rate applicable to such withdrawal shall be a rate which is specifically approved by the International Monetary Fund for such transactions or, in the absence of a rate so approved, an effective rate which, inclusive of any taxes or surcharges on exchange transfers, is just and reasonable.

4. Exchange restrictions shall not be imposed by either Party in a manner unnecessarily detrimental or arbitrarily discriminatory to the claims, investments, transport, trade and other interests of the nationals and companies of the other Party nor to the competitive position thereof.

5. The term "exchange restrictions" as used in the present article includes all restrictions, regulations, charges, taxes, or other requirements imposed by either Party which burden or interfere with payments, remittances, or transfers of funds or financial instruments between the territories of the two Parties.

6. Questions arising under the present Treaty concerning exchange restrictions affecting aliens are governed by the provisions of the present article.

ARTICLE XII

Commercial travelers representing nationals and companies of either Contracting Party engaged in business within the territories thereof shall be accorded within the territories of the other Party treatment no less favorable than that accorded to commercial travelers representing nationals and companies of such other Party with respect to the exercise of their functions. As concerns the temporary importation of samples the persons referred to above shall be accorded most-favored-nation treatment.

ARTICLE XIII

1. Between the territories of the two Contracting Parties there shall be freedom of navigation.

2. Vessels of either Party shall be accorded national treatment and most-favored-nation treatment by the other Party with respect to the right to carry all products that may be carried by vessel to or from the territories of such other Party; and such products shall be accorded treatment no less favorable than that accorded like products carried in vessels of such other Party, with respect to:

(a) duties and charges of all kinds,

(b) the administration of the customs, and

(c) bounties, drawbacks and other privileges of this nature.

ARTICLE XIV

The present Treaty shall not preclude the application by either Contracting Party of measures:

(a) regulating the importation or exportation of gold and silver;

(b) relative to its national fisheries and to the products thereof;

(c) relating to fissionable materials, to radioactive byproducts of the utilization or processing thereof, or to materials that are the source of fissionable materials;

(d) regulating the production of or traffic in arms, ammunition and implements of war, or traffic in other materials carried on directly or indirectly for the purpose of supplying a military establishment;

(e) necessary to fulfill the obligations of a Party for the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security, or necessary to protect its essential security interests;

(f) for the protection of national treasures having an artistic, historical or archeological value; or

(g) denying to any company in the ownership or direction of which nationals of any third country or countries have directly or indirectly the controlling interest, the advantages of the present Treaty, except with respect to recognition of judicial status and with respect to access to courts.

ARTICLE XV

1. The term "national treatment" means treatment accorded within the territories of a Contracting Party upon terms no less favorable than the treatment accorded therein, in like situation, to nationals, companies, products, vessels or other objects, as the case may be, of such Party.

2. The term "most-favored-nation treatment" means treatment accorded within the territories of a Party upon terms no less favorable than the treatment accorded therein, in like situations, to nationals, companies, products, vessels, or other objects, as the case may be, of any third country.

3. As used in the present Treaty, the term "companies" means corporations, partnerships, companies and other associations, whether or not with limited liability and whether or not for pecuniary profit. Companies constituted under the applicable laws and regulations within the territories of either Party shall be deemed companies thereof and shall have their juridical status recognized within the territories of the other Party.

4. National treatment accorded under the provisions of the present Treaty to companies of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg shall, in any State or possession of the United States of America, be the treatment accorded therein to companies created or organized in other States and possessions of the United States of America.

ARTICLE XVI

1. The territories to which the present Treaty extends shall comprise all areas of land and water under the sovereignty or authority of each Contracting Party, other than the Panama Canal Zone and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

2. It is understood that the present Treaty does not apply to territories under the authority of either Party solely as a military base or by reason of temporary military occupation.

ARTICLE XVII

1. Each Contracting Party shall accord sympathetic consideration to, and shall afford adequate opportunity for consultation regarding, such representations as the other Party may make with respect to any matter affecting the operation of the present Treaty.

2. Any dispute between the Parties as to the interpretation or application of the present Treaty, not satisfactorily adjusted by diplomacy, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice, unless the Parties agree to settlement by some other pacific means.

ARTICLE XVIII

The present Treaty shall terminate the Declaration between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the United States of America for the Effective Protection of Trademarks signed at Luxembourg December 23, 1904 and at The Hague December 27, 1904.

ARTICLE XIX

1. The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

2. The present Treaty shall enter into force one month after the day of exchange of instruments of ratification.

3. The present Treaty shall remain in force for ten years and shall continue in force thereafter until terminated as provided herein.

4. Either Contracting Party may, by giving one year's written notice to the other Party, terminate the present Treaty at the end of the initial ten-year period or at any time thereafter.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed hereunto their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English and French languages, both equally authentic, at Luxembourg this twenty-third day of February, one thousand nine hundred sixty-two.

For the United States of America,
JAMES W. WINE.

For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg,
EUGENE SCHAUS.

PROTOCOL

At the time of signing the Treaty of Friendship, Establishment and Navigation between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, duly authorized, have further agreed on the following provisions, which shall be considered integral parts of the aforesaid Treaty.

1. The provisions of article II, paragraph 1(b), of the Treaty shall be construed as extending to persons who represent nationals and companies of the same nationality which have invested or are actively in the process of investing a substantial amount of capital in an enterprise in the territories of the other Party, and who are employed by such nationals and companies in a responsible capacity.

2. With reference to the provisions of article III, paragraph 2, each Party agrees that, within its territories, the nationals of the other Party shall be entitled to free legal aid on the same conditions as its own nationals.

3. The provisions of article IV, paragraph 3, providing for the payment of compensation shall extend to interests held directly or indirectly by nationals and companies of either Party in property which is taken within the territories of the other Party.

4. The provisions of article VI, paragraph 1, shall not be construed to affect the right of the Luxembourg authorities to require that aliens may not be allowed to exercise gainful activities in Luxembourg unless the appropriate authorizations for access to and exercise of such activities have been granted. However, in keeping with the terms of that paragraph, the regulations governing access to and exercise of such activities shall be applied in a liberal fashion.

5. The provisions of article VI, paragraph 1, shall not extend to professions which, because they involve even occasionally participation in the exercise of public authority or relate to the public health and safety, are state licensed or reserved by law to nationals of the country.

6. The provisions of article VI, paragraph 1, shall not extend to the activity of peddlers and itinerant artisans in the exercise of their occupations as such.

7. It is understood that the provisions of article VIII, paragraph 1, do not contravene the national legislation relating to the exercise of the professions of lawyer, attorney or solicitor.

8. The treatment provided in article XI, paragraph 1, is designed only to preclude discriminations on the ground of nationality but does not, for instance, preclude different treatment based upon residence requirements.

9. The provisions of article XIII, paragraph 2, shall not apply to postal services.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this protocol and have affixed hereunto their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English and French languages, both equally authentic, at Luxembourg this twenty-third day of February, one thousand nine hundred sixty-two.

For the United States of America,
JAMES W. WINE.

For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg,
EUGENE SCHAUS.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the treaty with Luxembourg is the 22d such modern commercial agreement concluded by this country since the end of World War II.

The purpose of this treaty is to provide an agreed basis for protection of the property and interest of American citizens and companies in Luxembourg, with reciprocal rights for Luxembourg's citizens in the United States. The treaty contains no provisions that might seriously impair or infringe upon the domestic laws of the United States, nor does it contain any provisions which would restrict the legislative authority of the Congress.

It does, however, contain detailed provisions on a wide range of matters, including entry and sojourn, personal freedom, property rights, operating rights for business enterprises, taxation, and exchange regulation. I may add that these provisions conform to the general pattern of uniform treatment of such matters developed in treaties with Luxembourg's other partners in the European Economic Community.

The treaty with Luxembourg also provides that disputes between the parties as to the interpretation or application of the treaty, not satisfactorily adjusted by diplomacy, are to be submitted to the International Court of Justice, unless the parties agree to settlement by some other pacific means. I wish to point out, however, that this provision does not amount to a general waiver of the so-called Connally amendment relating to the submission of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

The treaty will enter into force 1 month after ratifications have been exchanged, and it will remain in force for an initial period of 10 years. Thereafter, it may be terminated by either party by giving 1 year's written notice.

Mr. President, this treaty is the sixth such agreement to be signed with countries in the European Economic Community, and it completes a uniform pattern of agreements designed to promote friendly economic intercourse between the United States and the members of that Community. I believe it will serve a useful purpose in regulating mutual economic relations between the United States and Luxembourg; and I hope the Senate will give its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty.

As has been stated by the majority leader, the treaty was reported unanimously from the Foreign Relations Committee; and I request its approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the treaty will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to the point of agreeing to the resolution of ratification, which will be read.

The resolution of ratification was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation Between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, together with a related protocol, signed at Luxembourg on February 23, 1962 (Executive B, 87th Cong., 2d sess.).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BOTTUM], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is necessarily absent attending the Republican State Convention as required by Texas law.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BOTTUM], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 269 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Aiken	Fong	Monroney
Allott	Gore	Moss
Anderson	Hart	Mundt
Bartlett	Hartke	Muskie
Beall	Hayden	Pastore
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bible	Hickey	Pell
Boggs	Hill	Prouty
Burdick	Holland	Proxmire
Bush	Humphrey	Randolph
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Carroll	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Case	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Church	Kerr	Sparkman
Clark	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dirksen	Long, La.	Wiley
Dodd	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ellender	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Miller	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—14

Bottum	Gruening	Morton
Cannon	Hruska	Murphy
Capehart	McClellan	Neuberger
Fulbright	Metcalf	Tower
Goldwater	Morse	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Hospitals and medical care, Public Health Service," for the fiscal year 1963, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN TUNGSTEN ORE AND TUNGSTEN CONCENTRATES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 852 short tons of low-grade tungsten ore and approximately 512 pounds of low-grade tungsten concentrates now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROVISION OF A JURY COMMISSION FOR EACH U.S. DISTRICT COURT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a jury commission for each U.S. district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 7708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver (Rept. No. 2110).

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, TO PERMIT THE DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACT CARRIERS AS CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2108)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and the supplemental views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAXES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2109)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes, and I submit a report thereon, I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and the supplemental views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

EXPRESSING THE DETERMINATION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN CUBA—REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND ARMED SERVICES, JOINTLY (S. REPT. NO. 2111)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of September 13, 1962, I report an original joint resolution (S.J. Res. 230) expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, and I submit a report thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 230) expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3730. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under a lease covering the oleum facilities located at the Kankakee Unit of the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, Ill.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3731. A bill to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 3732. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Calbayar Legaspi; to the Committeee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3733. A bill for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3734. A bill for the relief of Carmel Grech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 25th day of October in each year as "American Explorers' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he reported the above joint resolution, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADJUSTMENT OF RENTALS FOR OLEUM FACILITIES, KANKAKEE UNIT, JOLIET ARSENAL MILITARY RESERVATION, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to bring some relief to the Wabash Chemical Corp., the lessee of the oleum facilities located at the Kankakee unit of the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, Ill., under a lease, as amended, extending to June 15, 1979.

These facilities are used by the lessee for the production of sulfuric acid. As part of its obligation, the lessee has agreed to maintain the property in good operating condition and to maintain all portions of the property not being used by it in standby condition. These facilities would be important sources of TNT and other explosives in the event of a national emergency.

It is agreed by all concerned that the present rent payable under the lease is considerably in excess of the present fair market rental value of the property. It appears that unless relief is afforded, the lessee will be forced to cease operations; and the maintenance of this important property will have to be otherwise provided for.

The Secretary of the Army has determined that such relief is not available under existing statutory authority. The purpose of the bill, therefore, is to authorize amendment of the lease to permit adjustment of rentals payable on and after September 1, 1962, to amounts commensurate with the present fair market rental value of the property as appraised by the Corps of Engineers.

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

The bill (S. 3730) to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under a lease covering the oleum facilities located at the Kankakee unit of the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, Ill., was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MERGER OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES, RESERVE TRAINING, AND RETIRED PAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3731) to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve

training, and retired pay, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., September 7, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay."

In 1950, language was enacted in the Treasury Department Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1951 (act of Sept. 6, 1950, 64 Stat. 639) which provided for the transfer and merger of amounts equal to the unliquidated obligations outstanding against Coast Guard appropriations for fiscal years 1949 and 1950 for "Salaries, Office of the Commandant," "Pay and allowances," "General expenses," and "Civilian employees" with the fiscal year 1951 appropriation for "Operating expenses." This act authorized such merged appropriations to be available as one fund for the payment of obligations properly incurred against both the prior appropriations and the fiscal year 1951 appropriation, but required that the identity and integrity of each fiscal year appropriation be maintained in Coast Guard accounting records. Since 1951, each "Operating expenses" appropriation act has contained similar authorization, and beginning with fiscal year 1953, such authorization was extended to include appropriations for "Reserve training." The need for merger authorization was created by the Coast Guard's adoption, in fiscal year 1951, of a system of accounting based upon the accrual principle. This system developed more meaningful and current financial management information on the operating costs of units and programs; it is a system which was later made mandatory for all executive agencies by the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 782).

Under the accrual accounting principle, accrued expenditures are entered in the accounting records when liabilities are incurred for goods and services received and other assets acquired and performance accepted, whether or not payment has been made and whether or not invoices have been received. Operating costs are distributed to units and programs in the accounting period in which the cost is incurred. Under this system it often occurs that an expenditure is entered during a fiscal year subsequent to the year in which the obligation is incurred. Lacking some sort of merger authorization such as that contained in the 1951 and subsequent appropriations acts, the Coast Guard would be required to (1) maintain three separate fiscal year appropriation accounts for both "Operating expenses" and "Reserve training," (2) cause disbursements to be charged to the appropriation account for the year the obligation was incurred, and (3) relate cost information retroactively to appropriate accounts of previous fiscal years. This would serve no practical accounting purpose, but would be required in conformity with governmental accounting regulations.

The merged appropriation system, on the other hand, permits the Coast Guard to authorize disbursements from a single account for obligations incurred during any one of the 3 separate years and eliminates the need for tying costs to each individual fiscal year account. During the past 11 years, the merged appropriation authorization with respect to "Operating expenses" and "Reserve training" accounts has proved most effective and beneficial in achieving improved financial management.

The purpose of this bill is to provide permanent authority for this merger process and to extend it to the annual appropriation for "Retired pay," thereby bringing all Coast Guard annual appropriations under the merger principle on a permanent basis.

It is emphasized that the proposed bill would not destroy the identity or integrity of the individual appropriations or in any way diminish existing controls over expenditures. As in the past the Coast Guard would be required to keep its expenditures within the limits of these individual appropriations and to maintain detailed internal accounting records reflecting this. The bill would merely provide that the Coast Guard pay all obligations from a single appropriations account, regardless of the nature of the obligation or the year in which it was incurred. This will provide a permanent basis for accrual type accounting in the Coast Guard and permit the maximum advantages to be derived from that system.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

AMERICAN EXPLORERS' DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to proclaim October 25 of each year as American Explorers' Day.

The purpose of the joint resolution would be to designate a special day to commemorate the immeasurable contributions to our national progress and life by outstanding explorers of our history. The date October 25 was chosen because it marks the birthday of our most renowned explorer, Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd.

For the future, as the past, progress in all aspects of our individual and national life will depend upon the kind of adventurous, creative, visionary exploration of the earth, of space, of the evaluation of the significance of life's journey itself, of man's right relationship to man, and of ultimately establishing peace on the world.

For these, and other, great goals, there will be required the exploring spirit demonstrated by the indomitable, courageous spirit of Admiral Byrd.

Reflecting upon the pertinence of designating October 25 as National Explorers' Day, I ask unanimous consent to have three items printed at this point in the RECORD: First, the joint resolution itself; second, a brief statement memorializing Adm. Richard E. Byrd; and, third, excerpts of a letter from Dr. James E. Mooney, Antarctic Projects Officer of the Department of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, statement, and excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 229) to authorize the President to proclaim the 25th day of October in each year as American Explorers' Day, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 25th day of October in each year marks the anniversary of the birthday of Rear Admiral Richard Evelyn Byrd; and

Whereas the outstanding lifework and achievements of this illustrious American molded a modern epic of pioneering courage; and

Whereas his history-making flights over the ends of the earth, his service to the many branches of science and education, his sincerity and selflessness, and his lasting gifts to our broadening knowledge and understanding has helped immeasurably to lift humanity into the world of change and toward the world of tomorrow; and

Whereas the life of Admiral Byrd is symbolic of the lives of the other great American explorers, all of whom should be recognized in the minds and hearts of the citizenry of our country; and

Whereas it is fitting that the date that marks the anniversary of the birthday of Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd should be set aside as a day on which the American people may express their high appreciation of the great contributions rendered by this Nation's pioneer explorers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to officially proclaim the 25th day of October in each year as "American Explorers' Day", and to issue annually a proclamation inviting the State and local governments and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The statement and excerpts presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

MEMORIALIZING OCTOBER 25, THE BIRTHDAY OF THE ILLUSTRIOUS, LATE AMERICAN, REAR ADM. RICHARD EVELYN BYRD, AS AMERICAN EXPLORERS' DAY

His life and achievements molded a modern epic of pioneering courage. His history-making flights over the ends of the earth, his service to many branches of science and education, his sincerity and selflessness, his lasting gifts to our broadening knowledge and understanding, help immeasurably in his time to lift humanity to a new partnership in the world of change in the conquest of new horizons toward our world of tomorrow. The Senate of the United States directs that the lifework and achievement of the late, Rear Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd be memorialized for his exemplary accomplishments and that the date which marks the birthday of this illustrious American and gallant Virginian be set aside as American Explorers' Day to recognize, each year on this date, October 25, the appreciation of the American people of a life symbolic of other great explorers whose honor and devotion are inseparable and should be recognized as one in the minds and hearts of the citizenry of our country. This Nation, in growing times must take cognizance of its forceful pioneer explorers who are effective advocates for the extension of the American horizon.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * The accomplishments of Dick Byrd were symbolic of the best in American life and our American heritage. As you know, he was an ideal inspiration of youth for more than a quarter of a century.

In 1938, the schools of the Nation honored Admiral Byrd through the American Association of School Administrators. * * *

Hundreds of textbooks and articles include Admiral Byrd's signal contributions to American life. A number of schools and institutions have been named in his honor. Among these is one in far-off Japan.

It is felt by many that a day recognized officially, and set apart as National Explorers' Day, would be an incentive to the youth and teachers of the country in focusing their attention upon the pioneering accomplishments of one of our great American heritages which we have inherited from our explorers, and that these noted pioneers be represented together and thus honored on the Admiral's birthday.

Herman Hagedorn ably speaks of our heroes in his "Book of Courage":

"These men and women are torches. They illuminate their own centuries for us, but, what is more important, they illuminate our own and throw long beams along the paths we tread. We walk more deeply into hidden places, face the enemy more courageously. From their flame we ourselves catch fire; living or dead, to us they are all living, our companions in the silences and solitudes, our counselors, our rescuers, early and late our friends."

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MOONEY,
Deputy.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, TO MAKE PERMANENT A TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE MAXIMUM CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY UNDER SUCH ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2800) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to make permanent a temporary increase in the maximum construction differential subsidy that may be paid under such Act and to provide that such maximum shall not apply with respect to reconstructing or reconditioning of ships which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDATORY REPAYMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH QUINCY COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11164) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on August 16, found on page 16707 of the RECORD, together with Senate Joint Resolution 217, be included in the Senate document which was ordered to be printed by unanimous consent on September 17, 1962.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Articles entitled "An Inquiry Into Political Morality" and "A Senator Looks at the Lobbies," written by Senator MCCARTHY and published in the New York Times magazine.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2697) to waive certain time limitations prescribed in chapters 33 and 35 of title 38, United States Code, in the case of certain veterans and eligible persons ordered to active duty with the Armed Forces, or whose period of duty with the Armed Forces was involuntarily extended, on or after August 1, 1961, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7431) to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn., and for the Church of St. Francis Xavier, of Phoenix, Ariz.

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

H.R. 1660. An act for the relief of Margaret MacPherson, Angus MacPherson, Ruth MacPherson, and Marilyn MacPherson;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Elaine Veronica Brathwaite;

H.R. 2619. An act for the relief of Gerard Puillet;

H.R. 2806. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 3624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke;

H.R. 4483. An act for the relief of Simon Karasick;

H.R. 5695. An act for the relief of Forrest L. Gibson;

H.R. 5753. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 8846. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of dispositions of property (other than stock) pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws;

H.R. 9129. An act for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans;

H.R. 9469. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kays;

H.R. 10423. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy H. Johnson;

H.R. 10542. An act to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act;

H.R. 12092. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Brackbill;

H.R. 12093. An act for the relief of Joseph Wolf, Jr.;

H.R. 12653. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act;

H.R. 12818. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1946, to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain additional toll bridges over or across the Delaware River and Bay;

H.R. 12855. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 relating to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments;

H.R. 12887. An act for the relief of Benjamin Leach, Diogracias Leach, Rogelio Leach, and Maximo Leach; and

H.R. 12936. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Fousse and others.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 1660. An act for the relief of Margaret MacPherson, Angus MacPherson, Ruth MacPherson, and Marilyn MacPherson;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Elaine Veronica Brathwaite;

H.R. 2619. An act for the relief of Gerard Puillet;

H.R. 2806. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 3624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke;

H.R. 4483. An act for the relief of Simon Karasick;

H.R. 5695. An act for the relief of Forrest L. Gibson;

H.R. 5753. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 9129. An act for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans;

H.R. 9469. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kays;

H.R. 10423. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy H. Johnson;

H.R. 12092. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Brackbill;

H.R. 12093. An act for the relief of Joseph Wolf, Jr.;

H.R. 12887. An act for the relief of Benjamin Leach, Diogracias Leach, Rogelio Leach, and Maximo Leach; and

H.R. 12936. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Fousse and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8846. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of dispositions of property (other than stock) pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 10542. An act to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 12653. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; and

H.R. 12855. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 relating to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 12818. An act to amend the Act of July 13, 1946, to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain additional toll bridges over or across the Delaware River and Bay; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 4. An act to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore;

S. 149. An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich;

S. 319. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that the provisions of section 4 (I) thereof, relating to long- and short-haul charges, shall not apply to express companies;

S. 1161. An act to provide for the use of lands in the Garrison Dam project by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation;

S. 1307. An act to amend section 128 of title 28, United States Code, to constitute Richland, Wash., a place of holding court for the eastern district of Washington, southern division, and to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, Southern Division, holding court at Richland, Wash.;

S. 1924. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868) with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 2357. An act to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia;

S. 2511. An act to provide for the production and distribution of educational and training films for use by deaf persons, and for other purposes;

S. 2696. An act to correct certain land descriptions in the act entitled "An act to declare that the United States hold in trust for the pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso certain public domain lands";

S. 2971. An act to declare that certain lands of the United States are held by the United States in trust for the Jicarilla Apache Tribe of the Jicarilla Reservation;

S. 3086. An act to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3154. An act to amend Public Law 86–184, an act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State;

S. 3315. An act to relieve owners of abutting property from certain assessments in connection with the repair of alleys and sidewalks in the District of Columbia;

S. 3317. An act to amend the provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3580. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H.R. 2292. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates of honorable service in lieu of certificates of disenrollment to certain persons who served as temporary members of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve during World War II;

H.R. 9914. An act for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.;

H.R. 11974. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12870. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

ACQUISITION OF, AND PAYMENT FOR, CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL INDIAN AND TRIBAL LANDS OF LOWER BRULE SIOUX RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill, H.R. 5144, to provide for the acquisition of and the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5144) to provide for the acquisition of and the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the lower Brule Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adhere to its position on its amendments to the bill, H.R. 5144.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

ACQUISITION OF, AND PAYMENT FOR, CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL INDIAN AND TRIBAL LANDS OF THE CROW CREEK SIOUX RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill, H.R. 5165, to provide for the acquisition of and the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5165) to provide for the acquisition of and payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adhere to its position on its amendments to the bill, H.R. 5165.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

RECORD OF SENATOR JAVITS, OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it has been my custom during my service in this body to present an annual report to the voters of New York State. I hereby present my report on the momentous events of the past year. I include a summary of my record of the past 6 years. I am particularly gratified that I can report to the people of New York that we were successful in appropriating $17 million for a U.S. pavilion at the New York World's Fair of 1964–65.

Mr. President, since coming to the Senate in 1957, I have presented annually to the voters of New York State a report on the congressional session. These have been 6 years of momentous events, in which mankind literally reached for the moon. It has been a period of revolutionary change, in which more than 40 new nations emerged into independence. It has been a period dominated by the struggle for peace. The world has grown smaller and more complex; the stakes have never been higher for freedom; the opportunity never greater.

SENATE TERM EVENTFUL

These 6 years have demonstrated that to attain a stable peace we must dig in for long and continuing "competition" with international communism, involving all our resources; that we cannot hope for easy solutions and that we must be truly and deeply committed to maintaining the dignity of the individual and of free institutions—and we must be determined to see them prevail.

The 6 years have also demonstrated that events and problems can no longer be divided into neat foreign and domestic compartments. Accordingly, our Nation's economic health is the key factor in the life-and-death economic struggle with the Soviet Union; our failures in the civil rights field at home have global significance in a world two-thirds of which is nonwhite; and the new economic strength of Western Europe poses opportunities for all and new challenges for business, labor, management, investors, farmers, and consumers.

In the struggle for peace, I have been a consistent supporter of the bipartisan foreign policy; of helping to strengthen the United Nations; of advocating fidelity to our commitments on West Berlin; of preventing a Communist military base in Cuba; of encouraging democracy in developing nations; of fighting Arab States' discrimination against U.S. citizens and companies; and of seeking to end the perils of Arab intransigence against Israel. As Chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference for 4 years, I have worked with the 14 NATO nations for the economic integration of the free

world through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and trade expansion. I cosponsored legislation which established the Peace Corps and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and initiated amendments to expand private enterprise participation in U.S. foreign aid, and to thwart Communist economic penetration of the free world.

I have never relented in my struggle for human rights. I participated in the enactment of the two civil rights laws in 1957 and 1960, cosponsored bills to end hate bombings and to extend the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. My protests helped eliminate segregation in bus and air terminals and bring action against segregation in federally aided hospitals, and against discrimination in employment by Government contractors. Much more needs to be done. The Senate rule permitting filibusters still stands as the chief obstacle to meaningful legislation. And school desegregation, 8 years after the Supreme Court decision, is still proceeding at a snail's pace because of our failure to enact laws permitting Government-instituted lawsuits to achieve compliance.

I have supported the drive to improve the coverage and benefits of social security. My efforts for health care for the aging were concentrated this year in the Anderson-Javits health care bill, which extended coverage to all over 65 and gave a private coverage option. It was defeated in the Senate by four votes, and, I believe, will be the basis for future legislation. I supported the expanded National Defense Education Act, worked for Federal aid to education, public and private, and sponsored the student loan plan now so widely implemented.

The questions of economic growth and productivity have been of deep concern to me. I helped shape the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; cosponsored legislation to expand exports and assist business seriously affected by imports; helped win enactment of the 1961 minimum wage law; sponsored extension of unemployment compensation to Puerto Rico; worked for reorganization of the Securities and Exchange Commission after leading the fight to defeat an unjust reorganization plan; and was responsible for revisions in the Labor-Management Disclosure Act of 1959 to improve code of ethics provisions for unions and to safeguard union recognition in the garment trades.

New York State has benefited directly from my successful efforts to increase its share of urban renewal and college housing funds and for adequate middle income public housing construction. I helped write the Housing Acts of 1959 and 1961, cosponsored the program for middle-income housing, sponsored laws to aid relocated families and businesses, and sponsored the law to permit reduction of FHA mortgage charges and to aid section 213 cooperatives.

I have continued my fight to obtain a greater share of defense contracts for New York State firms, especially in areas of labor surplus. Continuous efforts for a more equitable Pentagon policy, plus legislation to increase competitive bidding, will eventually make this effort even more successful. I cosponsored the Area Redevelopment Act and coauthored provisions to prevent "pirating" of industry from the State; I worked to decrease feed grain costs, and for protection of the dairy industry against Midwest milk imports not meeting New York's high sanitation standards; led the drive for U.S. approval of New York as a site for the World's Fair of 1964, and for congressional approval of U.S. participation in the fair.

I sponsored bills to reduce court congestion, resulting in 11 additional Federal court judgeships in New York; cosponsored the law under which New York State is developing Niagara power; led the successful effort for congressional approval of the Theodore Roosevelt memorial, the Hamilton Grange in New York City as a national memorial, and to give U.S. recognition to the Cooperstown—baseball—Hall of Fame and to Samuel Wilson, of Troy, as the original "Uncle Sam."

I have continued my fight for a revision of our outdated immigration laws and sponsored refugee relief laws to permit adoption of alien orphans and reunite families. I helped write the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961, including demonstration and pilot projects, such as the mobilization for youth program in New York City, and sponsored the legislation for a U.S. Travel Service. I authored laws extending passports from 2 to 3 years and bills easing inconveniences for travelers to the United States. I also sponsored laws making possible the free importation of works of modern art into the United States; initiated the amendment exempting Federal admission taxes in nonprofit theaters; and continued my efforts to aid the arts through a U.S. Arts Foundation.

These are, in my judgment, the high spots of my 6 years of service. But service is not only written in accomplishments; it is also reflected in the day-to-day debate and in voting on hundreds of issues of importance to New York and the Nation; in answering letters; in meeting the requests and needs of constituents; and in working as a liaison between New Yorkers and the Federal Government. All this I have endeavored to do in representing the needs and spirit of our great Empire State to the best of my ability.

This is my report for the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

PEACE AND BERLIN, CUBA

Berlin and Cuba were the key cold war battlefronts as the session neared an end. I have stood firmly behind a no-backdown position on Berlin, and for action in combating the Castro threat to the Western Hemisphere. In both cases, I advocated diplomatic, political, and propaganda initiatives by the United States. I suggested action to incorporate West Berlin into the Federal Republic, to cut off trade between NATO members and East Germany, and to demonstrate the shame of the Berlin wall by appropriate U.N. action.

For Cuba, I advocated combined action with the Organization of American States to deal with the menace of a Soviet military base in Cuba, or if necessary acting unilaterally; also, to insist that NATO countries refrain from helping the Communist buildup in Cuba through transport or shipping. I supported our policy in Laos which resulted in the present peace, though we must recognize it as a risky solution of a neutralist government including Communists. In Vietnam, we are assisting the Government at its request to fight off Communist guerrillas from North Vietnam. I also urged support for the United Nations in the Congo situation. I continued to oppose recognition and the admission of Communist China to the U.N.

I spoke out for improving and strengthening the U.N. instead of downgrading it. The U.N. is not perfect but it is indispensable as a forum for world debate and conciliation, for effective policymaking and other peacekeeping action. I supported the bill to buy $100 million in bonds for, or otherwise loan, the U.N., and the Senate accepted my amendment that the United States match dollar for dollar the purchases of other nations.

I favor continuation of the nuclear test ban and disarmament negotiations at Geneva, and I believe that the test ban treaty on atmospheric testing proposed by the United States offers a meaningful opportunity to the Soviet Union as well as a demonstration to the world that we are seriously seeking the road to disarmament of which a test ban is the first step. I would be opposed, however, to acceptance of the U.S.S.R.'s word on the initial inventory of armaments, and I believe there can be no genuine disarmament without a satisfactory international inspection system. The objective is the most important in the world.

I urge continued support for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and its valuable economic studies.

I look upon resumption of nuclear testing by the United States with a heavy heart because I know and respect the strong feelings of Americans aware of its consequences, but the United States had no alternative in view of the President's determination that our national security had been adversely affected by the Soviet nuclear bomb tests.

I have urged the Senate to consider again the U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide to which 65 nations have so far acceded, and to ratify it as one means to attain a rule of law in the world.

SPACE

The space age continues to effect revolutionary changes in our lives. Development of ICBM's, more satellites, and the beginning of manned space flights have resulted from extraordinary breakthroughs in electronics, medicine, physics and other sciences. Congress has appropriated $3,644,115,000 for our space program which includes Apollo, the man-on-the-moon project.

The orbital flights of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., and Lt. Comdr. Scott Carpenter carried out in the full glare of publicity contrasted sharply with the secrecy that covered the Soviet orbital flights and had a strong impact on our foreign relations. I have supported a U.S. initiative to seek to bring about an

international treaty for the peaceful uses of outer space analogous to the 12-nation Antarctica Treaty of 1959.

I participated in hearings on the communications satellite bill conducted by the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member. I voted for cloture to halt the filibuster by its opponents and voted to establish an innovation—the mixed Government-business corporation to operate the communications satellite system.

DEFENSE

Congress appropriated $48.1 billion for defense for fiscal 1963—including $16.6 for procurement and $7 billion for research and development—the largest peacetime total. The impact will be felt in three key areas: First, the lunar program will be sharply stepped up; second, the number, flexibility, and effectiveness of our missiles, rockets, and Polaris submarines will be increased and development of the 2,000-mile-per-hour RS–70 long-range bomber will be accelerated; and third, weapons and supporting equipment of increased firepower, mobility, and versatility will improve our capability for limited military operations. I voted to give the President the authority he requested to call up 150,000 reservists, but urged the Army not to make the same mistakes in implementing last year's Reserve callup.

AID AND TRADE

The Congress sent to the President a bill authorizing $4.6 billion for the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, of which $1,818,900,000 was in new aid and $1.8 billion for the Alliance for Progress. I supported the bill. Strong sentiment against aid to Communist countries found expression in an amendment which was adopted denying aid to such nations unless the President determined and reported to Congress that this aid was vital to U.S. security, that the country was not dominated by international communism, and that it would promote that country's independence. I supported the provisions giving the President discretionary authority and requiring suspension of aid to any country that expropriates U.S. property without arranging for adequate compensation within 6 months. Included also were my amendments increasing to $25 million the ceiling for all risk loan guarantees; and directing the Agency for International Development—AID—to assist the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress in enlisting private enterprise.

The importance of foreign economic policy to U.S. domestic and international goals must be recognized in terms of trade expansion, private enterprise in international development programs, and leadership of coordinated free world efforts to raise living standards and meet the economic offensive of the Soviet bloc. Thus, I introduced amendments to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to provide for congressional policy directions on the use of tariff-negotiating authority by the President, control over trade adjustment assistance and the escape clause.

I have called for a conference for private enterprise-public cooperation for Latin American development, to be held under the auspices of OECD.

The Economic Committee—of which I am Chairman—of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference reported on free world economic policy including Communist economic exploitation of oil sales to Italy and other countries of Western Europe. A direct outgrowth of the Committee's work was the formation of a group of United States and West German businessmen at my invitation to serve as a nucleus for private enterprise participation in free world economic development programs.

I introduced several bills to strengthen U.S. leadership in fighting Communist trade penetration. I urged creation of a commission to study revision of the antitrust laws to meet the Soviet bloc challenge. My amendment to the Export Control Act to facilitate the unification of East-West trade policies was enacted into law. Most of these measures are based on "The Political Stakes in East-West Trade," a published report which I submitted to the Joint Economic Committee on my trip of November 1961 to the U.S.S.R., and Eastern Europe.

In the Senate I protested the action by the United States in sponsoring the U.N. resolution of censure against Israel for the clash with Syria while omitting all reference to Syria's provocations and urged the United States to review its policy in that region. I also called upon the administration to give up its "quiet" diplomacy in dealing with the continued Arab blockade of the Suez, the boycott of Israel, the blacklisting of and discrimination against U.S. tourists and businessmen because they are Jewish, Arab intransigence on steps toward peace, immobilization of the Arab refugee situation, and the threat of an Arab-Israel arms race. I urged the administration to insist that any aid program for the U.A.R. be conditioned on a guarantee to keep the peace and work for regional cooperation, and called on the White House to live up to its 1960 determination to spark an initiative for Near East peace.

To insist that the Arab States conduct themselves at least within the spirit of the Foreign Assistance Act, I successfully sponsored with 11 other Senators an amendment to the act which called on the President to report annually on the progress in implementing the statement of policy approved by Congress against the Arab boycott and blockade.

I protested the Soviet Union's increased propaganda activity against Israel, coupled with renewed intensification of a Soviet drive against Jews and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union, and called for worldwide public protests against such manifestations.

I also expressed deep concern in the Senate over the evidence of increasing anti-Semitism in the Argentine and Uruguay, and urged the Secretary of State to use his good offices. Our Government has advised the Argentine Government of its concern and has been given assurances that it would halt these activities.

BUDGET AND TAXES

In his budget message, the President estimated spending at $92.5 billion and revenues at $93 billion. Increased expenditures and reduced revenues of $5 to $6 billion for fiscal 1963 resulting chiefly from tax revisions and an economy which is not yet really moving forward will likely bring about a deficit. In view of this fiscal situation, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am especially concerned with scrutinizing all programs to eliminate pork-barrel spending and unrealistic price support programs, agricultural and otherwise.

The poor recovery of the economy, as evidenced by unemployment, the stock market slide and other indexes, warranted decisive action. I advocated a 1962 incentive tax cut to stimulate purchasing power and investment, and a relaxation of the antibusiness atmosphere which the administration had helped to create.

I supported several features of the omnibus tax bill which Congress adopted, such as the credit for investment in new plant and equipment, and the partial reduction of the tax preferences afforded certain mutual savings and insurance companies. I also supported an amendment to reduce from its present 27½ percent level the oil and gas depletion allowance. I opposed as burdensome for low-income recipients a proposal to withhold taxes on dividends and interests, and recommended a substitute which was adopted, to require more detailed reporting by payers of dividends and interest; opposed proposals to repeal the 4 percent tax credit for dividends; and proposed a substitute on foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms dealing with "tax haven" abuses.

I supported elimination of the wartime-created excise tax on rail travel. The Congress granted relief, which I supported, for the tax problems of the stockholders in the Du Pont-General Motors case. I sponsored legislation, which became law, to modernize the Securities and Exchange Commission effectively.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The importance of changing rule XXII of the Senate, which in its present form permits filibusters, was again demonstrated by congressional inaction on civil rights legislation. An effort will be made at the opening of the next Congress to amend the filibuster rule.

A bipartisan group of Senators, of which I am a member, introduced a series of bills designed to implement all the 1961 recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission.

Having failed to ask Congress for such legislation in his first year, the President opened the second with a request for only 2 of the 27 measures recommended by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission: the antiliteracy test and anti-poll tax bills. Yet even these were emasculated. The literacy test bill was killed by a filibuster, and the weak anti-poll-tax proposal was passed only in the unnecessarily cumbersome form of a constitutional amendment. Attempts which I made for the Senate to consider provisions to eliminate segregation in hospitals, schools, and recreational facilities constructed with Federal aid were killed because of threats of filibuster.

The inability of the Congress to provide legal solutions for this vital national problem was reflected in the handling of the so-called "reverse freedom rides"—sending economically disadvantaged Negroes on a one-way ticket from the South to the North—and the passive resistance and prayer movement which focused the attention of the world on Albany, Ga. I spoke out strongly against the injustices reflected by these events.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Select Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, conducted extensive hearings on the Small Business Investment Corporation program which I have long supported. The Congress passed a measure, which I supported, to insure effective participation of SBA in the new adjustment assistance program under the trade bill. Legislation to bolster the small business share of defense procurement was enacted, with amendments which I proposed, to give SBA a greater voice in negotiations with other Federal agencies.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

My determination to bring a program of health care for the aging before the Senate brought results when four Republican colleagues and I were able to work out a bill with Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, which was consistent with the 1960 Republican platform and the essential guidelines contained in my earlier proposals. The Anderson-Javits bill was superior to the original administration bill because under social security financing it included all those 65 years of age and over, whether or not on social security, provided for a separate trust fund to insure fiscal responsibility, for State and private participation in administration of the plan, and for an option to select or continue private plans.

The measure was defeated by a vote of 48 to 52, but I believe this program is inevitable and I shall continue to fight for it. A fine public task force will be bringing in recommendations at my request in 1963.

I voted for public welfare amendments which included funds for child day care services, a program I have sponsored for many years, and an amendment which I sponsored to include foster homes of private agencies. The bill was a comprehensive measure covering aid to the needy aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children. I proposed an amendment to permit Federal-State disputes over enforcement to be settled by the courts. I have repeatedly called attention of the Congress to the need for larger, better equipped hospital facilities as well as more doctors, nurses, and other public health personnel. I therefore sponsored the Hospital Renovation and Modernization Act and also supported measures to improve dental health, to make possible intensive vaccination programs, and to provide funds for research in cancer, heart ailments, and other diseases.

Alerted by the experience with the drug thalidomide, the Senate passed amendments to the Pure Food and Drug Act, several of which were designed to tighten control over experimentation with new drugs. I cosponsored an amendment making clear the power of the Food and Drug Administrator to stop experimentation on persons if he is not satisfied that new drugs are safe.

I proposed an amendment to permit Federal-State disputes to be settled by the courts. Also, I sponsored an amendment which was in part successful to give FDA authority to require notification when possible, to patients treated with experimental drugs.

Congress considered only one bill to aid education, the college academic facilities and scholarship bill, which I supported. The bill included a 5-year, $1.5 billion grant and loan construction program, a loan program for needy students, and a program of $50 million a year in matching grants for community colleges. The bill passed both Senate and House. As of this writing it has been impossible to compromise the views of the House and Senate, and the bill regrettably may have to go over to the next session of Congress.

I introduced several measures to help deal with narcotics addiction without relaxing the already heavy penalties against sellers, or "pushers," of narcotics. My bills would establish a Federal-State program to construct and operate narcotic hospital facilities in areas of need such as New York City; permit civil commitment of addicts to the custody of the U.S. Surgeon General; and stimulate research activity under an existing federally aided mental health program. I called for a White House Conference on Narcotics to study all aspects of the problem, which the President scheduled for September 1962.

LABOR

Congress passed virtually no major labor legislation in 1962, a year marked by the steel industry wage agreement, the Eastern flight engineers strike, continuing costly labor disputes at missile and defense bases, and railroads.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, which passed the Senate in 1961, was revised in the House and enacted into law in March 1962. It provides funds for retraining unemployed workers with 3 years' work experience and also establishes a special program for occupational training of youths. My amendment to assist the formation of local and industrywide labor-management-public committees was adopted.

The Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act of 1958 was amended this year to give the Secretary of Labor authority to investigate violations and enforce the act by injunction. Criminal penalties for bribes, kickbacks, and embezzlement were added. Also enacted was the Work Hours Act to make uniform wage and hour requirements on federally assisted construction projects. I supported equal pay legislation to prohibit discrimination because of sex.

Of five bills I cosponsored affecting the health and education of migratory workers and their families, which passed the Senate last year, one was reported favorably by the House committees in this session and one of them became law.

IMMIGRATION

Substantial revision of our outmoded immigration national quota system is essential, and I sponsored legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit pooling of unused quotas and their reallocation by Presidential Executive order. Another provision permits admission of fourth preference quota immigrants—family of citizens and lawfully admitted resident aliens—approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, without reference to quota. I also introduced a bill to grant permanent residence to first preference aliens who possess critically needed skills and whose national quotas are heavily oversubscribed.

The inadequacy of our archaic immigration laws was highlighted by the flight of Chinese refugees to Hong Kong and the international crisis this caused. The Migration and Refugees Assistance Act of 1962 permitted the President to centralize the authority for aid but little else. I supported the President in speeding surplus foods to the Hong Kong authorities and the Nationalist Government on Formosa to feed the Chinese refugees. The Senate adopted my amendment to a war claims bill to allow claims for loss at the hands of the Nazis by those who later became U.S. citizens.

AGRICULTURE

I voted against both farm bills which passed the Senate: the omnibus bill which was defeated in the House of Representatives and another bill relating to wheat and feed grains. I see real disadvantage to New York farmers in programs of strict production control and supply management, particularly respecting feed grains so important to dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. Food prices to the housewife are not lowered under these programs. I remain convinced that until Congress adopts a policy based on the realities of the U.S. economy in 1962, our agricultural productivity will continue to be a drain on the taxpayer.

The severe drought which hit New York dairy and livestock farmers brought immediate favorable action by the New York congressional delegation in obtaining emergency authorization for farmers to use retired land.

The much publicized Jesse Stalker case relating to producer-handlers, and the Supreme Court decision affecting milk marketing orders, have created an uncertain situation with respect to orderly milk marketing procedures in the New York milkshed, and I am prepared to respond to the need for legislation, if necessary, to assure dairy farmers an adequate return.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

I favor a pay raise this year for postal employees, as well as all other Federal employees who face the same cost-of-living squeeze—even if it is necessary to raise postal rates to help provide for such increases. Congress must maintain wage scales comparable with private industry.

An increase in postal rates appears to be fiscally necessary to cut down on operating deficits. but such increase must take full account of the public interest in the informational and educational contents of second-class mail, and the commercial functions of third-class mail advertising.

VETERANS

I have supported bills increasing the compensation for disabled veterans, and giving peacetime veterans the same hospital and medical care for service-connected disabilities as war service veterans get. Also, I voted for the bill reopening for 1 year national service life insurance to applications from Korean war and other veterans; this passed the Senate but was limited in the House to those with service-connected disability only. I continued to support the resolution to establish a standing Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

TRANSPORTATION

The financial problems of our railroads and the rising costs of freight and passenger operations continue to demand solution. The Senate considered the mass transit bill, which I cosponsored, to provide Federal financial assistance for the planning and development of comprehensive mass transportation systems in urban areas.

Hearings are now being held by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads and the Civil Aeronautics Board will hold hearings on the proposed American and Eastern Airlines merger. Mergers of common carriers into more efficient operating units appear to be necessary but they must protect the public interest in reasonable rates and service and the workers' interest in continuing security of employment, including, if necessary, retraining, severence pay, early retirement or other means, with the Federal Government helping as may be desirable. The railroads need modernization but the cost should not come out of the workers.

HOUSING

Long concerned with difficulties faced by tenants of both commercial and residential property which is demolished to make way for Federally assisted projects, I sponsored legislation to extend relocation assistance, already made a part of the urban renewal program and expanded with my help, to those displaced by Federal highways. Also, I introduced additional legislation to help small businesses to relocate because of Federal housing and urban renewal.

I cosponsored the bill to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs to coordinate the many Federal housing and other programs related to urban areas. The creation of this new Department was defeated for this session.

NEW YORK STATE

The analysis of defense procurement activities which my office has prepared and released every 3 months since 1959 indicates a continuing decline in contract awards given to businesses in New York State. Our share of the national total dropped from 15.3 percent during the Korean war to 12 percent during fiscal 1961, and a further decline lowered the share to 10 percent during the first 9 months of fiscal 1962.

To increase the number of contracts subject to competitive bidding and improve the preferential set-aside system for labor surplus areas is the aim of the armed services competitive procurement bill which I introduced with the cosponsorship of the New York State congressional delegation.

I am particularly gratified that my efforts in this session helped to secure the $17 million appropriation to build a U.S. Pavilion at the 1964–65 New York World's Fair.

POLITICAL ADVANTAGE THROUGH MANIPULATION OF NEWS ABOUT THE PEOPLE'S AFFAIRS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the Boston Herald of September 18, 1962, has an editorial of basic fairness. It calls for an end to the undignified practice of giving this or that Member of Congress political advantage through the manipulation of news about the people's affairs.

I am proud that under the Eisenhower Republican administration there was no such practice. I never received notices except those on the basis of simultaneous notification to all members of the Maine congressional delegation. That is the way it should be.

The editorial very accurately states my position and contention when it says—

What she asks, and what ought to suit everyone, is not favoritism but impartial treatment.

I recommend this editorial as good reading for the Portland Press Herald, the Portland Evening Express, and the Portland Sunday Telegram—and for the White House Special Assistant on Congressional Relations, Mr. Lawrence F. O'Brien.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be placed in the RECORD.

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

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, is mad as a hornet at the White House, and we don't blame her.

A year ago she complained to Presidential Aid Lawrence O'Brien that the White House had given Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, early notification of the news that a million dollar contract for a medical facility at Maine's Dow Air Force Base had been awarded.

O'Brien, she says, promised to investigate this inequity as between Maine Senators (not to say as between a male Senator and a female Senator). But nothing happened.

Indeed, she says, "Not only does it appear that * * * no investigation has been made during the interval of a year—but the handling of the recent disclosure of the construction award of a nuclear submarine to the Kittery Naval Shipyard constitutes a repetition of political favoritism on a matter of national defense in the notification given to Senator MUSKIE on the submarine award far in advance of the release time."

We don't envy Mr. O'Brien his placatory tasks. But we do hope he doesn't go so far as to offer to give Mrs. SMITH a few defense contract "exclusives" of her own. What she asks, and what ought to suit everyone, is not favoritism but impartial treatment.

It's time for an end to the undignified practice of giving this or that Member of Congress political advantage through the manipulation of news about the people's affairs.

WITI–TV HITS HARD FOR MORE ADEQUATE TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Milwaukee television station WITI continues an excellent editorial policy that constitutes an impressive contribution to our great metropolis in Wisconsin.

One of its recent editorials deals perceptively with a matter under consideration by the Senate and the House of Representatives—namely, the serious problem of getting more teachers and better teachers. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NOT JUST MORE TEACHERS BUT BETTER QUALIFIED TEACHERS

Not only more teachers but better qualified teachers should be the goal in modern education.

A modern school system faces many challenges. Probably the greatest is to meet the demands of our more complex and more competitive world. It means we need not only more teachers but better qualified teachers. Yet, in Milwaukee we do little to encourage our educators to add to their own training.

The average teacher here has spent 4 years in college to get a bachelor's degree that will qualify him for a job in the public schools. His starting salary is $4,900 a year, almost $2,000 less than the average income in Milwaukee in 1961.

We say we'd like this teacher to continue his education, work toward a master's degree, keep up with all the new knowledge available, and pass that knowledge on to our children.

But what incentive do we offer him? This starting salary of $4,900 won't inspire him. Under the present setup the teacher gets $100 a year more for obtaining his master's degree.

Here's what that master's degree costs him: Approximately 1,280 hours in class, many more hours of study outside of class, the time and money it costs him to get to and from class, ever-increasing tuition fees, and the possible loss of income he could be getting through evening or summer employment.

For all this effort, time, and expense we add $100 a year to his paycheck. This is how we are trying to compete not only with industry and other States but with other cities here in our own State.

Now the teachers are asking for a better break, for more incentive. They are asking for a $300 pay boost for obtaining a master's degree. The plan would cost $430,000 next year; it would be money well spent. We will encourage more people to the teaching profession, and we will encourage them to become better qualified instructors. Channel 6 believes we need this incentive in our modern school system.

EUROPEAN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, NO ALIBI FOR U.S. RED INK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about the more rapid growth rate of the economy of the European countires. Attention has been called to the fact that some European economies have been growing recently more rapidly than has ours. Some have argued with force that

this growth is forced by government deficit financing.

A recent analysis published in the New Republic was reported on by Sylvia Porter in an article published last night in the Washington Star. Her article casts some badly needed light on the reasons why European deficit spending might contribute to national growth, while red ink in our country would not.

Mrs. Porter writes:

In Europe, governments own, by and large, transportation, communications, power and many basic industries such as coal, gas, petroleum, iron and steel. When European government budgets go into the red, a fundamental cause is that they are investing in these enterprises—which are productive, make jobs, spur growth.

In the United States, the situation is drastically different, for "Much that would be government enterprise in Europe is privately owned."

The Federal budget of the United States is quite different. Our Federal deficits do not mean that we are investing more extensively in productive enterprises.

On the contrary, Federal spending is not likely to be productive in the same way that is private investments in the productive development and growth of plant and equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sylvia Porter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOW DEFICITS HELP EUROPE TO GROW

(By Sylvia Porter)

"You should read an article which has just appeared in the New Republic on this question of the American economy's inadequate growth in recent years in comparison with the strong growth rates of European economies and what should be done about it," said William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, "for the article says things people here should understand."

The face of a man I have known since he was the boy-wonder president of the New York Stock Exchange broke into a broad smile. "Of course, the reason I'm asking you to do this is that I agree with the points the article makes."

So naturally, as soon as I left the Federal Reserve Board's headquarters in Washington, I picked up the magazine (Aug. 27 issue) and studied the article "Deficits and Economic Growth" by Matthew J. Kust, identified as a "Washington lawyer specializing in international tax and financial matters." It is not easy reading, but here in simple language are the major points Mr. Kust makes.

1. It has become fashionable this year to suggest we examine what Europe has been doing that we have not been doing to spur economic growth—and an argument gaining adherents is that Europe "owes its greater economic growth to a bolder use of government deficit finance." But before we accept this, we should inquire whether government budget deficits have the same economic impact in the United States as in Europe.

2. We have kept pace with European countries in runing deficits during the last decade. Our Federal, State and local governments had deficits in 8 of the last 12 years; Britain in 9 of the last 11; France in each of the last 10 years, and Germany in 4 out of the last 6 years.

MIXED ECONOMY

3. Why, then, have government deficits resulted "in such an inadequate rate of growth in the United States while yielding such high rates in France and Germany?" The answer is that "Europeans have accepted, which we have not, the principle of the mixed economy wherein the government conducts many industrial undertakings that are privately owned in the United States." In Europe, governments own, by and large, transportation, communications, power, and many basic industries such as coal, gas, petroleum, iron and steel. When European government budgets go into the red, a fundamental cause is that they are investing in these enterprises—which are productive, make jobs, spur growth.

4. In the United States, the situation is drastically different, for "Much that would be government enterprise in Europe is privately owned." When our Federal budget goes into the red, little of the extra spending is for productive enterprise. Mr. Kust explains: "It would be quite different if, let us say, the Government owned the railways and floated a multibillion dollar bond issue for rehabilitation and modernization."

TAXES CURB INVESTING

5. Tax policies also are a key factor. We tax corporations far more heavily than other countries do. "Since corporations undertake most of the private productive investment in industrialized countries, heavy taxation of their earnings dissuades growth." The same goes for our personal tax structure, which cuts down on the savings that are essential to greater investment in productive facilities. We invest much less of our total production in new machinery and equipment than European countries do, and the outcome is that the United States "has an old and obsolete industrial plant."

Mr. Kust's conclusion is that "it is this quite striking difference in the economic impact" of our various government policies "which may provide the answer to the great difference in growth rates." He clearly believes the fundamental need is to overhaul our fiscal policies with the primary aim of stimulating investment rather than consumption.

Whether or not you agree, this is a thoughtful contribution to the debate on what we should do to get back on the road to strong growth. And most significant is that Mr. Martin sympathizes with this view, for, as head of the powerful central bank of the United States, he is among the most informed and influential men of the free world.

U.S. ALLIES STILL POURING MACHINERY AND INDUSTRIAL RAW MATERIALS INTO CUBA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the House of Representatives is about to consider the foreign-aid appropriation bill, and the Senate will do so shortly. I am very much disturbed about the fact that countries which receive substantial amounts of assistance from the United States are continuing to trade extensively with Cuba.

Yesterday's New York Times reported that—

Cuba has been getting machinery and industrial raw materials from Canada, diesel motors and chemicals from West Germany, and machinery and chemicals from Britain. The Netherlands and France also have exported goods to Cuba.

The article states that these countries continue to make such shipments in very large quantities.

I think the Senate should give serious consideration to this matter when it considers the foreign-aid bill, in the next few days.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the article published in the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES FAILS TO CURB ALLIES OVER CUBA

Nevertheless, Cuba has been getting machinery and industrial raw materials from Canada, diesel motors and chemicals from West Germany, and machinery and chemicals from Britain. The Netherlands and France also have exported goods to Cuba.

According to figures available here, North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries sold Cuba about $138 million worth of goods in 1959 and purchased goods amounting to $79 million. In 1961, NATO exports dropped to $86 million and imports from Cuba to $32 million.

In addition, Japan conducted a $16-million annual trade with Cuba, exchanging light machinery for sugar. Chile was the only country in Latin America reported to have an appreciable trade with Cuba, bartering various foodstuffs for sugar.

TWO ALLIES INCREASE TRADE

Two allied countries increased their trade with Cuba during the 2-year period, 1959–61, contrary to the general trend. Canada was the biggest allied trader with Cuba in 1961, exporting $31,800,000 worth of goods, slightly more than double her 1959 exports. The Netherlands increased her trade total with Cuba from $8,275,000 to $10,920,000.

The United States, which ended all imports from Cuba and limited sales to food and medical supplies, is now sending less than $50,000 worth of such supplies to Cuba each month.

SPACE INDUSTRY SURE TO EXCEED AUTO INDUSTRY IN SIZE; REQUIRES FAR GREATER ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the very important developments in the United States and, in fact, in the world has been the magnificent progress made by the space industry. All of us are anxious to have our country able to meet and to surpass such developments by the Soviet Union. We are being challenged in this area more than in any other, except perhaps the military area.

Nevertheless, I believe we must recognize the enormous size which the space industry will achieve in the next few years.

An article published yesterday in the Washington Post states that the space industry is expected to exceed the automobile industry in size.

Mr. President, with no profit incentive or discipline and with no budget discipline—because in the House committee hearings it was revealed that the Bureau of the Budget leaves virtually untouched the budget of the Space Agency. With the terrific public relations buildup for developments in

space, with television, radio, and the newspapers enthusiastically urging us to make more and more investments in space, there is danger that there will be great extravagance in this area.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post, entitled "Space Industry Seen Topping Auto in Size," as well as an editorial from Fortune magazine entitled "Defense in Space," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1962]

SPACE INDUSTRY SEEN TOPPING AUTO IN SIZE

ST. LOUIS, MO., September 17.—An aerospace executive said today the astronautics industry within 10 years may exceed in size the combined automotive industries of the world.

The prospect was raised by M. G. O'Neil, president of the General Tire & Rubber Co., in a talk prepared for a national convention of tire dealers.

He likened the impact of the space age to that of America's discovery nearly 500 years ago.

O'Neil said the country's steadily growing aerospace endeavor already numbers 5,000 companies or research organizations, and has led to over 3,000 space-oriented products.

He estimated that the approximate cost of landing a man on the moon by 1970 would be $30 billion, and said some estimates for the Government's total space projects run to $150 billion.

Calling space exploration a necessity for national survival, O'Neil enumerated useful byproducts of the space effort in the fields of medicine, communications, weather, and marine navigation.

[From Fortune magazine]

DEFENSE IN SPACE

It is high time that we forsake some of the more exotic scientific idealism in the space program, in recognition of a real and somber threat. NASA's programs should be trimmed at the fringes, and its lines of control strengthened. The Nation's defense requirements should be thoroughly, openly, and honestly integrated with the fabulously expensive development of moon-shot technology. Congress should see to it that these unified objectives are ensured by unified direction—not just coordination—of all space activities by the national aeronautics and space council. As Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert wrote recently: "We must be able to enforce our stand on the peaceful uses of space."

ISRAEL FOREIGN AID PROGRAM MODEL OF EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in connection with the foreign aid bill which is about to come before the Senate, all Senators are aware of the many examples of waste, and some examples of graft and extravagance, in our foreign aid program. The little State of Israel, which is deficient in resources, limited in capital, dimunitive in population as compared with ours, and urgently in need of capital investment on its own account, has been carrying on an inspiring foreign aid program from which we can learn real lessons.

A recent editorial in the Milwaukee Journal stated in part:

In Kenya, Israel has helped organize two cooperative stores. In Nepal it is helping to set up a bus transport system. It has just added Jamaica to the list of countries given free scholarships for technical students in Israel.

Africans from Dahomey, Niger, and Togo are studying radio techniques in Israel and more are coming soon from the Ivory Coast. Israel technicians have the contract to build large bathhouses in Ethiopia.

Israel's foreign aid program is such a model of efficiency and effectiveness, so honest and economic in its operation, that I think it serves as a real example for us and the rest of the free world. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ISRAEL HELPS OTHERS

Israel is one of the smaller nations but one of the most enterprising. Surrounded by Arab enemies, it has been making friends constantly by its program of international cooperation.

In Kenya, Israel has helped organize two cooperative stores. In Nepal it is helping to set up a bus transport system. It has just added Jamaica to the list of countries given free scholarships for technical students in Israel.

Africans from Dahomey, Niger and Togo are studying radio techniques in Israel and more are coming soon from the Ivory Coast. Israel technicians have the contract to build large bathhouses in Ethiopia. Two Israel doctors are at work in eye clinics in Liberia, which were set up by Israel experts. A number of students from French speaking African nations have completed police training in Israel.

Recipient of much foreign help itself, this small country is busy helping others.

PROXMIRE RESOLUTION TO END SCHOOL DROPOUTS BEFORE 17 WILL REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I submitted a resolution calling on State school officials to give consideration to raising the school dropout age to 17, which in some areas is now 14, 15, or 16. I submitted the resolution for many reasons. The principal reason is that unemployment is so highly concentrated among our young people.

Sylvia Porter, in a very fine article, commented on this question and stated:

This summer, while the general unemployment rate has ranged under 6 percent, the rate among the unskilled has been 11 percent. Among the 900,000 who were graduated from high school in June 1961 and didn't go on to college, the unemployment rate last October was 18 percent. Among the 350,000 youngsters of 16 to 24 who quit elementary or high school between January and mid-October 1961, the unemployment rate in the fall was 27 percent.

Even when he gets a job, a dropout is likely to get an undesirable one.

On the other hand, skilled workers will find their future bright and find more job openings than workers to fill them.

That is the reason why my resolution should be given consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I hope the resolution will be adopted by the Senate in this session. It is a simple Senate resolution and merely calls on school authorities around the country to give serious consideration to increasing the age for dropping out and to provide the kind of vocational training which can so tremendously help young students leaving education and also help the growth of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sylvia Porter which appeared recently in the Washington Star be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RETURN TO SCHOOL, DROPOUTS WARNED

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Return to school," urged President Kennedy in his Labor Day message to the youth of the Nation, thereby putting the White House behind the accelerating drive to convince America's youngsters that they must stay in school until they gain the education and skills essential to fill today's jobs.

But a potential dropout, or a young man or woman who already has quit school, well might ask for more than exhortation, more than even a warning from the President that "returning to school may mean the difference between possible hardship and unemployment or a fruitful life."

In this and Sunday's column, I'll submit the "why" and "what." Make a record of these facts, no matter who you are, for in your neighborhood may be a young person whose entire life you can benefit by reciting them.

Here's the why.

In the 1960's, overall employment is scheduled to rise about 20 percent, but unskilled workers always will face the threat of unemployment as jobs are eliminated by automation.

This summer, while the general unemployment rate has ranged under 6 percent, the rate among the unskilled has been 11 percent. Among the 900,000 who were graduated from high school in June 1961, and didn't go on to college, the unemployment rate last October was 18 percent.

Among the 350,000 youngsters of 16 to 24 who quit elementary or high school between January and mid-October 1961 the unemployment rate in the fall was 27 percent.

You need a high school diploma even for menial jobs today. In Detroit industrial companies require one for a sweeper.

Even when he gets a job, a dropout is likely to get an undesirable one. A full 28 percent of the male dropouts in 1961 who had obtained jobs by October were working as farm laborers, and 40 percent were working as factory laborers or semiskilled operatives. About two-fifths of the female dropouts were working in private households or as other types of service workers. Only 1 out of 10 of the dropouts had obtained a clerical job.

As a skilled worker, though, your future will be bright. In the 1960's, an additional 2.3 million jobs are due to open up for skilled workers and 2.7 million others will become available as those holding these jobs transfer to other occupations, retire or die. This means our economy will be looking for 5 million young, educated, skilled men and women. If you are trained, you'll not have trouble finding employment.

Jobs which today don't seem to require much training, such as simple clerical or office jobs, will require training tomorrow. As automated equipment takes over more and more offices, employers will need trained personnel to operate the equipment.

The job outlook for the educated and skilled young man and woman is superb. The uneducated, unskilled dropout is likely to be unplaced or displaced. That is the "why" behind the warning: "Return to school."

AMERICAN FARMER'S GREAT JOB FOR CONSUMER-TAXPAYER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Finally, Mr. President, we are about to consider a very important conference report on the farm bill. There is some possibility we will not have a farm program this year. Unfortunately, farmers have been accused of being a burden on other American citizens, particularly on the taxpayer. I feel very strongly that this is a serious mistake; that, actually, farmers contribute more to our well-being than does any other group in our society.

In this connection, Reader's Digest, which is conservative on such subjects, and particularly on the farm subject, published a fine article showing that American food is bought at bargain prices, and showing how the American consumer pays far less for food now than he has before in terms of wages and income. The article shows that the consumer pays a great deal less for his food in this country than he does in foreign countries; and the article spells out what this means in terms of leisure, income, and well-being. This also means a great deal in terms of our competition with the Soviet Union and communism in other parts of the world where agriculture has been such a dismal failure.

I think we should view the farm program in connection with the very fine job which has been done by our farmers in keeping the cost of food low. We are all consumers. When looked at in this way, what we have done in farm programs for our farmers is very modest.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Reader's Digest for September 1962, entitled "Why Our Food Is a Bargain," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHY OUR FOOD IS A BARGAIN

(By John Strohm)

(John Strohm, one of today's foremost agricultural writers, has visited 70 countries (including the Soviet Union and Red China) as a correspondent, and has conducted a group of Russian farm officials through the United States. A past president of the American Agricultural Editors' Association, he is currently president of Publications, Inc., and editor of Ford Almanac. This article is the basis for a presentation Mr. Strohm will make at the Fifth International Food Congress, which will be held in New York City's Coliseum, September 8–16.)

If I could show any visitor from abroad just one thing in the United States, I would turn him loose in a smalltown supermarket with $25—the average amount the American homemaker spends weekly to feed her family. For food is our No. 1 success story, a far bigger bargain here than in any other nation.

Mrs. America pays out, after taxes, only 20 percent of the family income for food. By contrast, the Russian family must spend 56 percent. In Sweden it's 27 percent; in Italy, 38 percent; Peru, 40 percent; Nigeria, 70 percent. This means that the U.S. family has 80 cents out of every dollar of disposable income left for "other things." It means more and better education for our sons and daughters. It means better homes, better health, better living. It means refrigerators, automobiles, TV sets. And with such a relatively small part of our national effort devoted to feeding the people, we can match missiles with the Russians or race them to the moon without giving up necessities or luxuries, while the Russian people suffer acute shortages of food, clothing, and housing.

Our national ability to feed our families with more food, of higher quality and variety, with less money and labor than any other people on earth is an achievement we too often take for granted. Let's see what goes into it.

Mrs. America makes three trips weekly to the food store, takes 27 minutes on each visit to look around among thousands of items, buys 21 of them, and pays $7.74 at the checkout counter. Does she wonder where all the money goes? Maybe she forgets that her husband works only 38 hours a month to buy food for his family. To earn a pound of butter, he works 21 minutes—while a Russian works 193 minutes. A pound of rice costs an American 5 minutes of work; a Japanese, 25 minutes, despite the fact that Japan gets among the highest rice yields in the world. A pound of sugar costs an American 3 minutes of work; an Englishman, 7 minutes of work; a Russian, 75 minutes of work.

And lest you long for the "good old days" when prime beef was 15 cents a pound and bread two loaves for a nickel, consider the real cost of food then and now. In 1912, Granddad's family earned $11 a week and spent 40 percent of it for food. His grandson's family earns more than $125 weekly, spends $25 for food—and buys more and better food.

You're better off than your dad, too. In 1931, an hour of U.S. factory labor bought only 1.4 pounds of round steak, while today it buys 2.2 pounds. It bought 8 pints of milk then—17.8 pints today; 1.5 dozen oranges then—3 dozen today. Since 1947–49 food prices have gone up less than most items in the cost-of-living index—22 percent. The cost of housing went up 33 percent; of transportation, 51 percent; of rent, 45 percent.

Moreover, while the old corner grocery with its crackers and pickles in open barrels and sauerkraut in tubs may be full of nostalgia, our food today is safer, cleaner and more nutritious.

Researchers have bred more vitamin C into tomatoes, more protein into corn, more lean meat into pork. Processors have improved nutrition by selecting crops at exact maturity, by rapid deactivation of enzymes and by cooking in a limited amount of liquid, which is then retained in the can rather than discarded. Mobile packing vans move right into the fields to film-wrap vegetables at their peak of freshness. We've improved on nature by enriching bread with vitamins and iron, by "fortifying" milk.

Improved diets have helped infant mortality to drop sharply. People are living an average 9 years longer than two generations ago. Our children are 2 inches taller than their grandparents, weigh several pounds more. And the sports pages tell us they can run faster and jump higher and farther than ever before. Children (and grownups, too) now get two-thirds of their protein from meat and dairy products, while these foods represent only 2 percent of the Japanese diet, 4 percent of the Indians'.

Instant and heat-and-eat foods can reduce the housewife's daily food preparation work from 5½ hours to 1½ hours. She buys freedom from the drudgery of kitchen chores in the form of cakes already mixed, meat already trimmed, vegetables already cleaned and washed, juice already squeezed.

The Agricultural Research Service says: Already prepared meals that cost $6.70 for a family of four for 1 day can be fixed by the housewife herself for $1.80 less. But should the housewife work 4 hours extra for 45 cents an hour, and save the $1.80? Or should she devote her 4 hours to her children, to community activities, to keeping up with the world, to holding an outside job? Unshackling the housewife from her kitchen has had an incalculable impact for good on our Nation—socially, politically, spiritually and culturally.

Many instant foods actually save money. A pound of fresh frozen peas costs about 32 cents; bought fresh, they cost 70 cents. A devil's food cake, made from a prepared mix, plus two eggs, costs 41 cents; made from scratch, it costs 53 cents. Frozen concentrated orange juice costs only half as much as that squeezed at home from fresh oranges (the can of concentrate costs 2.7 cents more to process, but 3.7 cents less to transport and 8.5 cents less to merchandise).

There were 100 items in the grocery store of a century ago; Mother found 1,000 items 20 years ago. Today's homemaker has a choice of 8,000 items in her local food store—and two-thirds of them are either brand new or materially improved over 10 years ago.

How did this food abundance come about? The answer is that three imaginative, venturesome groups have been working with increasingly effective teamwork to feed our Nation.

Farm suppliers: Six million workers produced $16 billion worth of fertilizer, feed, machinery and other food-production tools for the farmer last year. Machines permit one farmer to plow 40 acres a day (three out of four farmers around the world plow less than 1 acre a day, and that poorly, with oxen and wooden plow). Agricultural research has developed fertilizers that permit farmers to triple crop yields on "worn out" soil. Imaginative chemists have found ways to make apples hang on trees until ripe, to stimulate corn while killing weeds, to grow bug-resistant crops.

Farmers: Five and a half million farm workers take these new seeds, new breeds, new feeds, add their own capital, knowledge, and labor, and turn out raw food products worth about $27 billion a year. Motorized muscles have made the U.S. farmer a food-production giant. Here, where only 8 percent of our population remains on the land, 1 farmer feeds himself and 26 others. In Russia, with more than 40 percent of the people still on the land, a collective-farm worker can feed himself and three or four others.

If our farms were no more efficient than the Soviet collectives I've visited, 20 to 25 million U.S. industrial workers would have to quit their jobs for the farm. Think what that would do to our standard of living and to our ability to shoot for the moon.

The food industry: Some 8 million processors, package manufacturers, transporters, wholesalers, retailers take our raw farm produce and place $50 billion worth of food on store shelves. Packing plants utilize "all of the hog except the squeal," conserving once wasted byproducts for medicines and other valuable items. Jets carry lobsters from Maine to Iowa, fresh vegetables from California fields to Boston tables in 24 hours at a price the housewife is glad to pay.

Dramatic as our food progress has been, we can expect other near miracles soon. Among them are dried fruit juices that can be stored on the kitchen shelf; freeze-dried fruits and vegetables with weight and bulk reduced to save expense of refrigeration, shipping and storage; atomically irradiated steaks and chops that can be stored on the shelf.

"Food manufacturers are spending $120 million a year on research to develop new and improved products," says Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America. "In 10 years, the big markets will be handling 12,000 items, half of them different from those sold today."

Great as the impact of the U.S. food achievement has been on American consumers, it is potentially even more revolutionary for the 2 billion people who live in 70 nations where malnutrition is widespread and persistent. Four international food congresses, held in France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland, have helped spread the benefits of U.S. food technology throughout Europe. Supermarkets, with European refinements, are mushrooming in the six Common Market nations. At the Fifth International Food Congress, to be held in New York City this September, participants from some 50 countries will learn how food can be brought to the people efficiently, conveniently and abundantly.

"It took more than 170 years for Americans to develop the food system which has brought the cost of food per hours of work to its lowest point in history," says Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. "But, to achieve a similar goal, other nations need not go through all the steps we had to take. What we have learned over the years is available today to all who wish to use it."

BULGARIAN NATIONAL DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the 15th annual observance of Bulgarian National Day for the fight for freedom, independence, and democracy which is taking place on September 23. This observance commemorates a great hero of the Bulgarian people, Nikola Petkov, who was executed by the Communist dictators of Bulgaria because of his courageous opposition and denunciation of their tyranny and oppression.

Petkov is an outstanding example of the spirited fighters for freedom who by their resistance to tyranny have written a memorable page in the history of the Bulgarian people. Although they are now held captive by the Communists, no conqueror has been able to suppress for long their spirit and determination to be free. Their brothers in the free world speak where they cannot, and by observing the memory of their great hero, keep fresh and alive their continuing struggle for independence which has so much sympathy in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an account of the life and death of Nikola Petkov.

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

NIKOLA PETKOV, BULGARIAN NATIONAL HERO AND GREATEST MARTYR IN THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

Nikola Dimitrov Petkov was born in Sofia in 1894. He was the son of Dimiter Petkov, a self-educated peasant from Dobrudja, who became Prime Minister of Bulgaria. Dimiter Petkov was assassinated in 1907 for opposing foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Bulgaria, especially on the part of Czarist Russia.

Petko Petkov, Nikola's brother, was one of the greatest Bulgarian peasant leaders. He fought Alexander Tzankov's Fascist dictatorship of 1923 and as a result was shot down on a Sofia street on June 14, 1924—exactly 1 year after the merciless assassination of Alexander Stamboliiski.

Nikola Petkov received a law degree in Paris, where he spent most of his youth. During the Nazi occupation of Bulgaria he was an underground leader and was imprisoned several times.

When the Nazis were driven out of Bulgaria, Nikola Petkov and three other representatives of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union—the largest political organization in Bulgaria—took part in the first coalition government, together with Communists, Socialists, representatives of the political group "Zveno," and the independent intellectuals. Together with Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, Secretary-General of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union, Nikola Petkov fought stubbornly against Communist outrages, terror and violence, and thus incurred the hatred of both the Communist Party and the Soviet occupation authorities. Despite these difficulties, he continued to defend the freedom and independence of his country.

When the Soviet occupation authorities demanded the removal of the "capitalist agent" Dr. G. M. Dimitrov from his post as Secretary General, Nikola Petkov took his place.

In July 1945 Nikola Petkov sent a memorandum to the Inter-Allied Control Commission demanding the postponement of the elections which the Communists had scheduled for the end of August 1945. These elections were to involve only one list of candidates, headed by the Communist Party. As a result of the memorandum, the Prime Minister declared that Petkov had resigned, although formally he never did so. In protest, Nikola Petkov and other cabinet ministers broke up the coalition government, and thenceforth openly opposed the Communist dictatorship. Upon intervention of the Control Commission, the elections were postponed until November 18, 1945.

During the winter of 1946, Stalin sent Vishinsky to Sofia for the purpose of getting Petkov to come back into the government. At their dramatic meeting, Petkov declared that it was not his custom to obey the orders of any foreigner, but to listen only to the will of the Bulgarian people.

That meeting decided Petkov's fate.

In October 1946 Petkov headed the opposition in its election campaign against the Communist-Soviet attempts to seize full control of the country. The enthusiastic people from the countryside and towns voted en mass for Petkov's list, but the election results were falsified and violence and bloodshed were commonplace. Nevertheless, 101 people's representatives, headed by Petkov, were acknowledged to have been elected and triumphantly entered the Grand National Assembly. It was there that Petkov's most courageous and heroic struggle culminated. Availing himself of his constitutional immunity, he unmasked in Parliament the treacherous intentions of the Communists and their leader, Georgi Dimitrov, former Secretary-General of the Comintern. He accused them of being Stalinist agents, and said that their hands were stained with the blood of innocent Bulgarians and that they wanted to make Bulgaria a Soviet province.

As a result of his activity, Petkov was charged with conspiracy against the state and the Soviet Union. Like his predecessor, he was called "an agent of Anglo-American capitalism."

After dramatic and stormy debates in Parliament, Petkov was arrested inside the Parliament building in complete defiance of the Constitution and the law. Petkov declared dauntlessly that he would share with pride the fate of his father and his brother.

On August 16 Petkov was sentenced to die on the gallows.

Early in the morning of September 23, only 15 minutes after midnight, he was executed in secret because the Communists feared the people's mass indignation. (At that time all executions took place about 5 o'clock in the morning.)

Prior to the execution a representative of the Bulgarian Communist government appeared in Nikola Petkov's prison cell and offered him a pardon if he signed a petition in which he declared his repentance.

"You are even trying to desecrate my sacred memory," Petkov replied. "My sentence was passed by your Moscow masters and no one can revoke it. I do not seek any mercy from you. I want to die so that my people may be freed sooner."

The heroic example set by Nikola Petkov shook the free world and opened its eyes to the treacherous intentions and methods of the Bolshevist international conspiracy and the tragic fate which Soviet imperialism is preparing for all of humanity.

Petkov's career was a brilliant model of self-sacrifices for his people, principles, ideas, freedom and democracy. Thousands and thousands of Bulgarian patriots followed his great example.

That is the reason why the American Congressmen who, upon the occasion of a visit to Bulgaria, laid a wreath on his freshly dug grave, called him "one of the greatest democrats of all time."

This is why government officials and statesmen from all over the world sent protest notes to his Sofia and Moscow executioners, and honored and still continue to honor, Nikola Petkov as one of the greatest martyrs of human freedom and the right to independence.

With each elapsing year, the memory of Nikola Petkov is becoming a greater danger for the Communist tyranny, shaking its yoke and leading the freedom fighters to their final victory.

TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Ohio's Association of Chiefs of Police has recently adopted two resolutions commending Director J. Edgar Hoover for his significant contributions in exposing communistic activities and propaganda in his two recently published books, "Masters of Deceit" and "A Study of Communism," and also for Director Hoover's cooperative attitude toward the law enforcement agencies in Ohio and elsewhere in the performance of their duties and services to the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION ON "A STUDY OF COMMUNISM," BY DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover is eminently qualified as an authority on communism and since his assumption of FBI directorship in 1924 has held responsibility for protecting the internal security of the United States, and conducting investigation into all aspects of subversive activity, espionage, sabotage, and related functions with emphasis on communism; and

Whereas the book "Masters of Deceit," written by Director Hoover was an outstanding compilation of Communist ideology, tactics, and strategy, and served a vital need in the United States; and

Whereas the recent intensification of Communist activity directed toward the capture of the minds of young people and the overt actions of the international Communist conspiracy are directed at the destruction of the United States, and thus emphasizing the

importance of all citizens being aware of Communist challenges against law and order; and

Whereas it is fundamental that the Communists seek to destroy confidence in established agencies of government, including the dedicated public servants in the police profession, and it becomes important for each citizen to be aware that the Communist world membership of 40 million, its false appeals, its propaganda, front groups, infiltration of non-Communist organizations and other subtle tactics, including the all-out, systematic campaign to recruit members from the college campuses, can be combated only through enlightened citizens; and

Whereas Director Hoover has now performed another characteristic service to the American people through the issuance of his new book, "A Study of Communism," designed to help high school and college students, as well as adults, more effectively serve in the protection of the United States and in contributions to government under law; and

Whereas Director J. Edgar Hoover has, without remuneration to himself, offered in "A Study of Communism" the most modern, complete, factual compendium of the entire Communist picture in textbook form, especially designed for use in the schools, as well as in adult education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police does hereby express its hearty commendation to Director J. Edgar Hoover for his latest book, "A Study of Communism," and for his selfless services in providing this penetrating analysis of the Communist threat to freedom as well as for his many years of protecting the internal security of the United States; and be it also

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police endorses "A Study of Communism" and urges its incorporation into the high school and college curriculums throughout the land, as well as the widest possible dissemination to citizens everywhere as a means of enhancing democratic government under law.

WAYNE F. ETHELL,
President, Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police.

Adopted by the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police in conference assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, September 11, 1962.

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION FOR J. EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas the FBI Laboratory was established by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover on November 24, 1932, for the purpose of serving all law enforcement agencies throughout the United States in the scientific examination of evidence in criminal cases, and has rendered scintillating, effective, harmonious, and gratis services in this direction; and

Whereas the law enforcement agencies of Ohio have used the facilities of the FBI Laboratory to a degree rarely exceeded by that of any other State; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Director J. Edgar Hoover, constantly strives in all scientific matters and in many other service aspects to improve the professionalization of police work and effective service to citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police in conference assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, on September 11, 1962, does hereby commend Director J. Edgar Hoover, FBI, for his multifold services, and congratulate him on the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the FBI Laboratory which will occur on November 24, 1962; and be it further

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police expresses deep gratitude for the many aspects of FBI cooperation and for its efficient, effective, economical service to the people of the United States and to the people and the law enforcement agencies of the great State of Ohio.

WAYNE F. ETHELL,
President, Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police.

LAND AND PEOPLE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on September 17–18 the first of a series of five regional Land and People Conferences was held in St. Louis, Mo., under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Some 1,500 rural leaders from the Midwestern States were in attendance.

The purpose of the meeting was for the Department of Agriculture to have a means of counseling with rural leaders to find ways and means of strengthening rural America, of providing for adequate family farming, and of stimulating economic growth throughout the rural areas of the Nation.

A spokesman for the rural leaders summarized the conference by saying:

I believe that this conference is a great step forward and has been and will continue to be more productive of ideas and plans for action than any other similar effort in many years.

From the many conversations I have been involved in and others I have overheard, it is my firm conviction that I speak the sentiments of the vast majority that we here in attendance are taking home with us renewed vitality, a new sense of hope and faith in the future of rural America and an unprecedented determination to build a more socially satisfying and economically desirable life for rural people.

Outstanding addresses were also delivered by the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Fred V. Heinkle, president of the Missouri Farmers Association; Edwin Christianson, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union; and Dan Saults, assistant director of the Missouri Conservation Commission.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that these speeches be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN KEYNOTING REGIONAL LAND AND PEOPLE CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 17, 1962

The people of the United States are concerned about strengthening rural America in order that rural America may continue to make invaluable contributions to the strength of the Nation.

Political philosophers, poets, and historians have rightly sung the praises of rural America. They have told of how the basic qualities that have made America great—the spirit of initiative and independence, the dedication to ideals of democracy, the pioneering courage and drive that overcomes tremendous obstacles, the vision to aspire to a future of limitless possibilities—they have told of how all these qualities grew, and flourished, and bore fruit on the farms and ranches and in the small towns of our country.

This rural America, that has up to now contributed so much to our national growth and greatness, now faces a period of serious crisis—a crisis brought about by the same technological and scientific progress that has made American agriculture the productive marvel of the world. But let me make it perfectly clear that the real threat to rural America does not lie in scientific and technological progress itself; the real threat lies in a failure to direct the changes that grow out of that progress to meet the real needs and wants of all the people. And it is not only rural America, but the health of the entire Nation, that will be seriously threatened if we fail to preserve and advance the real values of the past as we adopt and make use of the new potential for the future.

I would like to emphasize that this threat is very real, and very serious. Its reality is illustrated by the cold facts of what has been happening to rural America in our generation. I will point out some of these facts a little later. Its seriousness is demonstrated by the fact that an organization as distinguished as the Committee for Economic Development has recently put out a proposal that would attempt to solve the farm problem by cruelly depressing farm income to the point where a mortal blow would be inflicted upon the small cities, towns, villages, and farms that, together, make up rural America.

The CED would thus attempt to solve a problem of surplus grain by substituting for it an infinitely more serious problem of surplus human beings.

We are unalterably opposed to this approach.

Instead of the CED program of deliberately using poverty to drive people off the farms, we seek to end rural poverty by building new resources in the country.

Instead of the CED program to idle our great land resources because they now produce more food than we can use, we seek to redirect those resources to meet critical and growing scarcities that exist in our society.

Instead of using rural America as a base from which to inflict upon our burgeoning metropolitan areas an influx of jobseekers we seek to develop in rural America facilities for outdoor recreation that will offer to the men, women, and children of our cities opportunities to fulfill one of this Nation's most pressing and urgent demands.

These are some of our goals for rural America. This Land and People Conference is held for the purpose of exploring ways and means for reaching these goals. In order to approach this task within a framework of understanding that will enable us to choose the best programs directed toward those goals, I am asking you to review with me: first, the size and shape of rural America; second, some of the facts of today that clearly warn us of the imminent threat to our rural economy; and, third, some of the programs we are developing to avert this threat by expanding opportunity and encouraging new growth.

Two out of every five Americans today live in areas that are essentially rural in their nature. Almost 16 million live on farms. Thirty-eight million others, who are not farmers, live close to the land in strictly rural areas. In towns and nonmetropolitan cities of less than 25,000 population there are 22 million more people who, because they draw their economic lifeblood from the countryside, must be considered a part of rural America.

These 76 million people are the ones most directly concerned with the danger signals that threaten rural America, though all Americans are indirectly involved. To understand their implications, let's look for a moment at some of the results that technological and scientific changes have brought about, along with the new problems arising because of the failure to adjust to these changes.

In the first place, it is important to recognize to what extent our growth in population reflects increasing urbanization. From 1950 to 1960, some 300 metropolitan

counties accounted for 85 percent of the population increase. And 50 of these metropolitan counties had half of the Nation's total population growth.

Outside urbanized areas, the population of most towns under 2,500 declined, while that of most towns from 2,500 to 10,000 people increased only slightly. But their supporting farm population dropped by one-third—from 23.1 million to 15.6 million. On the average at least a million people left the farm every year through the 1950's.

The decline in farm population reflects the economic plight of the farmer. The efficient family farmer found it necessary to increase his acreage enough for full use of the machine-based technologies. He bought or rented land from the small farmer who lacked the resources or the skills to take advantage of the new technology.

Many small farmers gave up, or turned to whatever nonfarm work he could find in order to remain in rural America. In 1959, families on the 2.9 million farms producing less than $10,000 in marketings got 73 percent of their cash income from nonfarm sources.

Even with many fewer people to divide farm earnings, per capita personal income of the farm population was $1,373 last year, or only 50 percent of the $2,345 for the nonfarm population.

And this was true despite the fact that total realized net farm income was 10 percent higher in 1961 than in 1960, and the highest since 1953.

With its major economic mainstay in trouble, rural America began to slide backward. And today we see these results:

More than half of the Nation's poverty today is rural poverty.

Rural people lack educational opportunities. Half of our urban people 25 years of age and older have had more than 11 years of formal education. By comparison, the median figure for the rural nonfarm population is 9.5 years of formal schooling, and for farm people it is 8.8 years.

Rural people lack employment opportunities. Underemployment in the countryside and its small towns is so great that it is the equivalent of around 4 million unemployed.

This has happened in a countryside which has produced an abundance of food and fiber never before seen in the world—where one farmworker feeds and clothes 27 people.

This has happened in the United States of America—the richest Nation in the world.

The sound and the fury over the management and use of agricultural abundance has too often obscured the plight of people and the plight of communities. Concern has centered on commodities—instead of communities. And to solve the problem of abundance, it even has been seriously proposed that people deliberately and systematically be moved off the farm—that the present rate of movement be speeded up.

We don't hold with the idea of depopulating rural America through administered out-migration. Change, inexorable though it is, can be shaped to work for people—not against them. This means that we must have a two-pronged attack on the problems of agriculture. We must manage our abundant productivity in order that the really efficient family farm can produce a decent income; and, for those now living on farms that are not or cannot operate efficiently, we must offer opportunities to raise their levels of living by means of both agricultural and nonagricultural pursuits, or some combination of the two, as far as practicable in their own communities where they prefer to live.

It is utterly inconceivable to me to think that in the American society there is a lack of resources, a lack of ingenuity, or a shortage of determination to revitalize rural America. We are here today to see how we can work together toward that goal.

What basic resources do we have with which to strengthen rural America?

First, we have tremendous human resources. You and thousands of others are serving in hundreds of local, State, and regional planning and action institutions or committees—both public and private. With determination, the people of this Nation can make of rural America what it should be.

Second, we have abundant natural resources in our land, water, forests, and wildlife. Nearly three-fourths of all land in the 46 contiguous States is in private ownership. More than three-fifths of all land in the 50 States is privately owned. Here is the source of our abundance of food and fiber, and 69 percent of our commercial forests. Privately owned land, together with the national forests and other public land, is the great gathering place and reservoir of most of the fresh water for farm, city, industry, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

Eighty percent of the game taken by hunting is produced on privately owned land. Eighty-five percent of the wildlife habitat economically feasible of improvement is privately owned.

Here, near the crowded cities, is space for outdoor recreation, and the water, fish game, wild creatures, and woodlands to make outdoor recreation truly meaningful to urban people.

Here, in agriculture, are assets of $207 billion, producing commodities selling for around $35 billion. Farmland alone is valued at more than $109 billion—a living, renewable resource that feeds, clothes, shelters, and possesses intangible values no man can measure.

Third, we have made a good beginning in the development of programs to enable people to conserve, use, and develop the land and water resources—a whole galaxy of action programs authorized by the Congress, by the States, and by local government. In an all-out effort to improve and strengthen these programs, the USDA is now emphasizing rural area development. We have reorganized the Department to place key action agencies under a new Assistant Secretary. We are developing new tools and seeking new legislation for a more effective program to strengthen rural America.

One great step forward lies in the coordination of many related activities toward one broad goal. Rural areas development is a blending of all available programs for a broad-gage, long-range simultaneous attack on all the problems of rural America.

Credit problems are not being attacked separately from those of conservation.

Conservation is not being sought separately from the efforts to bring production into balance with consumption and increase farm income through fair prices for farm products.

Industrial development is not being sought separately from solution of the problems of adequate training and education, water supply, sewage disposal, electrification, hospitals, libraries, and other necessary public facilities.

Help for the development of outdoor recreation on the farm and in the forest takes into account the need for credit and technical assistance, and the needs of both rural and urban people.

The time is past when each program goes its separate way. The time is here when local people can use as one, the tools of credit, research, technical aid, electrification, educational services, marketing, and assistance in cooperative efforts.

The time is past when land can be idled. Last year, American farmers produced abundantly and they did this while growing crops on about two-thirds of the Nation's cropland. This means a potential for overproduction that hasn't even been tapped. Unless effective programs are devised to prevent it, at least 38 million acres will return to crop production within the next 5 years—acres that have been diverted under Government programs. Rural America—all America—needs this land in economic use, but not for crops. It can be put to paying use—for the production of grass, trees, and outdoor recreation.

The time is past when America can afford a single use for any acre. Instead, that acre can be put to multiple use, just as the national forests are producing timber, water supply, forage, wildlife and recreation—all at the same time.

And the time is past when it's even valid to ask, "Can rural America be revitalized?"

Rural America is being revitalized now.

It's happening in Kentucky's Mud River watershed.

There we have an outstanding example of local people—rural and urban—working together. They have teamed up with their government—local, State, and Federal—to solve the problems of flood, water supply, soil erosion, poor land use, underemployment, and lack of recreation.

This small watershed project is sponsored by soil conservation districts in Butler, Logan, Muhlenberg, and Todd Counties, by the Mud River Watershed Conservation District, and by the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources.

Many of the 25 dams being built with help from the Department of Agriculture for flood prevention also are serving many other important purposes.

One multipurpose structure provides wildlife conservation and recreation as well as flood prevention. The lake it created covers more than 800 acres. The Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources will manage it for recreational purposes. Some 50 cabins already have been built around the lake. A sportsman group has built a clubhouse there. Landowners are selling cabin sites for $500 to $1,500 on land formerly of very low value.

Seven other flood prevention structures have been completed and stocked with fish to provide additional recreational opportunity.

Another multiple-purpose structure, now being built will supply water to the city of Lewisburg. It is estimated that the additional water supply ultimately will mean 150 more new jobs in the city. Lewisburg recently obtained from the Area Redevelopment Administration, in the Department of Commerce, a grant of $144,000 and a public facility loan of $130,000 to help finance the water system that will distribute water stored behind the multiple-purpose watershed dam.

More than 60 percent of the landowners in the watershed are cooperating with their soil conservation districts in applying land treatment measures. They are receiving technical and conservation cost-sharing help from the Department of Agriculture. To protect young and old forests, the Kentucky Division of Forestry has built a forest fire tower and organized a volunteer firefighting organization.

Kentucky's Mud River watershed project is not an isolated case. It is 1 of 403 small watershed projects operating throughout the country—1 of 791 projects which have been authorized for help with planning—1 of more than 1,739 watersheds covering 123 million acres for which projects have been requested.

The watershed project is just one type of community or area development work being done today, with thousands of local people directly involved in seeking common objectives.

Nearly 50,000 rural and smalltown people are members of 1,500 rural areas development committees. These committees already have prepared 2,700 development project proposals, and have initiated 900 of them. These 900 operating projects have created

new employment for more than 12,000 rural people. And when plans for the other 1,800 projects are carried out, an estimated 25,000 new jobs will have been created in rural America.

Rural housing reflects new hope and new confidence in more and more rural communities. There is no better place to see—and to feel—the upswing in the countryside than with the family in a new rural home. Like many another rural homemaker, an Iowa farm wife has said of the family's new home: "It is something we have hoped for, for many years. Sometimes I think I may wake up at midnight and find our family back in the old house."

Time and again we have seen fears disappear and confidence reappear as the Department has helped rural families to finance 6,200 new homes since the Housing Act of 1961 was passed. The effect also is electrifying on the community. The building of a new home is proof that someone has confidence in the community's future as a good place to live, to work, and to bring up a family.

The effect goes far beyond the community. Rural construction creates jobs and extra buying power for carpenters, electricians, bricklayers, and others. It provides an additional market for building materials and appliances—a market that helps to buoy the urban economy.

This is extremely important, for we are an interdependent people—rural, suburban, and urban. Revitalization of the countryside will be speeded by a strong and vigorously growing urban economy with the means to buy the goods and services, including outdoor recreation, produced in rural areas.

Rural areas development also recognizes the interdependence of regions of the United States. Each with its complex of open country, peopled by farm and nonfarm residents, its shifting boundaries of urban, suburban, and rural areas, and its varied resources, is an integral part of the whole.

Yet, each region differs from all the others. There are measurable differences in climate, resources, size of farm, crops and livestock produced, income, density of population, public facilities and services, nearness to markets, degree of industrial development, and in the impact of change. Each region, and in most cases each subregion or area, has problems and resources peculiar to it.

This conference was arranged to give you full opportunity to review with each other, and with us, the problems of this region and the resources—both human and physical or material—for solving these problems. Your evaluation of rural changes in this region is needed. Your ideas for stimulating and expanding economic growth are wanted.

I urge each of you to participate in one of the four discussion groups. We are eager to have your answers to the questions to be propounded at these group sessions:

First, how can family farms be strengthened for rural development?

Second, how can new uses and conservation of land and water expand income, employment, and better living in rural communities?

Third, how can planning and implementation of economic development for county or rural areas be accomplished?

And, fourth, how important is rural-urban community planning?

In these group discussions and during the questioning period tomorrow, you have an opportunity to be heard on matters of vital concern to rural development and conservation in your region.

We are here to listen and to learn. We want your suggestions for improving the Department's services to make them more effective development tools in your hands.

To make the services of the Department more effective, I have reorganized it to place under one leader—the Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation—the Farmer Cooperative Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Forest Service, the Office of Rural Areas Development, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. This is a grouping—a packaging—of important development and conservation services to enable the Department to help you more effectively.

The Department may soon have additional authority to work with you in long-range programs for putting the land we don't need for crops into new and profitable uses—for timber, for grassland farming, and for outdoor recreation, including water-based recreation in small watershed projects. These new authorities pave the way for greater cooperation of urban and rural people, and of farmers and sportsmen.

With these new tools, the Department can assist you and your local organizations in planning and carrying out rural renewal projects, resource conservation and development projects, watershed recreation projects, projects for expanding grasslands and family forests, and for the development of outdoor recreation facilities on farmland.

The Department looks to local people to initiate, to plan, and to carry out these projects in cooperation with local and State agencies, just as it does in its long-established conservation and development programs for privately owned land.

The Department will enlist the help of farmer-elected committees and the advisory committees on credit and education. The Department will build upon the soundly conceived and technically aided experience of the Nation's 2,900 soil conservation districts, and upon proven methods of sharing conservation costs and providing credit. We will rely upon proven methods of education in cooperation with the land-grant colleges and universities. We will draw on our successful multiple-use experience in the national forests. Research will seek out improved methods and test them. The Department also will continue to work closely with other Federal departments and agencies, for the whole concept of rural areas development is a joining of forces—a joining of resources—for revitalizing all of rural America.

But the ultimate success of rural areas development is—and must be—the responsibility of local people. The impetus and the drive must come from them.

The Federal Government can provide incentives and technical services, but Government cannot and should not do the job for local people. Government cannot and should not control all the land-use activities of its citizens.

Local people—those who live on the land and use it—must make rural development and conservation their own business and carry out their own programs. The Government has programs and resources that will help them. But any community—any area—that waits for Government to pull it out of the problems caused by change and shifting economic and social patterns will be submerged.

The challenge, then, is to the leadership of the people of this great countryside of ours. Countless thousands of people, living up to the tradition born in rural America of local effort to meet local problems, have already accepted the challenge. They have sound experience and notable achievements to back them in this effort. Local leadership in farmer committees, in REA's, in soil and water conservation districts, in rural area development committees, as well as in scores of organizations in our towns and villages, has demonstrated its worth. A united and coordinated effort of all these forces will insure the future of rural America.

I should like to conclude by pointing out that our program for strengthening rural America is an integral part of our program for food and agriculture in the 1960's. The sound and fury over controversial supply management features of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 obscured the great advances authorized in the act for conservation and development—advances that drew quiet but strong support from conservation leaders in all fields and at all levels, rural and urban. But the goal of strengthening the income of the famiy farm, by means of adjusting production to amounts that can be used, is inseparable from the goal of strengthening rural America.

We seek increased efficiency on our farms, and we would further this goal by helping farmers to acquire and operate more efficient farming units; but along with this we seek farm programs that will enable the farmer, as well as the consumer, to benefit from this increased efficiency.

We seek, therefore, to manage our abundant productivity, not by idling land, but by putting it to use to provide services such as recreation that are in increasingly scarce supply.

We repudiate the CED proposals to use poverty as a weapon to accelerate the migration from our farms, and to replace a surplus of wheat and corn with a surplus of men and women.

Instead, we can provide, in rural America—

A land of prosperous farms and thriving towns, where people may choose to earn a living, not only by producing food and fiber, but also from among a number of attractive alternatives that result from building new enterprises and creating new opportunities.

Opportunities for combining part-time employment with part-time agriculture to help to provide a good life for those many Americans who prefer to live in nonmetropolitan areas.

Decent housing and adequate living for the millions of senior citizens who live in greater proportions in our rural areas than in our cities.

Communities that can provide health, education, and other public services equal to the best that we know how to provide.

Resources of outdoor recreation of all kinds and in sufficient supply to meet the needs of our growing urban population.

The conservation of our soil and water resources to meet the needs of future generations.

This kind of rural America will add to the economic strength of the Nation, and will continue to make invaluable spiritual and social contributions to our national life. We can have this kind of rural America if we work together to preserve the real values of our heritage as we use the new science and technology to meet changing human needs.

Rural-Urban Interdependence in This Region

(Address of Fred V. Heinkel, president, Missouri Farmers Association, USDA Regional Land and People Conference, St. Louis, Mo., Sept. 17, 1962)

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Freeman, it is indeed an honor to have been invited to attend this unique conference. The title, "Land and People," denotes that it is signally important and a history-making event.

"Rural-Urban Interdependence in This Region," the subject assigned to me, is a fascinating one.

The Pilgrims who survived that first terrible winter of hunger, cold, and hardship following their landing at Plymouth Rock, of necessity, became farmers. They raised crops, harvested these crops, and then set aside a day of thanksgiving in the autumn of 1621. From then until now agriculture's importance has continually increased. Its importance will continue to increase daily.

Each day there are 8,000 new citizens to be fed. This is the equivalent of adding to our population a city like St. Louis each 100

days, or St. Louis and the urban fringe every 200 days. It equals the total population of the State of Iowa once a year, and amounts to a city like Chicago every 16 months.

Surely this emphasizes the growing importance of rural America in its role as the supplier of food and fiber. Likewise, rural-urban interdependence becomes greater. More emphasis needs to be placed on this fact.

It is the responsibility of farmers, as part of the rural-urban interdependence, to produce and to market their products in quantities adequate to meet the needs of the consuming public. This they have done, with a most outstanding record.

It is the job of labor and industry to manufacture the production supplies needed by farmers. Farmers purchased more than $27 billion worth of production supply items last year. Farm homes are among the most substantial customers of American industry, American labor, and of American retail business. These family farms provide some of our greatest markets for petroleum products, steel, fertilizer, agricultural chemicals and a multitude of other products. They maintain the rural towns and cities of America. These in turn provide support for the larger cities. Loss of income and buying power on the farms is reflected in loss of business in the towns and cities. It is not necessary to belabor the point that 100 family farms are better customers than 10 factory-type units on the same land.

America grew great because it had a great rural economy to back it up.

Many nations of the earth struggle with poverty, chaos and revolution because they have treated agriculture as an outcast. And of course they are short of food.

It is in the best interests of the public to establish programs which will assist farmers to do their job effectively and efficiently. Here in America we have taken many actions in an effort to treat agriculture as a partner.

Our Government, "of the people, by the people, for the people," recognized its vital stake in the land and in its development and potential. The public, through Government set up numerous programs with respect to the land; enacted a homestead act, for example, to encourage individuals to claim and clear the land and make it produce; established and subsidized land-grant colleges and experiment stations to provide information and aid to farmers in order that they might produce more and do it more efficiently.

Since the turn of the century the public, by law, created the Agricultural Extension Service; the Farm Credit Administration with its land banks; the Farmers Home Administration; the Soil Conservation Service to specialize in the conservation of the land; and then the Rural Electrification Administration to bring the blessings of electricity to those who dwell upon the land. Most every farm in America today has electric power; and this has benefited the urban people too, because they have furnished the electrical supplies, equipment, and appliances.

During the last 100 years, almost $6 billion has been spent on agricultural research, according to a recent USDA study. This investment has paid off in an amazing manner. This study estimated that if farmers today used 1940 methods it would cost consumers $13 billion more each year for food and fiber. That's an annual return of more than 200 percent on the public's investment. Again the farmers have put to use programs set up by Government, and all the people benefit.

Say what you like, you can't escape the fact that the public is interested in the land.

So, to be practical about it, we farmers must accept this fact, and welcome this interest when it is sincere.

The fact is that our American farming system and its accomplishments are the envy of the world, not in spite of (as some infer), but because of the public's interest in agriculture.

Times are changing. America is changing. Agriculture is changing. Our methods of production and our patterns of marketing can be expected to change. We make use of tools and techniques which we never thought of a few decades ago.

Isn't it logical then to assume that we can also benefit from refinements and improvements in, and even completely new farm programs?

What does all this have to do with rural-urban interdependence?

It simply means that rural America needs to be treated as a full partner—not only in research and production, but with respect to income—if it is to continue as a substantial market for the products of labor and industry.

In a documentary presented by the National Broadcasting Co. entitled "The Land," Chet Huntley pointed out in his narration that the 47 percent of farmers who account for 92 percent of production earn only 80 cents an hour. These are the modern, efficient, commercial farmers who feed and clothe more than 180 million people from the land that supported only 1 million Indians when Columbus discovered America.

We have farm programs for tobacco, sugar, and specialty crops that have proved satisfactory to both producers and consumers. Therefore, it is obvious that Congress should, through enabling legislation, make similar programs available to producers and growers of other crops and products, the privilege of adoption or rejection being left to the farmer in referendum.

While these programs vary, the key to their success is supply management and the right of producers to approve or disapprove the program.

We adopted long ago a public policy through law of regulating crude oil production. The law determines the number of days per month oil wells can be operated, thereby conserving crude oil reserves until such time as they will be needed. This program has resulted in orderly production of crude oil and in establishment of stable prices. Oil is essential in our economy, but not more essential than food and fiber.

A few complain that quotas on sugarbeet production prevent those not now producing from getting into the business. It should be pointed out, however, that were it not for the success of the industry resulting from quotas and supply management no one not now producing would want to get into the business.

And, incidentally, it is worthy of note that the tobacco program with a 90-percent price-support program and strict acreage allotments has cost the Government and the taxpayers nothing, but has made the tobacco growers millions. It has also made them and their families good customers of the retail merchants.

All this is pertinent to the subject of rural-urban interdependence because farmers don't buy and pay for the products of labor and industry with pounds, bushels, and tons—but with dollars. And unlimited production does not provide the most dollars.

We have discussed the problem of the 47 percent of our farmers who account for 92 percent of production; what about the other 53 percent? This is evidently the group, plus a few more, that Dr. Leon Keyserling, an eminent economist, refers to when he says that 68 percent of farmers and farm managers have an inadequate income. This is in contrast to the only 31 percent of all families (both farm and nonfarm) whose incomes are inadequate.

We need to do those things necessary to provide additional off-the-farm employment, within daily driving distance of the farm home, in order that these farmers and their families may continue to reside in the environment in which they were reared and to which they are best suited. They will then continue to provide substantial support for the schools, churches, and retail businesses of their community.

This will make it unnecessary for the farmer and his family to move to the city in search of a job that may not exist or is now filled by someone who needs to keep it. If he moves to the city and cannot find a job, then he joins the ranks of the unemployed and he and his family become a social problem.

In this area of rural-urban interdependence there appears to be a problem in the cities of what to do with leisure time resulting from automation and shorter hours. This seems to pose a need for more recreational facilities, for hunting, fishing, boating, and picnicking.

It would seem logical that farmers could provide, on a private enterprise-for-profit basis, a lot of recreational facilities for the use and enjoyment of city people. This is an area in which lie many opportunities for both rural and urban people.

Is there land available? Yes. We now feed 180 million people from 40 million fewer acres than in the early 1900's. And we may add that it is estimated that our population will be 240 million by 1980 and that we will need 50 million fewer acres than were used last year. These facts serve to emphasize the need for fewer acres in production of food and fiber and for increased need of land for recreation.

Are we alert to these opportunities to strengthen rural-urban interdependence? Yes, we are. Again, the public, acting through Government, has created the program known as rural area development, commonly referred to as RAD.

The Farmers Home Administration, land-grant colleges, ASCS, Soil Conservation Service, and many individuals are working diligently to develop this total RAD program of greater off-the-farm employment and development of privately owned recreational facilities.

This RAD program holds much promise for helping both rural and urban people. It should also improve farm-city relations, reinforce our form of government, and strengthen our way of life.

REMARKS BY EDWIN CHRISTIANSON, PRESIDENT, MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION, AT REGIONAL LAND AND PEOPLE CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 17, 1962

This morning, I think, the speakers laid a good groundwork for this conference when they outlined the nature of the changes taking place, the impact of these changes upon our rural society, and some guidelines for living in these fast-changing times.

It is important that we have a constructive attitude toward change—we cannot blindly oppose change, for change is the rule of life. Yet, we cannot stand helpless in the face of change. We do not oppose efficiency or new technology—new technology is not the problem, it merely magnifies the old problem of lack of economic organization in agriculture.

The remedy is not to oppose efficiency, but to guide it in ways which will benefit agriculture and the national economy.

We do not accept poverty as a natural condition for an efficient and productive agriculture. We take the attitude that we welcome change and we welcome progress, but it must be guided in constructive channels which will make it possible for agriculture to make its maximum contribution to the gross national product and to national strength.

Our assignment on this panel this afternoon is to move on from the foundation set this morning and study how we can stimulate economic growth in the rural areas.

Our panelists, I know, will touch upon some of the tools which are vital to economic growth—community and regional planning, credit, resource conservation and development, and low-cost power.

Before getting into these specifics, it would be important to recognize that stimulating economic growth in rural America is a twofold problem. First, it is a matter of strengthening the basic industries which we have and, second, it is a matter of pioneering new industries and new development.

Few people realize the high cost of low farm prices. In a typical farming country in my State, full parity prices would mean $5 million more each year in income and purchasing power for agriculture.

Every community has a chamber of commerce or business development group exploring every avenue for attracting new industry and new payroll. It is understandable that such groups are overjoyed when they can persuade a new plant employing 50 or 100 workers to locate in their community.

Yet to restore full parity prices on all farm products in that county would mean more than $5 million in added purchasing power and be the equivalent of new plants employing 1,000 workers.

So, we ought to proceed on the basis that the most fundamental and far-reaching step that can be taken is to restore farm parity income and that this will determine the effectiveness of other measures which we might take for economic development of rural America.

Rural development, industrialization of rural areas and development of recreation and other new land uses should not be thought of as substitutes, but as supplements to the agricultural industry. In fact, the other efforts are foredoomed to ineffectiveness if agriculture is left in a depressed state.

The total economic strength of the United States is the sum of the economic strength of our individual communities and States. America is a series of communities, rural and urban, stretching from coast to coast and the Nation can be truly strong only if we have economic strength all along the line.

We deceive ourselves seriously if we think we can allow basic industries like agriculture to remain in a depressed condition and still think we can have the needed national economic growth.

It is clear that in the past several years, the national economy has suffered to the extent that farm prices have been below parity.

The Nation suffers an economic deficit to the extent that these raw materials go to market at less than parity prices—and this deficit affects not only farmers, but the industry, the business and the employment of the community as well.

Surveys in our area, made on a farm-to-farm basis, have revealed that there is a backlog or nea- to $5,000 per farm in repairs, new equipment or in modernization of facilities, which has had to be shelved because of lack of purchasing power.

All that is needed to turn loose this pent-up economic demand is an improvement in farm purchasing power.

Some people reach the conclusion that because the farm programs have not been entirely successful, they are inherently unworkable and ought to be eliminated.

The trouble with the farm programs has been, not that they are basically unworkable, but that there has not been an adequate set of tools available to cope with the problems.

Too much of the time in the past several years, the emphasis has been placed upon fringe programs. Naturally, if a program deals with only the secondary phases of the farm problem, it is not likely to be successful in bringing about a cure of the principal problem, that of low farm prices and income. Neither can we expect really significant results from each dollar spent in the farm programs as long as indirect approaches are used.

Our observation has been that the programs which have taken a direct approach, such as the direct payment programs, have been the most successful and effective, both from the viewpoint of the farmer and of society.

We are encouraged that the principle of direct payments, which has worked so well on sugar and wool in this country and so well in Canada and other countries on other commodities, is receiving more consideration now for other commodities.

It is significant that direct payments, on a limited basis, will be a part of the wheat and feed grains support programs for 1963.

The direct payment support system is one with which all interests in the economy could live—as it would assure an increase in net farm income and purchasing power and provide a climate in which our new efforts in community development would have a chance to be fruitful.

One does not have to go back so many years to recall the contradictory situation which prevailed when the first rural development program was launched.

There was nothing wrong with the pioneer effort in rural development except that it was more than nullified by the reduction of farm prices.

For every low income farmer who was rescued by the early rural development program, 100 new low income farmers were created by the slashing of farm prices.

As we look to the future, it is well to remember that farm policies and rural development policies must both work together toward strengthening the rural economy.

In fact, the evidence is very compelling that agricultural prosperity is essential as a basis for holding and expanding industry.

While it is not necessary that all industry brought into rural areas needs to be related to agriculture, as a matter of practical reality, the best chance to locate industry in the countryside seems to be with plants processing and handling farm commodities.

Some concrete examples can be cited of how strengthening the situation of the producers of a farm commodity has helped retain and strengthen the domestic processing industry using that commodity.

In the case of the sugar industry, undoubtedly the refining industry would have gone overseas to the source of cheap raw materials there, if no effort had been made to retain a domestic beet and sugarcane production operation.

The Sugar Act, adopted first in 1934 and renewed at intervals of several years since that time, has kept the farm production end of the sugar industry on a sound basis.

Instead of diminishing in importance the sugar refining industry has been expanding its plants and facilities—today it provides some 53 million man-hours of employment and an annual payroll of $120 million.

Similarly, the wool milling industry enjoys larger production volume and employment because the Federal wool support programs have enabled domestic producers to continue in production.

What these examples indicate to us is that we are all enter-dependent in our rural communities and that the things which strengthen agriculture are the same things which will foster our ability to diversify and develop new industries and activities.

In looking at the balance sheet of our communities, there are many things which make for a good community.

Some of the actions which will make for better communities can be approached at the local level, some at the State level, some at the national level, but regardless of where the initial push comes from, the eventual and long-term success of a program will depend upon community initiative.

Certainly, there are many fields in which Federal initiative and the broadness of the Federal tax base were needed to get the ball rolling, but few programs have ever been of much value without local initiative to go along with the Federal initiative.

The REA program for example floundered around for a whole year before the key to local initiative was found in the form of farmer-owned distribution co-ops. And from the moment when the local initiative and the Federal initiative were hitched together, the program moved forward rapidly.

In the same way, the Federal Government provided the spark to get the engines going in soil conservation, vocational education, and other fields.

For this reason, I am convinced we have the right key today in our discussions in seeking to develop the local nucleus for planning community economic growth.

If we mobilize our communities for economic growth, I do not think there is any limit to the progress we can make in any field—in community purchasing power, jobs and employment, new industries, recreational development, better housing, community facilities and educational opportunity.

As we proceed here this afternoon on this panel, I am sure that our resources and our opportunities, once we have marshaled them, will far outbalance the problems which sometimes loom so difficult.

THE USE AND NEED OF FARMLANDS IN WILDLIFE AND FORESTRY PRODUCTION FOR PEOPLE

(By Dan Saults, assistant director, Missouri Conservation Commission)

There is no such thing as conservation by subject matter. Game management, timber production, crop growing, erosion control, or water pollution are only ideas for management of what we call resources. Ideas are devised by people and are ephemeral, subject to error; soil, air, and water are as close to eternal as we are likely ever to come on earth. Let us not make sacred icons out of our forefathers' assumptions about land use and economic growth.

This pretentious pontification is my way of arguing that there isn't any base for our economy except physical resources, and that we can't really define any other resource except the physical variety. Man is as much a part of nature as deer, wheat, or oaks, but we're biased in favor of men. I am one of this species of mammal, incidentally here as spokesman for a State department charged with management of wildlife and forestry in the political map myth known as Missouri.

We know how to manage wildlife by natural reproduction, how to have more fish in lakes or streams, and more quail and rabbits per farm; we have demonstrated to our own satisfaction how timber quality and quantity can be improved. But we don't know how to get this knowledge applied under the socio-economic motivations of human behavior current in this particular area at this particular time.

Further, we know (though less provably) that mankind has a conscious and subconscious need for soil, air, and water beyond that required for his food.

On the first Sunday in September I was in Forest Park, near this hotel, watching many thousands of people simply sitting upon grass, leaning against trees, drinking beer beneath shading leaves. On Labor Day I was in 25,000-acre Lake Ozark State Park, 150 miles from St. Louis, watching much the same sort of people in a huge but crowded campground doing just about the same thing. Five days later I saw 600 people fishing for trout in 1 day on a mile of water at Bennett Spring. And last April, I sat alone in a deadfall on Clark National Forest, 20 miles from the nearest town and 3 miles

from the nearest road, waiting fruitlessly for a wild turkey.

There is a single common denominator linking the many thousands sitting in Forest Park, the few thousands camping on the lake, the several hundreds angling on the trout stream, and the lone would-be gunner in the forest. That denominator is mankind's primal need to touch the source of existence, as best he may and where he can. Man cannot live without his roots somewhere touching soil.

Stripped of herbal foliage, the tree of my argument is that man, like all other life, needs soil, air and water—but under our present system he isn't getting much of it. For despite the rural traditions to which we cling so frantically, the United States is today an urban nation for the great proportion of its people, and it is certainly true of most States represented here today. This is neither good nor bad in a moral sense; it is just a sociological "fact." Highways have become extensions of the city's main street; corporations are seeking dividends rather than corn from large agricultural factories; we are even finding, at least in Missouri, a pronounced trend toward urban ownership of Ozark timberlands. And more than 50 percent of our population live in less than one-fiftieth of our area.

The urbanization of rural areas, and the capitalization of farm lands has destroyed wildlife habitat. And the destruction of habitat, whether by bulldozer, plow, ax, fire or herbicide, has destroyed the production of quail, rabbits, squirrels and other species that have provided a traditional recreation, a return to primal sources of man's beginnings.

How shall wildlife managers appeal to the ecological conscience of a corporation? And how shall a farmer be motivated to spend time, money, and land in providing habitat that will produce upland game but not cash? Can landowners be persuaded to invest labor and years in a woodlot even if seedlings are provided at cost, solely because trees are an essential part of land esthetics and squirrel nesting? Will forest deedholders fight fires and provide timber stand improvement solely to protect the watershed of a hillstream and the bass in that stream?

However, the situation here, and I am sure wildlife departments in other States would agree, is not bad in terms of incidental game production. Possibly our really immediate problem is lack of habitat for hunters. The gunner has no place to stand, few farms where he and his dog are welcome—or tolerated. In the generation that produced me, most city dwellers still had a tie to farmland; Grandpa, or Cousin Ed were working the soil and keeping the family bonds tied. But now Grandpa is dead, Ed's with General Motors, and the dweller at 42d and Broadway eats Thanksgiving Dinner at Schwartz Irish Bistro instead of the Old Homestead. Most urbanites of 1962 have lost personal contact with the steadily diminishing farmers. And these farmers, quite understandably, are reluctant to play host to numbers of unknown gun-bearing guests.

Yet, to use a local example, the number of deer hunters in Missouri jumped from 14,000 in 1948 to almost 100,000 last year but we heard far fewer complaints about "no place to hunt" than we did from 70,000 quail hunters.

We think there are two conclusions which most clearly explain why 100,000 riflemen can find hunting space while 70,000 shotgunners can't. First, we have nearly 2 million acres of Federal and State forest land to which we have conditioned deer hunters; many of them are not only prepared but eager to drive two hundred miles into relatively unsettled country.

Second, and may I stress this point, many of our farmers welcome deer hunters because the landowner makes money by providing food, lodging and deer stands. In Wyoming last week I met a rancher who had made $20,000 last year as an outfitter.

Also the small-game gunner is following the tradition of his father and grandfather: he wants to hunt close to home; he has little interest in forest lands, though cooperative range management by foresters and biologists has greatly increased game; and he does not want to pay for trespass rights.

There are rabbit hunters in St. Louis who arise in winter darkness, drive 200 miles across the State, hunt 3 hours and then drive home in night's darkness.

A great many fishermen drive from St. Louis to Lake Table Rock—more than 600 miles round trip—over a weekend. And 36,000 St. Louisians fished on Busch Wildlife Area, 40 miles from here, this summer in 28 small lakes totaling 244 acres. This is about 150 people per acre, on waters restocked only by natural reproduction.

Yet there are 138,500 farm ponds in Missouri that meet Extension Service requirements of construction, and my department has stocked over 55,000 of these in the last few years for which I checked figures. Farm ponds provide excellent fishing—but most of those we investigate contain fish that are stunted for lack of enough harvesting.

A fortnight ago, Director Tom Kimball of the National Wildlife Federation told the Soil Conservation Society of America—that the future of hunting in America would be decided by private landowners, and that farmers are now passing up opportunities to supplement their incomes. Secretary Freeman has said that less and less land is needed for feeding our people because of our revolution in agricultural techniques. The September issue of the American Rifleman carried an analytical article on hunting by C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, which discussed at length the history of hunting, made the same points on tradition that I have, and said "the major problem of the future will be space in which to hunt, not a shortage of game."

A partial answer has been devised by operators of commercial shooting areas, where on small acreage large numbers of hatchery-reared pheasants, quail and chukar are released just ahead of the gun, usually at high cost to hunters and low profit to operators. I've no quarrel with "game farms"; they serve a real purpose for those who have little time and some cash, who want to know where hatchery birds are and how to get directly to them. But this will never supply hunting for a mass public.

A partial answer has been devised by State and Federal agencies on publicly owned lands and waters; this has worked fairly well for fishermen although large impoundments are costly and usually distant from population masses. But publicly owned hunting lands are vastly more expensive than water in terms of usage per acre and in distance from masses, quite apart from the small-game tradition of hunting near home.

The real answer to the mass problem of outdoor recreation—not just hunting and fishing—cannot be provided by Government agencies, not even if the moon is made into a national park.

Most Americans will visit their primal sources, land and air and water, grass and trees and living earth, only if we can devise within our society a truly multiple-use philosophy. The specialist in corn and the specialist in quail, the timber technician and the wheat expert, the fisheries biologist and the livestock authority, all are important men in our society; but somewhere, somehow, there must be a synthesis, an overall view, a recognition that all of this activity must be aimed at providing human happiness and well-being, that specialization is not an end in itself. This, I think, is Government's major role.

Many people want and need space; a relatively few people in our society own space. In its simplest terms, our complicated problem here is to get them together, on a basis that will benefit both.

RIGHT OF IMMEDIATE TRIAL IN CRIMINAL CASES

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, during the past 6 weeks I have received some correspondence and have noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some statements with regard to the delay occasioned in at least one criminal case that has been docketed for trial by the Department of Justice. I ask unanimous consent that the facts related in the following excerpts from correspondence I have received be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

On August 20, the Tampa newspaper headline read as follows: "Government Wins Delay in Hoffa Case." This delay resulted from the Government's opposition to the defendant's petition demanding to be tried on October 1 in Tampa.

Even more shocking is the fact that the Government sought this delay because it preferred to proceed with the case in Nashville although the indictment, in Tampa, Fla., was returned a year before the Nashville indictment.

Obviously, the Government feels it has a better chance of sending Hoffa to jail in the Nashville case.

I have been greatly concerned with the Government's policy of forum shopping, in this or any other case. The Government has transported thousands of documents into Nashville, Tenn., and then proceeds to justify jurisdiction of the Nashville court on this basis.

It would appear that in the interest of fairness, the records should have remained where the business is located, where the defendant resides, where almost all of the witnesses reside, and where most of the alleged overt acts occurred.

In fact, the Government has been able to produce only three highly technical acts to justify trying the case in Nashville. According to the indictment, the only acts that took place in the middle district of Tennessee were:

Filing of the charter in 1949.

Amendment to the charter in 1953.

Filing of an excise tax return.

These acts which are purely legalistic and are performed not only all over the country for corporations which are incorporated in States other than that in which they do business, i.e., Delaware, etc., but all over the world, have never been considered as anything more than purely formal legal jurisdictional matters.

On the other hand, we find that all of the substantive acts occurred or exist in Detroit, Mich.

As far back as the Magna Carta, Anglo-Saxon justice required that the defendant must be tried in the vicinity where the alleged offense was committed. This was a basic protection against the despot dragging the defendant for trial from the scene of an alleged crime, where he could be judged by members of the community, to a hostile or unfriendly jurisdiction.

Our forebearers fought the American Revolution against such tactics by the British crown. For this reason, we have article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides that criminal trials "shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed," a safeguard reinforced by the

command of the sixth amendment that the criminal trial shall be before an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.

In construing these provisions, the Supreme Court has said (*Travis* v. *U.S.*, 364 U.S. 631):

"The venue provisions in acts of Congress should not be so freely construed as to give the Government the choice of a tribunal favorable to it."

Why then has the Government so flagrantly disregarded Hoffa's constitutional rights?

Why is it playing free and loose with basic principles of fairness, and equity so thoroughly engraved in our system of jurisprudence since the days of Magna Carta?

Why is it overreaching and tampering with the schedules of cases—an exclusive function of the courts, under our system of separation of powers—in order to try the case in Nashville now?

The answer is quite obvious—Nashville, Tenn., is dominated by a newspaper—the publisher of which is a former aid of the Attorney General. The newspaper has saturated the Nashville, Tenn., area with an anti-Hoffa bias.

Nashville, Tenn., is one of the major right-to-work centers of a right-to-work State. The likelihood of finding a jury free of an antilabor bias, let alone anti-Hoffa bias, is remote indeed.

Is it proper for the prosecutor to shop around for a court in which the chances of a fair trial are minimal?

In fact, the courts have suggested that a defendant may not be tried where the hostility of the community has been engendered by the Government's acts.

The prosecutor has a responsibility in the interest of a fair and impartial trial, to lean over backward in securing the defendant's rights.

Mr. HICKEY. As a former U.S. attorney dedicated to the proposition that the right of speedy trial by jury was one of the basic guarantees assured to all accused, wherein their right to trial by jury and their right to be confronted with witnesses and secure testimony has been one of the most important aspects of our judicial procedure, I have been disturbed to learn that in at least one instance by virtue of application made by the Department of Justice a trial has been postponed and removed from the docket in spite of the fact that the accused and his counsel have diligently pursued their efforts to obtain an immediate trial. The evidence presented to me indicates an order which removed a cause from the docket and without the consent of the accused was not reset for immediate trial but still awaits a setting.

The administration of justice in this fashion does more to shake the confidence of people in the courts and destroy the efficient administration which all interested members of the bar and the bench are dedicated to than any other matter. I would, therefore, suggest that the Judiciary Committee examine the facts of those cases that have been delayed on the criminal dockets, and particularly the one referred to in this statement.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I wish at this time to make known my strong hopes that a salary increase measure for Federal service employees including postal workers is acted upon during this session.

No one can doubt that our Federal employees have found it increasingly difficult to meet the increased costs of living in a manner comparable with their counterparts in private life.

We have all encountered in public life the diligence and dedication common to those who have devoted their lives to public service and well known is the realization that this dedication and spirit of public service transcends the material rewards expected and gained.

However, Mr. President, this selflessness of these persons which benefits the entire Nation should be recognized, not penalized. For as the President stated in his message to the Congress relative to salary increases for Federal service employees, the success of this Government, and thus the success of our Nation, depend in the last analysis upon the quality of our career services.

REVIEW OF SMALL WATERSHED PROGRAM IN MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, several weeks ago, at my request, representatives of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture participated in a series of meetings to review the small watershed program in Michigan. Mr. Russell Hill, executive secretary, State soil conservation committee, and Michigan State University extension specialist, provided leadership in assembling an outstanding group representing various State organizations in this series of meetings.

Ever since I was privileged to serve with the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, the problem of utilizing the small watershed program to its fullest potential in the Midwest and the East has been of special interest to me. Serving on the Small Watershed Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has given me the opportunity to see how this program in many parts of our Nation has become one of the key tools in managing land and water resources to their broadest and fullest potential.

The July meetings reviewing the small watershed program in Michigan represent the type of State-Federal cooperation which all who have studied the management of our land and water resources believe is essential. Participants in these meetings, both State and Federal, deserve special commendation.

The letter summarizing these meetings, while directed primarily toward Michigan, is applicable I am sure to the overall problem of broader utilization of this program in our Midwest and Eastern States. I commend it to all concerned with better use of our water resources, a cause which requires our interest and thought and merits the fullest cooperation of responsible local, State, and Federal agencies.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter from Mr. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, summarizing some of the results of these meetings, and a list of those participating in the discussions, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1962.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HART: In response to your request, we have been pleased to have representatives of this office and our Milwaukee Engineering and Watershed Planning Unit participate in a review of the small watershed program in Michigan. This review was made on July 9, 10 and 11, 1962, and the enclosed list of participants indicates the broad coverage of State and Federal agency officials who joined in the various sessions.

The primary objectives of the review were to study the progress of the watershed program in Michigan thus far and determine what changes might be desirable in both State and Federal operating policies and procedures in order to accelerate the program and make it more applicable to Michigan conditions.

The review team was very much impressed with the interest exhibited by the various State and Federal agency representatives, with their analysis of the problems being encountered in Michigan, and with their desire and willingness to take whatever action was possible under their existing authorities to make the watershed program a more effective tool in solving the State's land and water problems.

The specific problems considered, together with the action agreed upon as being needed to meet these problems, are as follows:

1. There is an overall need for local people throughout the State to be better informed about the opportunities available under the watershed program and their responsibilities in initiating, developing, and carrying out watershed projects. It was agreed that as an initial and immediate step the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service will plan and carry out a coordinated training program for their employees throughout the State aimed at making certain that all county representatives of the two agencies were fully aware of the opportunities under the program and the procedures for developing projects. The ACP and FHA county representatives, the drain commissioners, and soil conservation district directors will be invited to take advantage of this training opportunity.

2. It appears that the local drain commissioner will continue to be a key individual in sponsoring most watershed projects in Michigan. Unless he is enthusiastic and active in project development and installation, the chances for a successful project are considerably decreased. It is proposed to concentrate on informing the drain commissioners as to the opportunities they have for using watershed project development to increase their prestige and stature within the local community. Special emphasis will be placed on the desirability of encouraging the drain commissioners to promote and participate in project development since some commissioners have taken a somewhat narrow and limiting view on their legal authorities for these activities. Deputy State Drain Commissioner Stan Quackenbush, the Soil Conservation Service, and the extension service will join together in this educational endeavor. The State Association of Drain Commissioners will be used as one of the media for reaching the individual commissioners. The State Association of Soil Conservation Districts has agreed to establish a closer working relationship with the State Association of Drain Commissioners.

3. Since the drain commissioner has been a primary sponsor in nearly all projects to date and most projects have been carried out under the Michigan drain code, there appears to be a general attitude throughout the State that watershed projects are primarily drainage projects rather than an approach to overall land- and water-management problems. All agencies participating in the review agreed that in their publicity and contacts with local people they will emphasize the multiple-purpose aspects of the program.

4. In discussions with the conservation department, several projects were discussed which are primarily for fish and wildlife development. It was the review team's opinion that these projects were eligible under present policies and legal authorities and the conservation department was urged to explore the potential for sponsorship of the applications.

5. Discussions with the deputy attorney general and his staff were felt to be very productive in clarifying the presently confused legal situation in Michigan. The primary discussion concerned the March 1962 decision of the Michigan Supreme Court in the case of *Ridenour* v. *County of Bay* and the remedial legislation (enrolled senate bill No. 1452) enacted by the Michigan Legislature in connection with this decision, together with the effects of the decision and legislation on the progress of the watershed program in Michigan. The team was informed that another decision of the Michigan Supreme Court was expected to be issued in the near future which involves the specific question of the constitutionality of the notice required by law to be given in a drain proceeding, and that this decision might resolve some of the legal questions raised but left unanswered by the Ridenour decision. It was suggested that it would be desirable for the Soil Conservation Service to defer entering into project agreements with drainage districts until the forthcoming decision of the Michigan Supreme Court had been issued and sufficient time had elapsed for its review and analysis.

There appears to be general agreement among the attorneys present that the provisions of the remedial legislation requiring that notice to property owners in special assessment proceedings be given by mail were applicable only to the notice in drain proceedings in connection with the review of the appraisal of benefits, and did not apply to other notices required to be given to property owners in the drain proceedings, such as notices relating to the creation of the district and to the necessity and feasibility of the drainage project.

Discussion was also had of another problem in Michigan bearing upon the progress of the watershed program, namely, injunctions issued by State courts for the purpose of delaying or prohibiting the prosecution of watershed projects. It was pointed out that the injunction problem is somewhat peculiar to Michigan since it does not appear to exist to a comparable degree in other States. The reason for the seriousness of this problem was believed to lie in the fact that in Michigan a temporary injunction can be obtained by a landowner without the necessity of posting a bond to insure payment of any damages resulting from the wrongful issuance of the temporary injunction. The laws of most other States require that such a bond be posted by the applicant for the injunction, and the effect of this requirement is generally to discourage landowners from seeking injunctive relief in connection with watershed projects in order to avoid personal liability for damages. It was agreed that there was no prospect of lessening this problem by obtaining amendments to the Michigan injunction laws.

6. The review team pointed out to the administrative assistant to the Governor and the State soil conservation committee that one possible solution to most of the watershed program problems in Michigan would be a State appropriation to help sponsoring local organizations meet the costs of acquiring the necessary land, easements, and rights-of-way. Ten States are now utilizing State funds to pay for all or part of these costs. It was agreed that this would be desirable but that in view of the State government's current financial problems such a move would be out of the question at the present time but would be given careful consideration at such time as the State's financial problems were eased.

We appreciated the cooperation shown by the various State and Federal agencies in making this review, and trust that in some degree the review will help in accelerating watershed activities in the State. If you believe there is any additional assistance that might be provided by this service or if there is any further information that you may desire, please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

P.S.—Two significant developments affecting the legal situation in Michigan with respect to the watershed program have occurred since the preparation of the above report. First, the Michigan Supreme Court has decided the case of *International Salt Company* v. *Henry V. Herrick, Wayne County Drain Commissioner,* involving the validity of the notice given to landowners of the hearing on the apportionment of benefits in proceedings under the Michigan drain code; and, second, the Michigan Attorney General has issued an opinion upholding the legal sufficiency of the notice to landowners provided for under certain sections of the Michigan drain code relating to intercounty drains. These two developments, together with the remedial legislation passed by the Michigan Legislature relating to notices to be given to landowners in special assessment proceedings, have largely resolved the legal questions raised by the Ridenour decision. Consequently, the prosecution of watershed projects in Michigan need not be further delayed on account of the Ridenour decision.

ATTENDANCE AT WATERSHED REVIEW MEETING
JULY 9, 10, 11, 1962

Review group: Leroy M. Adams, General Counsel's Office, USDA, Washington; V. W. Silkett, field representative, Corn Belt, SCS, Washington; G. E. Ryerson, Director, Administrative Services Division, SCS, Washington; J. H. Wetzel, Director, Watershed Planning Division, SCS, Washington; C. E. Ghormley, head, engineering and watershed planning unit, SCS, Milwaukee.

Monday, July 9, 9 a.m., SCS State office, East Lansing Soil Conservation Service; Allan J. Collins, State conservationist; H. D. Lakin, assistant State conservationist; J. W. Waterman, State conservation engineer; E. E. Fenton, watershed party leader; S. K. Kamminga, State administrative officer.

Monday, July 9, afternoon, USDA conference room, East Lansing, university-extension service; Raleigh Barlowe, head, resource development; M. H. Steinmuller, resource development; L. F. Twardzik, resource development (recreation); N. P. Ralston, director, cooperative extension service; W. A. Cutler, agricultural engineering department; E. H. Kidder, agricultural engineering department; R. G. Hill, executive secretary, State soil conservation committee and MSU extension specialist; W. S. Harrison, assistant secretary, State soil conservation committee and MSU extension specialist.

Michigan Department of Agriculture, Lansing; S. R. Quackenbush, deputy State drain commissioner.

Tuesday, July 10, morning, conservation department conference room, Mason Building, Lansing, water resources commission; L. F. Oeming, executive secretary; Norman F. Billings, assistant executive secretary and chief, hydrology division; Dale W. Granger, hydraulic engineer, hydrology division.

Tuesday, July 10, a.m., conservation department conference room, Mason Building, Lansing, State department of conservation, Lansing, A. C. Elmer, chief, parks and recreation division; Roger Wicklund, biologist, lake and stream improvement section, fish division; L. A. Davenport, habitat management, game division; H. J. Miller, wetlands investigation and planning, game division; A. B. Cook, chief, fish division; C. E. Millar, chief, lands division; W. H. Colburn, land use specialist, lands division; G. E. Eddy, director, conservation department; W. H. Evans, supervisor general engineering, engineering and architect section; H. D. Ruhl, chief, game division; Dr. J. W. Leonard, assistant deputy director, research department; Clarence J. Messner, chairman, State conservation department commission, Ann Arbor; G. A. Walker, chief deputy director; L. F. Twardzik, cooperative employee, conservation department and university.

Tuesday, July 10, p.m., conservation department conference room, Mason Building, Lansing attorney general's office: S. S. Faville, chief assistant, assistant attorneys general; M. M. Moule, assistant attorneys general; V. H. Meier, conservation division, office of attorney general; Robert Kealy, office of general counsel, Milwaukee, Wis.

Wednesday, July 11, a.m., USDA conference room, East Lansing, Mich. ASCS: F. E. Carroll, State executive director; Carl Shumway, chairman, ASC committee; Frank Light, member, ASC committee; Franklin Switzer, member, ASC committee. Farmers Home Administration: Nyle L. Katz, State director; R. R. Wilson, real estate loan officer. State association committee on water resources, soil conservation districts; Carl Loss, Sanilac SCD, Deckerville, Mich.; Lavern Weisenberger, Saginaw SCD, New Lothrop, Mich.; Wesley Myllyla, Baraga SCD, Pelkie, Mich.; John Harmon, Hillsdale SCD, Hudson, Mich.; Corwin Smart, Thornapple-Grand SCD, Mulliken, Mich.; Clarence Manning, Clinton SCR, route No. 1, Eagle, Mich.

Wednesday, July 11, p.m., Kellogg Center, Michigan State University campus, East Lansing, State soil conservation committee: B. Dale Ball, deputy director, representing G. S. McIntyre, director, Michigan Department of Agriculture; Farley F. Tubbs, assistant deputy director, representing G. E. Eddy, director, Michigan Department of Conservation; Lloyd M. Turk, assistant dean and director of agricultural experiment station, representing T.K. Cowden, dean of agriculture; Russell W. Gingrich, Reed City, Mich.; R. Lester Hill, Caro, Mich.; Lloyd Ruesink, Adrian, Mich.; Wendell Sandahl, Stephenson, Mich.; R. G. Hill, executive secretary; W. S. Harrison, assistant secretary; executive officer B. K. Benedict, administrative assistant to Governor Swainson; Michigan Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Inc., R. W. Peterson, president, Lakeview, Mich.; Corps of Engineers, Detroit, Vernonr Goelzer, chief, planning and reports branch, and Philip McAllister, planning and reports branch; Michigan Department of Conservation, H. J. Hanes, in charge, engineering and architecture, and L. A. Davenport, habitat management, game division; Soil Conservation Service, Allan J. Collins, H. D. Lakin, J. W. Waterman, E. E. Fenton; Michigan Department of Agriculture, S. R. Quackenbush, deputy State drain commissioner; water resources commission, L. F. Oeming, executive secretary, and Norman F. Billings, assistant executive secretary and chief, hydrology division; Michigan ASCS, F. E. Carroll, State executive director.

Wednesday, July 11, p.m., Kellogg Center, Michigan State University campus, East Lansing, State association committee on water resources, soil conservation districts; Carl Loss, Sanilac SCD, Deckerville; Lavern

Weisenberger, Saginaw SCD, New Lothrop; Wesley Myllyla, Baraga SCD, Pelkie; John Harmon, Hillsidale SCD, Hudson; Corwin Smart, Thornapple-Grand SCD, Mulliken; review group, Adams, Silkett, Ryerson, Wetzel, Ghormley, and Kealy.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD J. MEEMAN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this September Edward J. Meeman, the editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, became "editor-emeritus" of the Memphis Press-Scimitar.

This fact marks the official conclusion of one of the most distinguished careers in newspapering and public service in the history of our Nation; but even more important, it marks the beginning of Ed Meeman's continued devotion to the causes and principles for which he has always fought. For Ed Meeman, who prides himself above all as being a working newspaperman, will never be able to lay aside the tools of his trade.

I like to feel—because I know it is true—that Ed Meeman has been freed, in a sense, from the details and technicalities of directing a great newspaper. In this freedom as "editor-emeritus" he will find new opportunities to bring to bear his tremendous personal influence and tireless mind on issues and causes.

I would like to emphasize to my colleagues in the Senate that Ed Meeman's retirement does not mean at all that his attributes as a newsman will retire.

I can see Ed Meeman as "editor-emeritus" now, riding down Main Street in Memphis in a taxicab. A fire engine roars past, pulls up in front of the Claridge Hotel. Ed Meeman, reporter, stops the cab, steps out to the nearest phone, calls the city desk. He will never be able to stop being a newsman.

I can see Ed Meeman now, at his typewriter, pounding out his fierce ideas on what city hall must do about expressways, urging the citizens of his city to accept their civic responsibility in elections, selling the projects he believes in to the community he lives in.

Although I am not such Ed Meeman would not vehemently deny it, I think I know him well enough to describe him also as one of the most effective politicians abroad today. When he sets his mind to it, he can really go to work for an issue—on the telephone, person to person, or standing in the public forum.

But one of the most admirable characteristics of Ed Meeman—whether he be in the role of editor, newspaper reporter, or politician—is his abiding faith in what he is fighting for. If Ed Meeman believes it is right, and all arguments to the contrary do not otherwise convince him, he has always been and will always be unswervable in his purpose.

The editor's shoes out of which Ed Meeman is stepping officially are big and busy. They will be hard to fill. I know that Charles Schneider, who has been named the new editor of the Press-Scimitar, will do a fine job in carrying on the traditions of courage and devotion to the public interest which Ed Meeman has nurtured and built upon in the many years he has guided the destinies and responsibilities of this great newspaper.

And I know that Ed Meeman will be turned to for advice and counsel many times in the years ahead and that he will continue to be a moving, active force for good in his community.

To these remarks I add also my own fondest and warmest best wishes to Ed Meeman, my admiration for him as a newspaperman and an editor and a fighter, and my gratitude for the many times he has stood behind me in my own battles—or shoulder to shoulder with me when we shared the fray together to bring such dreams as an Atlantic Community close to reality.

I ask unanimous consent that a story in the Press-Scimitar of Memphis, telling of Ed Meeman's accomplishments and of those of his successor, be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

MEEMAN BECOMES EDITOR EMERITUS—CHARLES SCHNEIDER IS NEW EDITOR

(By Clark Porteous)

In accordance with the retirement policy of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Press-Scimitar, today becomes editor emeritus of this newspaper.

He is succeeded as editor by Charles H. Schneider, who was born in Mississippi just over the line from Memphis, and got his start as copy boy on the Memphis Press-Scimitar. Until recently he was editor of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin.

TO CONTINUE ACTIVE

"But it is not 'retirement' for me," Meeman said. "I am in excellent health and will be as active as ever." His signed editorial page column will appear more frequently. He will act as a consultant to the Press-Scimitar and the Scripps-Howard Newspapers. He will engage in certain civic activities. He will occupy an office adjoining his present one.

Announcement of the appointment of Schneider was made by Jack R. Howard, president and general editorial manager of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

A FAMOUS PHRASE

Meeman came to the Press-Scimitar in 1931 from Knoxville where he had started the Knoxville News and became editor of the Knoxville News-Sentinel.

Meeman coined a phrase which has had much to do with his success as an editor in Memphis. It is:

"Citizens working alone can do much; a newspaper working alone can do much; but citizens and a newspaper, working together, can do anything."

Meeman has proved this time after time.

THE DRIVE FOR TVA

Two years after Meeman took over editorship of the Press-Scimitar, he opened a 6-year campaign for TVA that brought cheap power to Memphis. It was an exciting fight, founded on Meeman's convictions about public power and conservation of the land, and spearheaded by a young reporter named Null Adams, who became city editor during the fight and is still city editor.

Meeman's lucid editorials backed Adams' dynamic stories and victory was achieved, a victory still commemorated by November 6th Street, from the date of the overwhelming victory at the polls for TVA in 1934. Now Memphis is negotiating to get back into TVA.

SLUMS AND SOIL

In the same period, the Press-Scimitar made a dramatic study of housing needs written by the late Walter Stewart, which was a large factor in making Memphis one of the first cities to have a slum clearance project and a housing development.

Meeman vitalized soil conservation in the Midsouth. Topsoil which once washed wastefully down the rivers of the Mississippi Valley to be lost in the gulf was stopped by scientific farming practices inspired by the Press-Scimitar's save-enrich our soil campaign.

SHELBY FOREST

A strong believer in parks and recreation areas, Meeman conceived of and campaigned for Shelby Forest. He practices what he preaches, and lives on Forest Farm on the edge of Shelby Forest's green preserves, which were carved from the river wilderness in the north part of Shelby County. Shelby Forest is now the most-used State park in Tennessee.

Citizens and the Press-Scimitar working together in 1948 found they could, indeed, accomplish anything. One of the greatest achievements of Meeman's career was the ending of a political machine's 20-year domination of State affairs. He led the campaign to elect ESTES KEFAUVER as U.S. Senator and to return Gordon Browning to the governorship he had held more than a decade before.

Comprehensive city planning, vital to a city's healthy growth, became a reality again in recent years, after the Press-Scimitar and citizens reviewed it after a period of stagnation.

RECOGNITION

Among many awards won by the Press-Scimitar during Meeman's editorship was the Sigma Delta Chi national award for Courage in Journalism. SDC is the national professional journalism fraternity.

When the University of Tennessee-Tennessee Press Association annual newspaper excellence contests were opened to metropolitan daily papers in 1947, the Press-Scimitar immediately won the General Excellence Award, as the best daily newspaper in the State. This award was discontinued after 1 year. During the next 5 years, until the U-T-TPA contests were again closed to the metropolitan dailies in 1952, the Press-Scimitar won 12 first-place awards for editorials, public service, local features, and makeup and appearance. Plaques symbolizing all these awards are displayed in the Press-Scimitar newsroom.

Not only has Meeman been a leader in local affairs, but he is credited by Clarence Streit, founder of the Atlantic Union movement, with having played an indispensable part in bringing about its recent climactic success, the holding of the Atlantic Convention of the NATO nations in Paris in January 1962, under a resolution passed by the U.S. Congress. Meeman was a member of the American delegation to the Atlantic Congress in London in 1959, which issued the call for the Atlantic Convention.

OUR NEW EDITOR

For "Charley" Schneider it is a homecoming.

He was born January 17, 1912, in Miller, Miss., 23 miles southeast of Memphis. As a boy, he used to negotiate old Pigeon Roost Road once a year, in September, to attend the Tri-State Fair, now the Mid-South Fair and spend the nickels and dimes earned during the summer delivering Sunday Commercial Appeals on horseback in and around Miller.

His father, the late William Schneider, ran one of Miller's four general merchandise stores, and young Schneider started clerking in the store as a small boy. He attended grammar school in Miller's one-room schoolhouse, and at the ninth grade shifted to a consolidated high school at Byhalia. He commuted 6 miles daily by train with his younger sister.

EARLY DAYS

During this time, for a spell, Schneider was Miller correspondent for the De Soto County weekly paper under the pseudonym of "Barney Google." Items invariably said somebody "motored" to Memphis and returned. In those days of careful driving they always returned.

The family moved to Buntyn, then a suburb of Memphis, when Charley was in the 11th grade. His father pioneered in the then sparsely settled community with a grocery store at the corner of Park and Speed, now Semmes. Young Schneider was graduated from Messick High in 1928, working after school and on Saturdays delivering groceries.

Schneider, after graduation from high school in June, applied to both the Press-Scimitar and the Commercial Appeal for a job as a "journalist." No luck. He delivered more groceries.

COPY BOY

In September James E. Mills, then managing editor of the Press-Scimitar, and now editor of the Birmingham Post-Herald, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, telephoned the Schneider store and said he had a job for Charley as a copy boy. Schneider took the job and has been with Scripps-Howard practically ever since.

As a copy boy, he had to make hourly "copy runs" to press rooms at the courthouse and police station, as copy boys still do to get stories written for the paper. He took the "run" part seriously and usually did just that.

After a few months, Schneider was made a clerk in the editorial department library, known as the "morgue," then became morgue keeper.

As morgue keeper, Schneider also had the assignment of writing death notices. This is not true now, as an experienced reporter writes obituaries. But writing deaths led Schneider to other writing, chiefly bright little feature stories.

TAKING PICTURES

Later he broke in as a cub photographer, then became staff—and for quite a while the only—photographer. Soon Hilman Pinegar and his cigar joined Schneider in the darkroom and they teamed as photographers. Pinegar is now assistant Mid-South editor of the Press-Scimitar.

Schneider became Boy Scout reporter, schools editor, and civic club reporter.

He recalls some of his most enjoyable photographic assignments, were with Eldon Roark, who had just started his "Strolling" column.

FUN ON THE JOB

"We pulled some 'duzies' and had a lot of laughs together," Schneider recalls. "Also, I turned out some picture-story combinations that were pretty good, if I do say so myself.

"I remember Eldon's classic story about the scrubwoman. Randi Lerohl, who skiffed alone down the Mississippi in search of sunshine, together with a silhouette picture I took at sunrise of this courageous character.

"I still remember my work as a photographer on the Press-Scimitar as my most enjoyable newspaper experience."

Many still remember Schneider's classic picture, "Plowin' Under."

It was an angle shot of an old gray mule and a farmer plowing under every third row of cotton, one of the things Henry Wallace had advocated as Secretary of Agriculture. Reprints were sent around the Nation and even abroad.

MEMPHIS WEDDING

In 1932, Schneider married a Memphis girl, Katherine Kasaftes, whose picture he had been assigned to take when she was singing for a Press-Scimitar-sponsored show to raise money for the Cynthia Milk Fund. They were married twice the same day—in the afternoon in a Greek ceremony at the Hellenic Orthodox Church, and in the evening in a Methodist ceremony at a newspaper wedding in the backyard of Forrest Allen, a member of the editorial staff of the Press-Scimitar.

The Schneiders have a married daughter, Mrs. George L. Powell, Jr., the former Tina Schneider, who lives in New York. The Powells have a daughter, Pamela, 3, who is Editor Schneider's only grandchild.

MOVING UP

Schneider was transferred to the Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard paper, in 1934. He started out as a general assignment reporter, and began to cover amateur theatricals. By 1935, he became theater editor of the Press. The first play he reviewed was the world premier of Katharine Cornell in George Bernard Shaw's "Saint Joan" and he was more frightened than an actor making his debut. But he did an excellent job as a critic, until 1937, when he was made director of the Press' Public Service Bureau.

Schneider was promotion editor, until February 1948, when he was promoted to one of the top jobs in Scripps-Howard, national promotion editor with an office in Scripps-Howard's general offices in New York. He was in charge of the National Spelling Bee in Washington for 9 years and did other things to help make Scripps-Howard papers better.

SAN FRANCISCO EDITOR

Schneider became editor of the San Francisco News, a Scripps-Howard paper, in February, 1957. In August 1959, the News and the Hearst Call-Bulletin merged, with Scripps-Howard in charge of the editorial and Hearst in charge of the business side. Schneider became editor of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin.

Under editor Schneider, the paper fought vigorously for progress. It battled for rapid transit to serve the entire Bay area, but insisted that no construction violate the city's natural beauty. The paper exposed California's shaky second-mortgage investment businesses, saving readers thousands and leading to a State crackdown.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The paper won a State law against cancer quacks, put a pornography mill out of business, disclosed wasteful surplus textbook burning by the State education department.

The News-Call Bulletin won the Tom Wallace Award of the Inter-American Press Association for a fundraising drive after the Chilean earthquake. Readers gave $46,000 for earthquake victims and erected in Chile a "City of San Francisco" which included apartments and a school.

While Schneider was editor, the paper won a number of awards, including the Catholic Newsmen's Association award last year, both first place and first honorable mention for the newspaper in San Francisco which best exemplified the principles of the Sermon on the Mount.

MOTHER A MEMPHIAN

Last June 2, the San Francisco arrangement between Scripps-Howard and Hearst was ended, and Scripps-Howard sold its interest in the News-Call Bulletin to Hearst. And Charley Schneider, after 28 years, has now come back home to Memphis.

His mother, Mrs. William Schneider, and a sister, Miss Marjorie Schneider, live at 3042 Park. Another sister, Mrs. Hardy S. Green, lives at 3053 Harris.

Editor Schneider and his wife are living presently at the Parkview, will move into an apartment at the Continental, 1422 Lamar, on October 1.

EARLY U.N. ACTION ON FINANCIAL OBLIGATION OF MEMBERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the U.N.—opening yesterday—has before it an agenda of highly significant challenges relating to peace.

Of high priority, affecting the heart of the U.N., itself, is a determination of whether or not U.N. members have a real responsibility for meeting financial obligations for peacekeeping operations of the U.N.

During recent world crises, several countries—particularly, the Soviet Union—have withheld financial support.

Earlier this year, the World Court rendered an advisory opinion that all U.N. members are obligated to help pay for its peacekeeping operations.

The General Assembly now has the responsibility for considering—and, I believe, confirming—the decision of the International Court of Justice.

Over the years, the United States has borne a substantial share of the costs of this International peacekeeping agency.

As a nation, and as taxpayers, we have a right to require that other member nations of the U.N., exercising equal voting rights, similarly live up to their obligations.

U.S. delegates, I believe, should therefore press for early consideration of this matter on the agenda of the present session of the U.N.

I ask unanimous consent to have editorials from three leading national newspapers printed at this point in the RECORD—the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Evening Star:

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1962]

U.N. ASSESSMENTS

The International Court of Justice recently decided in 242 big pages, nine agreements and five dissents, that the cost of the United Nations police activities in Suez and the more expensive ones in the Congo could be charged to the member nations under the terms of the charter. The arguments, in brief, were that the Assembly as well as the Security Council had the right to take actions that cost money and that in each case the assessments could properly be levied according to the percentages assigned in the regular budget.

In a letter on this page today Dr. Alexander W. Rudzinski addresses himself to the point raised by article 19—namely, whether a member of the U.N. in arrears for its share of the Suez and Congo costs is likely to lose its vote in the Assembly. Article 19 says that such a nation shall lose its vote "if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years." It happens that the Russians and some others who have refused to pay the Suez and Congo assessments have paid their assesment for the regular operations of the U.N. The inference is that they cannot lose their voting rights in the Assembly until they are behind in their payments not only for the special assessments but for the total of the regular and the special assessments.

The problem remains whether or not, as Dr. Rudzinski says, the General Assembly will ever be willing to "suspend the voting rights of a defiant big power." He suggests that the mere possibility of such a procedure may induce member nations to pay up. It is hard to imagine the President of the General Assembly either refusing to recognize a Russian speaker or refusing to record a Russian vote, but it could conceivably

What we must hope for, however, is that no coercion, parliamentary or otherwise, will

have to be applied to Russia and other delinquents. What the world needs is the rule of law. If the Russians and their dissenting friends cannot see this, the U.N. will never become an effective instrument for what the charter repeatedly alludes to as the maintenance of "international peace and security."

[From the Washington Star, July 23, 1962]

COURT AND U.N.

In its 9-to-5 advisory opinion holding that all members of the United Nations are obligated to meet special assessments to finance emergency operations, the World Court has not handed down a judgment that is either enforceable or really binding upon anybody unwilling to accept it. Indeed, the Soviet-led Communist bloc has been quick to indicate that it will ignore the decision and continue in arrears on what it is supposed to pay to help maintain the U.N.'s forces in the Congo and the Middle East.

To that extent, the Court's action in this matter may seem to amount to little more than an exercise in futility. Still, despite some pessimistic interpretations of it, it ought not to be dismissed too lightly as a ruling of little or no consequence. Actually, there is considerable promise in it. There are indications, for example, that it may be respected and obeyed by Belgium, France, and certain other countries that have thus far joined the Soviet Union in declining to put up their fair share of the costs of the U.N.'s peacekeeping tasks. If only a few of these delinquent nations now begin to pay what they owe, the gain will be substantial.

Further the ruling is almost certain to be a key item on the agenda of the U.N. General Assembly when it meets for its next regular session in September. What is hoped for, and even confidently expected in some quarters, is that two-thirds of the Assembly's membership will vote in favor of formally accepting—or, better still, explicitly endorsing—the Court's advisory opinion. Certainly backed by such a vote, the opinion would be strengthened in a way that might make it significantly strong in terms of exerting moral influence or suasion on members in arrears—strong enough, perhaps, to persuade even the Kremlin to back away from its no-pay policy.

As for depriving persistent delinquents of their votes in the Assembly, the U.N. Charter leaves that pretty much to the Assembly's discretion. Of course, applied to a country like France or the Soviet Union, such a penalty could lead to the disintegration of the world organization. But the same holds true for continuing delinquency in the payment of special assessments—a delinquency that has already pushed the United Nations to the brink of bankruptcy.

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1962]

NEW SINEW FOR THE U.N.

The World Court has given substantial buttressing to the United Nations by its advisory opinion that all members of the U.N. are obligated to help pay for its peacekeeping operations. The Court ruled in effect that the United Nations outlays in the Congo and in the Near East are "expenses of the organization" within the meaning of the U.N. Charter. Its decision sweeps away all the legal excuses that the Soviet Union and many other countries have offered in the past for refusing to pay their share of the cost of these activities.

There is, of course, no means by which either the Court or the United Nations can force the delinquents to pay. But the General Assembly now has, for the first time, a formidable source of pressure that it can apply. The charter provides in unmistakable terms:

"A member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years."

The General Assembly has authority to permit members in arrears to vote if their failure to pay is due to conditions beyond their control. But this would seem to require a specific vote by the Assembly to relieve members temporarily of their obligations. Otherwise the loss of voting rights in the General Assembly would appear to stand, as declared in the charter, without any positive action on the part of the General Assembly, other than adoption of the opinion of the Court.

The ruling is of great importance not merely from the financial viewpoint. In recent months the United Nations has been skating close to the edge of bankruptcy. Now it will doubtless be able to collect substantial sums which have been assessed, but not paid, for policing the Gaza strip and the Congo. The combined arrears for the Congo alone amount to more than $116 million.

Far more important, however, are the political implications of the ruling. The General Assembly can now institute peacekeeping operations wherever they may appear necessary without risking a denial of funds for their support. Its operations in the future may, therefore, be less hesitant. The result may be to drive some members out of the organization or to leave them in a state of suspension, but it would be farcical to permit members to thwart the vital purposes of the organization merely to keep their names on the rolls in good standing.

The effect of the ruling in Congress should be substantial. There has been a shameful amount of foot-dragging on Capitol Hill in regard to President Kennedy's proposal to buy $100 million worth of U.N. bonds. Some Congressmen have been fearful of allowing the United States to support peacekeeping activities in full unless all other countries do likewise. That self-defeating attitude should have less appeal for even the neoisolationists now that the World Court has ruled that all U.N. members have an obligation to pay specific as well as general assessments.

The new power in the hands of the General Assembly should not be used to impose a hardship on any country. But we hope that the body will use it vigorously to give itself the new girding that it needs in the complex and insecure world of 1962. The Court has taken the world a step closer to an international legal order and opened the way for the General Assembly to move substantially farther in the same direction.

COLORADO COLLEGE WINS FORD GRANT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recently it was announced that a relatively small private institution of higher education in the State of Colorado was the only college in over 1 million square miles to receive a grant from the Ford Foundation. This institution was Colorado College, with an enrollment of approximately 1,200 students and a permanent faculty of 100, located in Colorado Springs, Colo.

We in Colorado take a great pride in the educational facilities in our State. There is no area, we believe, with such a comparatively small population, that can surpass our State in either the number or quality of outstanding educational institutions. This is exemplified by the amazing growth, particularly in the past decade, of the number of students from other sections of the country and the world, who come to Colorado to avail themselves of our facilities. This growth is the result of a concentrated effort on the part of the people of our State to provide the very best in higher education for our young people. As a result of this interest and the progress that has been made, our institutions are more and more being recognized nationwide, and are being made the recipients of increasingly larger bequests and grants by both foundations and individuals.

Outstanding among our institutions is the comparatively small in size, but large in import, Colorado College. This school is entitled to recognition and commendation for the progressiveness and strengthening of curriculum which made this latest grant possible.

The Colorado College received $2,200,000 conditional on its raising $5,500,000 within 3 years in other funds. The gift is without strings, save "to advance the development of selected private institutions of higher education, as national and regional centers of excellence."

The new grant recognized the progress made by Colorado College under its president, Dr. Louis T. Benezet, who came to the institution in 1955 from Allegheny College, Pennsylvania, and who has in recent years resisted several attempts to pull him away from Colorado College to larger institutions.

There appeared in the July 6, 1962, issue of the Christian Science Monitor an article giving the details of this most significant grant by the Ford Foundation, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

WESTERN COLLEGE WINS FORD GRANT

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.—Colorado College, a relatively small private institution that is making a big impression over a vast area, was the only college in nearly 1 million square miles to be included in the Ford Foundation's latest grant awards.

The local institution received $2,200,000, conditional on its raising $5,500,000 within 3 years in other funds. The gift is without strings, save "to advance the development of selected private institutions of higher education, as national and regional centers of excellence."

The West is relatively void of such private colleges, as compared to those which thickly dot the East and Midwest. Colorado College was one of only five from west of the Mississippi to be included, out of 21 in all.

PROGRESS RECOGNIZED

This was the second largest academic grant ever made in the immediate region. The University of Denver received a similar Ford conditional grant, dependent on raising supplementary funds, in 1960, for $5 million.

The new grant recognized the progress made by Colorado College under its president, Dr. Louis T. Benezet, who came to the institution in 1955 from Allegheny College, Pennsylvania, and who has in recent years resisted several attempts to pull him away from Colorado College to larger institutions.

The college was founded in 1874 as a joint enterprise of the Colorado Congregational Conference and the American College and Education Society. It has remained an institution "in which liberal studies may be pursued under positive Christian influences [though] under no ecclesiastical or political control."

OTHER GIFTS

The raw, new town of Colorado Springs, made as a realty development enterprise by Gen. William J. Palmer and his associates in building the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad, was chosen as the college site simply because it offered a campus and an establishment loan of $10,000.

The Ford Foundation's award is the third largest gift, among many smaller ones, made to the college under Dr. Benezet. The larger ones included $1,250,000 from the local El Pomar Foundation for the new Charles Leaming Tutt Library just completed; $1,490,400 from the Olin Foundation in 1960 for a new hall of science; and $1,250,000 in a general bequest from the estate of Ethel Carlton, member of one of the town's founding families.

ACHIEVEMENTS LISTED

Under Dr. Benezet the college is seeking to raise $6,500,000 in all—exclusive of the new Ford grant. It has increased faculty salary levels, and has strengthened the curriculum, particularly in the sciences, though retaining a strong emphasis on the liberal arts. It now has a student body of about 1,200 and a full-time faculty of 100.

Other southwestern colleges included in the Ford program were Austin College at Sherman, Tex., and Oklahoma City University. The two other western colleges were on the west coast.

TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there recently appeared in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, Colo., an article by the eminent columnist, Mr. Henry J. Taylor. In this article Mr. Taylor takes his own profession, the fourth estate, to task a bit. His article states most clearly that perhaps his profession would better serve the interest of the public, and better fulfill its responsibility to that public, if it would more frequently make reference to Federal spending as an expenditure of the "taxpayers' money" rather than "Federal funds." With Mr. Taylor's thought I thoroughly agree. In addition, it occurs to me that perhaps we, as the elected representatives of those taxpayers, could better fulfill our responsibility to those taxpayers if we would sharpen our own awareness of this difference in terminology.

It is Mr. Taylor's contention—and again I agree—that too often when people read or hear of some joint State-Federal project being financed with "Federal funds," they get the impression that some new outside source of capital has been found to provide their State with its needs. This is, of course, a misimpression, since these funds, to be supplied by the Federal Government, are actually dollars from their own pockets. As Mr. Taylor points out, there are no "Federal funds," only the taxpayers' dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Taylor's remarks may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

TODAY'S CLICHES COST OUR SHIRTS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

A poor choice of words, grown traditional, has helped send our sweat-kissed taxes around the world in a ballastless balloon, finance the pork-pork-pork in political barrels, pay for loony projects without end, toss good money after bad and yet hardly let us known how we foot the bill.

The words? "Federal funds," "Government money," "the Government is paying," etc.

Repetition has done the rest. Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "A catchword long enough repeated can defy analysis for 100 years." And when Cato repeated "Carthage must fall," so often that Carthage finally fell, the old Roman simply proved the collapse of public understanding in the face of cliche.

Today's cliches have cost us our shirts. Countless millions are falsely led to believe they somehow get something for nothing.

A simple correction by editors and others, constantly repeated, might even bring a taxpayers' revolt.

Day after day we read some new cost "will be met by Federal funds." There are no "Federal funds." Hey, that's our money. An accurate revision would read, "* * * will be met by taxpayers' funds."

Why not? As standard practice, if editors always blue-penciled "Federal funds" into "taxpayers' funds," it could certainly ring a beli in better public understanding.

The blue-pencil could easily clarify the joint financing of State-Federal projects. When announced locally that part of the cost "will come from Federal funds," this part sounds like found money.

We're constantly told "the Government" will pay for such-and-such an educational program, or this, that, or the other thing—a subsidy to mushroom growers, a cultural TV station in the Samoa Islands, or whatnot. A Niagara of handouts gushing from every Government department reemphasizes the misinformation. The Government pays for nothing.

We read that Washington is supporting Nehru in India with another billion dollars and that Ambassador George F. Kennan would resign if Washington's aid to Tito is cut. Washington never gave Nehru or Tito a nickel. Washington aids nobody.

The rewrite: "The taxpayers are supporting Nehru, and Kennan would resign if the taxpayers' aid to Tito is cut." It begins to sound different already.

When the Government recently gave the National Biscuit Co. a multimillion-dollar order for atomic shelter saltines, that's us taxpayers buying something again. The State Department did not pay the $300,000 for Chester Bowles' latest lush-lush world-conference journey. We did.

Communists everlastingly use wrong words and cash in on the result. Moreover, they understand the enormous effect of repetition. This is how they spread the big lie.

RESOLUTIONS BY ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN STATE ENGINEERS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the Association of Western State Engineers, held at Salt Lake City in August, a number of resolutions were adopted which bear directly on legislation currently before the Congress such as the wilderness bill, Water Resources Planning Act, State water rights—for which I have been pressing for over 5 years—and others. Mr. J. E. Whitten, State engineer for the State of Colorado, was good enough to furnish me with copies of those as well as the resolutions concerning Federal-State relations in areas of mutual concern.

The importance of these resolutions, gaged as they are by the caliber of the group involved, suggests that they should be widely circulated and studied. I therefore ask unanimous consent they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 1

Resolution relating to the protection of water rights under State laws

Whereas Federal legislation has not yet been enacted for the protection of water rights acquired under State laws nor to preserve the historic authority of the States to control the acquisition and administration of water rights within their respective borders; and

Whereas recent court decisions threatening such rights and undermining such authority continue in effect; and

Whereas extensive committee hearings have been held by the Congress during the last several years with respect to water rights legislation; and

Whereas although such legislation has been introduced in the 87th Congress it has not been enacted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers urges the earliest possible introduction and enactment by the Congress of legislation that (1) will clearly state that the Federal Government shall not be deemed to have acquired or reserved any water rights as a result of the reservation or withdrawal of public land; (2) will require compliance with State water laws by all Federal agencies, licensees, or project beneficiaries; and (3) will adequately safeguard all water rights established under State laws against the action of Federal agencies and their licensees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to appropriate executive departments of the U.S. Government and that copies also be promptly sent by each of the members of this association to the congressional delegation of his State.

RESOLUTION 3

Resolution relating to the proposed Water Resources Planning Act of 1961

Whereas there has been introduced in the 87th Congress proposed legislation entitled "Water Resources Planning Act of 1961" (e.g., S. 2246 and H.R. 8177); and

Whereas such legislation would accomplish three major objectives; namely: (1) Establish a water resources council, (2) establish river basin commissions, and (3) provide grants to States for water resource planning; and

Whereas the Association of Western State Engineers believes such legislation to be of major importance to the future development and conservation of the Nation's water resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the association supports the establishment of a Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of the Interior; Agriculture; Army; and Health, Education, and Welfare; and the association is also of the opinion that there should be established an advisory committee to such Council, composed of non-Federal members and representing each of the 22 water resource regions defined in the 1961 report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources; and be it further

Resolved, That the association recommends that any legislation authorizing river basin commissions should provide that:

1. Any such Commission should be established only upon the request of a majority of the Governors of the affected States.

2. Non-Federal members of such Commission should be equal in number to Federal agency representatives.

RESOLUTION 4

Resolution relating to consultation between the United States and the affected States in planning

Whereas population growth has greatly accelerated demands for water supplies for agricultural, domestic, municipal, and industrial uses throughout the Nation; and

Whereas water resources development has not kept pace with the water supply demands made upon it; and

Whereas the Federal Government has declared and demonstrated that it cannot alone satisfy such demands; and

Whereas the States have a responsibility to participate with the Federal Government in comprehensive and multiple-purpose water resources development which can best provide water supplies for maximum beneficial uses; and

Whereas a waste of time, materials, and resources by conflict, duplication, or isolated effort in water supply development can best be prevented at the investigations stage; and

Whereas a readily available means of accomplishing economical, effective, and orderly development of water resources is through consultation between the United States and the affected States commencing with the initiation of investigations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers urges the adoption of the principle of continuing consultation between the United States and the affected States with respect to the construction, maintenance, and operation of water resources projects, commencing with the initiation of investigations as an integral element of State and Federal water resources development policy, and that it commends those Federal agencies that have followed this principle; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Federal Power Commission, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

RESOLUTION 5

Resolution relating to national wilderness preservation system bills

Whereas certain bills have been introduced in successive Congresses which would establish a national wilderness preservation system; and

Whereas such bills would authorize administrative creation of wilderness areas additional to areas designated by the Congress in creating the system; and

Whereas water conservation and modification of plan cover in wilderness areas would be allowed only upon an express presidential finding of greater national interest than an otherwise presumed paramount interest in wilderness preservation; and

Whereas diverse national interests will be more fully satisfied through a discerning policy of accommodation of all uses of such areas than by an absolute preferment of an exclusively undeveloped status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That while the Association of Western State Engineers is not opposed to the establishment of wilderness areas under proper management, it is opposed to any wilderness legislation which would impede water resources development in the Western States; and be it further

Resolved, That the establishment of new wilderness areas or the expansion of existing areas should be accomplished only upon the specific approval of Congress to each new inclusion of such areas; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to members of the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that each member of the association is requested to send copies of this resolution to the members of the congressional delegation from his State.

RESOLUTION 6

Resolution relating to the Federal Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961

Whereas, the Congress has passed and the President has signed an act entitled "Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961" (Public Law 87-88, 87th Cong., H.R. 6441, dated July 20, 1961); and

Whereas the act provides in part: "(b) (1) In the survey or planning of any reservoir by the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation or other Federal agency, consideration shall be given to inclusion of storage for regulation of streamflow for the purposes of water quality control, except that any such storage and water releases shall not be provided as a substitute for adequate treatment or other methods of controlling waste at the source"; and

Whereas available flow in many streams in the 17 Western States is limited and the entire yield of reservoirs on some streams is required for beneficial uses such as municipal, industrial and irrigation purposes which, in many cases, are more important uses than those for nonconsumptive purposes, such as streamflow enhancement for water quality control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers urges that in determining the need for and the value of storage for regulation of streamflow for the purpose of water quality control, the Federal agencies shall give serious consideration, in early and continued consultation with the States involved, to the relative needs for water to supply the various beneficial use from reservoirs proposed to be bulit in the 17 Western States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the two Houses of the Congress, the President, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RESOLUTION 7

Resolution relating to the use of interstate compacts

Whereas the problems of water resources development and use of interstate water by the States and the Federal Government require a high degree of cooperation; and

Whereas such cooperation involves the coordination of planning and programing of water resources developments to avoid duplication and waste; and

Whereas there is need for simple, effective, and equitable representation of local, State, and Federal interests in the administration of a cooperative water resources development program for interstate water; and

Whereas the existence of such an administrative body brings about a saving of money and time in accomplishing water resources development and maximizes the benefits resulting from such development; and

Whereas an interstate compact commission or board composed of representatives of State and Federal Governments is a recognized vehicle for providing equitable administration and effective coordination of local, State, and National responsibilities and the satisfaction of needs for water resources use and development; and

Whereas the interstate compact also provides an opportunity for States to accomplish by negotiation the equitable allocation of interstate waters; and the substantial delay in water resources development required by the pursuit of litigation may be largely avoided by utilization of the interstate compact: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers believes that (1) planning for and actual development of interstate water resources should be governed by interstate compacts as the most effective, economical, and equitable means of resolving problems of water allocation among the States concerned and achieving maximum benefit from the development of such water in preference to the pursuit of litigation for the resolution of such problems, and (2) to the extent that the United States now participates or will participate in the planning for and actual development of the waters of interstate streams it should be a party to and be bound by the provisions of the interstate compact concerning such waters.

RESOLUTION 8

Resolution relating to Federal assistance to non-Federal municipal and industrial water projects

Whereas S. 13 has been introduced in the 87th Congress to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal, nonprofit public projects proposed to be constructed primarily for municipal and industrial purposes; and

Whereas such cooperation is intended to encourage the planning and construction of water resources developments on a multiple-purpose and comprehensive basis; and

Whereas the proposed legislation would authorize the United States through the Secretary of the Interior, to make loans repayable in 50 years to State and local agencies for the portion of project construction costs properly allocable to irrigation; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army would be authorized to make grants for the portion of project construction costs properly allocable to recreation fish and wildlife preservation and propagation and to navigation and flood control, respectively; and

Whereas the enactment of such legislation would facilitate the acomplishment of water resources development in concurrent satisfaction of National, State, and local interests and needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers urges prompt enactment by the 87th Congress of legislation substantially embodying the foregoing provisions of S. 13 as a forward step in Federal-State cooperations; and be it further

Resolved, That each member of the association is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the congressional delegation of his State as constituted in the 87th Congress.

RESOLUTION 9

Resolution relating to the use and regulation of flood plains in connection with flood control

Whereas it is necessary for the full development of land and water resources that maximum economic use be made of flood plains at the same time minimizing the risk of flood damage; and

Whereas in order to make such use consistent with sound planning and the public welfare and safety, planning, and regulation of the use of flood plains is necessary, and the use and regulation of flood plains should be closely coordinated with the provision of flood control through the construction of projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers believes that all of the following factors should be considered in relation to flood problems:

1. Consistent with the necessity for maximum feasible utilization of land and water resources the maximum economic use of flood plains should be made.

2. The use of flood plains should be regulated so as to allow their full economic use consistent with public welfare and safety.

3. Flood control projects should be provided consistent with and coordinated with the economic use and regulation of flood plains.

4. Where necessary, State and local legislation should be enacted to accomplish these objectives.

RESOLUTION 10

Resolution relating to cost participation with the U.S. Weather Bureau through the use of non-Federal funds

Whereas there is increasing need for climatological and hydrologic basic data for the design of water projects and for such data, including evaporation measurements, in connection with water losses and reservoir operation; and

Whereas the U.S. Weather Bureau is often best equipped to provide such data by expansion of existing low-cost substation networks designed to provide generalized overall information and to make such data available to all through existing processing facilities and publications; and

Whereas the Weather Bureau now lacks authority to accept non-Federal funds and cannot now cooperate with States or other entities in obtaining such basic data for basin or other hydrologic studies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers supports and urges provision of authority for the U.S. Weather Bureau to accept non-Federal funds to enable cooperation in the assembly of data necessary for hydrologic studies, for the design and operation of water projects, and for providing information for flood forecasting; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce.

RESOLUTION 11

Resolution relating to acquisition of rights in reservoirs constructed by Corps of Engineers

Whereas in some instances contracts for water-storage rights in reservoir projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers limit the exercise of such rights to 50 years, even though such contracts provide for the full repayment of costs allocated to water storage; and

Whereas many such reservoirs will have a useful life in excess of 50 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers urges enactment by the Congress of the principle, contained in H.R. 2438, 87th Congress, that such contracts shall grant permanent rights to water storage, extending throughout the useful life of the project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Army and to the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate.

RESOLUTION 14

Resolution relating to the standards and criteria for evaluation of multiple-purpose projects (S. Doc. 97)

Whereas the association notes that on May 15, 1962, the President of the United States approved a recommendation of a special Cabinet Committee for establishing new standards and criteria for the evaluation of multiple-purpose water resource development projects (S. Doc. 97), replacing the Circular No. A-47 requirements of the Bureau of the Budget; and

Whereas the association believes that this action of the President will be beneficial to the 17 Western States, making possible the full development of the waters of the West to meet the ever-increasing water demands, provided the special needs of each of the States are recognized; and

Whereas the association understands the several Federal agencies directly concerned will soon issue instructions to their respective offices intended to implement the new standards; and

Whereas the association believes the greatest benefit in the 17 Western States from the new standards will be achieved by close coordination of the instructions of the several Federal agencies directly concerned with the responsible State officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the association requests that the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and all other Federal agencies concerned with the feasibility of multiple-purpose water resource development projects confer with each of the 17 Western States on the plans of the Federal agencies for the implementation of the new standards to the end that the requirements and rights of each of the States are fully understood and recognized.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL FISHERY CONSERVATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was delighted with the understanding and affirmative support that was given last night to my revised amendment to the trade bill. The amendment is identical in purpose, if not in content, with the one originally introduced and that purpose is to promote the conservation of our fishery resources. This amendment represents a major advance in our long struggle to obtain effective means by which we can persuade other nations to participate with us in conferences involving our fishery resources and to negotiate in good faith. The President under this amendment has ample authority to increase tariffs as a sanction to assure good faith negotiations of a nature similar to that required between parties by our labor and other laws. The responsibilities of parties who have a duty to negotiate in good faith is clear under American law. By placing this duty on all concerned we will be threatened no longer with the possibility of an arbitrary termination of any fishery convention or negotiation and we will no longer be plagued by the threat of a foreign government openly disregarding facts or refusing to supply pertinent information regarding the fishery resource.

Mr. President, last night when I withdrew my original amendment I intended to introduce other legislation on the subject. The acceptance of this amendment suggests that the introduction of additional legislation by me at this time is unnecessary.

I stated then and do again that I and others have not forgotten and will not forget the desperate need we have to protect our fishermen on the high seas from harassment by other nations. I pledge to call for immediate hearings and early action next Congress on separate legislation which would amend the Fishermen's Protective Act in a manner that will assure our fishermen that they can expect compensation for not only the fine imposed but also for other damages suffered under conditions of harassment and I will work to assure our fishermen that their claims will be paid in a speedy and efficient manner. And I can say Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Commerce Committee, is fully sympathetic with these goals.

Mr. President, the acceptance of this amendment does not place an American flag on every fish on the high seas, nor does it suggest that international waters are American waters. The amendment is not directed at any particular nation, nor any particular species of fish; it is directed at solving a conservation problem on the high seas. The amendment does represent an acknowledgment on the part of our Government and this administration that it intends to fulfill the entire scope of its responsibilities of leadership in our struggle to conserve international fishery resources.

FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to inform my colleagues that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations held its first hearing on problems of Federal-State-local relations on Tuesday, September 18. This hearing was conducted in the form of a panel discussion, with experts in the field of intergovernmental relations presenting their views on problem areas in federalism. Prior to their presentation of prepared remarks on this subject, Senators MUNDT, ERVIN, and I made some introductory remarks which I believe will be of interest to our colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to place these remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS. AT SEPTEMBER 18, 1962, SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON PROBLEMS IN THE FIELD OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

This is the first hearing to be conducted by the newly created Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, established under Senate Resolution 359 of the 87th Congress. I should like to include in the record at this point the resolution and Senate Report No. 1716 which accompanied it. In this material can be found the reasoning which led to Senate action to give specific attention to ways and means of enhancing cooperation between all levels of Government and strengthening our Federal system.

The field of intergovernmental relations might be categorized as the "Hidden Dimension of Government." Performing as almost a fourth branch of government in meeting the needs of our people, it nonetheless has no direct electorate, operates from no set perspective, is under no special control, and moves in no particular direction. Programs in this field make an unpredictable impact on our society and our economy. The world of intergovernmental relations is represented by no policymaking body—there is no executive, no legislature and no judiciary. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations serves as its major meeting ground, but this organization functions only in an advisory capacity. What we hope to do in the work of this subcommittee is to give this hidden dimension of Government definition and identity—to understand what it is and what its potential is, and in what directions it is moving.

Evidence that this field makes a major impact on the lives of all Americans can be found in its involvement in such matters as highways, housing, public assistance, hospitals, airports, public health, unemployment compensation, education, agricultural extension, and waste treatment facilities. A substantial amount of our governmental expenditures is involved in those programs every year. Assuming that we consider the combined Federal, State and local contributions, estimates of the sum involved range from $11 billion in fiscal 1962 to $14 billion in 1963. It is significant to note that no governmental authority is prepared to provide any specific data on this subject. This amount is greater than the total Federal budget used to be in the not too distant past, and yet we do not see it appearing as a recognizable entity in the Federal budget or in State and local budgets.

It is our purpose today to explore with a panel of experts the problems in the field of Federal-State-local relations which they view as currently causing major difficulties in the proper functioning of our Federal system. It is clear that many Americans hold drastically conflicting views on the relative roles of the different levels of government, and it is our intention to give careful attention to every point of view to determine which pattern of interrelationships best serves the needs of the United States during this period of our history.

Woodrow Wilson said that "the question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government is the cardinal question of our constitutional system." Our Founding Fathers created a system of the division of powers between levels of government which has withstood the test of time. There are those who say that the system is outmoded and an anachronism in the space age. But we find growing evidence that State and local governments are trying to make the necessary adjustments to meet the needs of the time.

What seems to be the pattern that is taking shape in governmental efforts to cope with public needs and demands has been referred to by one authority as a "marble cake" of relationships rather than the old "layer cake." More and more the emphasis is on cooperation rather than competition between levels of government. We hear less talk about States' rights and more talk about States' responsibilities. When it became clear that the Federal Government had more power to accomplish certain public ends than was necessary to do the job, the comment of James Madison that the system required "reciprocal forbearance" took on new meaning.

There is no sense denying that the 20th century has seen the rise of "revolutionary" demands on the part of the people for the provision of services by the government. What we are striving to achieve is a new balance of governmental activity which unshackles all levels of government to perform these tasks adequately. At the same time, we must be on guard to prevent the growth of the kind of imbalance that leads to the stultification of local initiative and the deprivation of individual rights. The tendency to overlook the establishment of appropriate standards by which to measure the total cost and the allocation of the costs of government must be checked if sound fiscal management is to prevail.

When we look at the current situation in the field of Federal-State-local relations, we find numerous problem areas existing, many of them festering because of inaction or the lack of proper action. A brief cataloging of trouble spots includes: the governmental organization of metropolitan areas, the conservation of natural resources, the division of revenue resources, the apportionment of electoral districts (now being redressed somewhat by the Supreme Court decision), the provision of adequate transportation, the provision of adequate housing, the maintenance of a high standard of education, the status of grant-in-aid programs, and many more. Such basic questions as the extent to which local self-government should be granted, what measures should be adopted to strengthen State and local finances, how decentralization of government administration should be achieved, and what steps should be taken to improve cooperation between the levels of government, remain unanswered.

Our subcommittee has been given the broad mandate by the Senate to "examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities." It is also called upon to review the recommendations made in this area by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. In order to perform these functions, we should first find out what the relevant organizations representing both geographic and functional groups regard as the basic problem areas from their point of view. We are now, of course, in the very preliminary stages of reviewing these problem areas and intend to hold additional hearings this fall to determine what specific contributions the subcommittee can make to the resolution of these problems. In addition to observations of the men who have kindly agreed to assemble here today for a panel discussion of these issues, we plan on calling for the views of a wide range of governmental and nongovernmental organizations, scholars and practitioners alike. In this manner, we hope to ultimately be able to offer to the Congress some legislative proposals which will contribute to the strengthening of our Federal system.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, AT THE FIRST HEARING OF THE NEWLY CREATED SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. Chairman, this hearing marks the public debut of the newly created Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. I have great confidence that this subcommittee, acting as an agency of the National Legislature, can make a meaningful and constructive contribution to the advancement and improvement of our Federal system.

It seems to me most fitting that the first public action of this subcommittee should be a panel discussion by a group of men, all knowledgeable in the field of intergovernmental relations, concerning the critical problems that face us as a nation in the broad sector of Federal, State, and local governmental relations. This discussion and the similar discussions which will be pursued with other panels will, I am sure, provide us with valuable information and ideas.

The Federal system, as conceived by the drafters of the Constitution, stands as one of the most remarkable and worthwhile innovations in the history of mankind's experience with representative government.

Historically, we know that the Federal principle came into being as a compromise between two sharply divided schools of thought—those who sought to abolish all State autonomy and establish a unitary governmental authority at the national level and those who desired a Central Government of form rather than substance with the primary governmental authority being retained by the several States.

From its inception the essence of the Federal system has been balance—the striking of an equilibrium between the central authority required for unity and action as a single national entity and the circumferential authority and State autonomy demanded for the meaningful operation of our democratic political system.

We have now functioned as a nation under this system for 173 years. During that period the Federal system has undergone many changes and adjustments. A third level of government has emerged, deriving its powers and authority from the States. Generally denominated as local government, this third level includes our county, township, and municipal governments, which are charged with providing basic governmental services specially tailored to meet the needs of a particular locale or an individual community.

Since the original enunciation of the Federal principle, population growth, the increased mobility of people, military emergencies, economic crises, industrial development, commercial diversification and dramatic technological advancements have wrought significant and lasting changes in the character and composition of this Nation. The changes of profile and content have brought with them ever-increasing demands for better service at all levels of government.

Three major wars and a serious economic depression during the past five decades have compounded the pressures for governmental action. All of these events and developments have combined to place extraordinary stresses and strains on the Federal system.

In numerous instances, responding to pressures for emergency action, the Federal Government has expanded existing authority or undertaken responsibilities previously carried by the States and their local units of government. Rarely has there been a relinquishment or retrocession of this authority by the Federal Government after the emergency has passed. This development has caused many individuals to contend that the Federal system is now out of balance with too great an accretion of power and authority at the center. Other commentators have concluded that the continued growth of central power and authority is an inevitable development in an increasingly complex society. There are even some who have charged that State and local units of Government are nothing more than outmoded reliques of the 18th century, lacking the competency and capacity to govern in these fast-moving times of the 20th century. I personally regard this latter view as "ismatic propaganda" and directly in conflict with the abundant evidence of dramatic State and local governmental growth since the end of World War II.

This diversity of opinion and viewpoint on the present and future status of the various levels of government reflects the important need for an objective assessment and analysis of the Federal system and the current relationships existing among its constituent parts. I am delighted that the Senate has charged us with that responsibility.

During the course of our study and investigation I hope that we can give consideration to such problem areas as:

1. The equitable division of tax sources among the various levels of government.

2. Federal involvement in urban development and the accompanying impact on State and local government.

3. The system of Federal grants-in-aid; its growth; its direction; and its effect on the efficient utilization of State and local resources.

4. The prospective role of State and local government in our development of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

5. The appropriate role of the National Government in assisting State and local governments to more effectively fulfill their functions and responsibilities.

6. The growth of interlocal cooperation; its capacity for effecting improvement in the quality of government at the local level; and its corresponding use in areas of high and low population density.

The chairman has suggested several other avenues of inquiry which should lead to a more comprehensive understanding by the Congress of the critical challenges presently

confronting the Federal system. In the final analysis what we are seeking, and what I hope we will obtain, are objective answers to the eternal question, "How can representative government best serve the needs and aspirations of the people from which it derives its power and authority?"

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR., AT THE FIRST HEARING OF THE NEWLY CREATED SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared statement. However, I would like to make a few observations on the subject under discussion.

In my judgment, William Gladstone was clearly right in the main when he said that the Constitution of the United States was the greatest instrument ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

As a matter of fact, however, he was partly in error in that statement. The Constitution of the United States was not struck off at a given moment, although it was reduced to writing at a given moment. It embodied, however, the experience of many generations of men in their quest for a system of government in which man should be guaranteed the right to self-rule, and also the right to protection against governmental tyranny.

I think that the finest system of government ever devised by man is the American system of government, and I think that is true because the Constitution is correctly described in a nutshell in the statement made by Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase in *Texas* v. *White*. He said in that case, "The Constitution, in all of its provisions, looks to an indestructible union composed of indestructible States."

I think if we were to destroy the States we would destroy our Constitutional system of government and do the greatest injury to the cause of good government that could possibly be done.

The States are in jeopardy at this time, I think, for several reasons. The first reason is that those who seek to impose their will upon others in governmental matters would prefer to deal with one government only, namely, the Federal Government.

They do not like to deal with 50 State governments and the Federal Government, in addition.

They realize that if they can immobilize State government and control the Federal Government, they can control all of the government.

Now, this would have a very bad effect, if it were to be accomplished. I think one of the great values of our system of government, which separates the powers of government between the National Government and State government, lies in the fact that it affords us 50 laboratories in the States for governmental experiments.

A State can experiment with an innovation in government or economics and if it turns out bad it doesn't affect us governmentally speaking or economically speaking except in one limited area.

If it turns out good then it can be adopted in the other States.

But if the Federal Government indulges in an experiment which has tragic consequences, it affects us tragically at all levels.

Then there is another thing of a detrimental character in shifting all responsibility of government from a State level to a National level, and that is that such action relieves the people of a sense of responsibility at the local level. One of the things about democracy which is essential if democracy is to endure is a sense of responsibility in individuals at local levels.

Someone has said that the saddest epitaph that can be written on the loss of any right is that those who had the saving power failed to stretch forth a saving hand while there was yet time. I think one of the finest things that this subcommittee can do is to take steps which will preserve the Federal system of government with its division of powers between National and State levels.

This thing goes far beyond merely governmental things. It goes to the personality of the people of the United States.

A member of the Supreme Court of the United States whom I admired very much was Justice Brandeis. Justice Brandeis is said by Judge Learned Hand to have made this statement, "The States are the only breakwater against the ever-pounding surf which threatens to submerge the individual, and destroy the only society in which personality can exist."

I think there is more than a modicum of truth in that statement. Whenever you shift all responsibility of government from the States to the national level you destroy the only society in which personality really can exist. You are certainly impressed by the truth of this observation when you try to deal with some of these overgrown Federal agencies.

I recognize there is a great deal of difficulty in local self-government and particularly in the cities due to the fact that the Federal Government monopolizes the sources of taxation which yield the taxes most easily collected. I think that one of the finest contributions which this subcommittee can make is to see if we can't devise some method by which we can prove that Aesop was not thinking of the Federal Government when he told the story about the lion.

He said that the lion invited another animal to visit him in his cave. The animal said, "I am not coming because I notice that all tracks lead into your cave and none lead out."

Now that is certainly a parable about the system of taxation which prevails in this country. I think this is a field in which something drastic has got to be done in order to give to the States and the local communities more sources of taxation than they now enjoy. The alternative is to have them continue to do what they have been doing with increasing frequency; and that is, to come to Uncle Sam to beg for a little more of the patrimony which he has taken from them.

These are just some random observations. As a consequence of knowledge gained from my service with him in the Senate, I know the subcommittee has an excellent chairman, a very devoted American, who has participated with great distinction in government at several levels. I think it is most fortunate that the Senator from Maine is chairman.

I will say a word about my friend from South Dakota who has just left. He comes from an area where, like my own State, there are still some folks who believe that a federal system of government ought to be preserved and that really and truly the Constitution was designed to create an indestructible union composed of indestructible States.

NEGOTIATED FIXED-PRICE CONTRACTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under date of September 17, 1962, the Comptroller General sent to Congress a report in which he called attention to the fact that the Air Force has awarded to Convair, a division of General Dynamics, San Diego, Calif., a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee and fixed-price incentive contract, with fixed-price subcontracts to Lear, Inc., Grand Rapids, Mich. He criticized the performance of these negotiated contracts totaling $1,579,000 wherein a 52-percent profit went to Lear, Inc., on one of these subcontracts.

This is another example of unnecessary expenditures in our Defense Department as a result of its failure to exercise normal business practices in soliciting competitive bids in all instances where they are economically feasible.

This is an indefensible waste of taxpayers' money and a practice which should have been corrected long ago.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Comptroller General's report be included in my statement at this point in the RECORD, including the letter which is addressed to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated September 17, 1962.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1962.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Enclosed is our report on examination of the pricing of screwjack assemblies for F–106 airplanes under Department of the Air Force negotiated fixed-price subcontracts awarded by Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif. (now General Dynamics Corp., San Diego), to Lear, Inc., Grand Rapids, Mich.

The report shows that, although Lear was the sole source supplier of screwjack assemblies for F–106 airplanes, Convair generally accepted Lear's quoted prices without obtaining cost data or other pertinent information in support of the prices. Consequently, neither the prime contractor nor the Air Force had a sound basis for determining whether the prices quoted were reasonable. On the basis of computations which we made, using data taken from Lear's formal records and available to Lear at the time its price quotations were submitted to Convair, prices totaling about $1,579,000 for negotiated fixed-price subcontracts awarded Lear for screwjack assemblies from August 1958 to April 1960 were about $439,000 or 39 percent higher than costs previously experienced in producing like assemblies. In the performance of these subcontracts, we estimated that Lear experienced total costs of about $1,038,000 and profit of about 52 percent of cost.

In commenting on our finding, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force advised us that neither the prime contractor nor the subcontractor had established the reasonableness of the prices of the subcontracts covered by our report, or any other considerations which would render such prices reasonable because of equitable pricing factors not reflected in the report. The Air Force requested Convair to obtain an appropriate adjustment from Lear, and Convair made a demand on Lear, but Lear has not indicated whether or not a refund will be made.

Subsequent to award of the subcontracts described in this report, the Air Force and the Department of Defense have introduced a number of measures aimed toward improving the pricing of contracts. We believe that the measures taken, if properly executed, should contribute significantly to the negotiation of fair and reasonable contract prices and to the prevention of recurrences of the deficiencies which occurred in the pricing of the subcontracts described in this report. However, the extent to which these measures are effective will depend upon the degree to which they are applied by contracting officials. We believe also that it is inequitable for a contractor to realize finan-

cial benefits as a result of its failure to furnish available cost information or other evidence in support of the reasonableness of the prices established. We are recommending, therefore, that the Secretary of the Air Force take aggressive action to obtain for the Government an equitable adjustment of the prices of Convair's subcontracts with Lear.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Air Force.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION—SUBCONTRACT PRICES ESTABLISHED FOR SCREWJACK ASSEMBLIES WERE HIGH IN RELATION TO COSTS PREVIOUSLY EXPERIENCED BY THE SOLE-SOURCE SUPPLIER IN PRODUCING LIKE ITEMS

Although Lear was the sole-source supplier of screwjack assemblies for F-106 airplanes, Convair generally accepted Lear's quoted prices without obtaining cost data or other pertinent information in support of the prices. Consequently, neither the prime contractor nor the Air Force had a sound basis for determining whether the prices quoted were reasonable. On the basis of computations which we made, using data taken from Lear's formal records and available to Lear at the time its price quotations were submitted to Convair, prices totaling about $1,579,000 for negotiated fixed-price subcontracts awarded Lear for screwjack assemblies from August 1958 to April 1960 were about $439,000 or 39 percent higher than costs previously experienced in producing like assemblies. In the performance of these subcontracts we estimated that Lear experienced total costs of about $1,038,000 and profit of about 52 percent of cost.

On September 20, 1956, Convair invited proposals from three companies for development of screwjack assemblies and certain other components for the F-106 airplane. Lear was selected on the basis of technical capability and the lowest competitive prices, and late in September 1956 Lear was awarded subcontracts by Convair for the initial procurement of two types of screwjack assemblies. Subsequently, there were many design changes in the assemblies as the development progressed, and it was not until mid-1958 that the designs became relatively stable. However, Convair did not invite competitive bids subsequent to the initial procurement because it believed that procurement of these items from another supplier would most likely result in the duplication of costs for qualification testing and engineering. Thus, follow-on orders, including those discussed in this report, were awarded to Lear on a sole-source basis.

The basic designs of the screwjack assemblies designated as models 533 A and B and models 534 A and B were developed by Lear on a prototype basis, and the first units produced were tested on F-102 aircraft. Successive design changes requested by Convair during 1957 resulted in the development of models 533 E and F and models 534 E and F screwjack assemblies. During 1958, models 533 E and F were redesigned to replace an aluminum gear housing with a steel-forged housing, and were designated as models 533 G and H. Except for the gear housing and an added thrust ring, similar component parts were used in producing models 533 E and F and models 533 G and H. During the period from August 28, 1958, through completion of shipments under subcontracts awarded on April 18, 1960, Lear produced and shipped 5,412 screwjack assemblies to Convair under negotiated fixed-price subcontracts.

Although on several occasions Convair requested lower prices for the screwjack assemblies, Lear refused to reduce its prices except on orders for larger quantities. Convair accepted the prices quoted by Lear, generally on the basis of preceding subcontract prices, which Convair considered to be reasonable because (1) the prices remained fairly stable as compared to the competitive prices initially obtained and (2) reduced prices were quoted for purchases of larger quantities. However, we estimate, on the basis of computations made from information taken from Lear's formal records, that the prices quoted by Lear generally exceeded its recently experienced costs by amounts ranging from 26 to 128 percent. In October 1958 Lear furnished Convair a cost summary in support of the unit price of $309 quoted for models 534 E and F screwjack assemblies. This price consisted of an estimated unit cost of $283 plus a profit of $26, or about 9 percent of the cost. On the basis of our estimates, Lear's costs of producing screwjack assemblies during the period from July through September 1958 averaged only $237 a unit. Except for this one procurement, we found no evidence that either Convair or the Air Force obtained from Lear price analyses, information on costs experienced in recent production of like items, or other data to support the reasonableness of the prices quoted by the subcontractor.

PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, which were, on page 1, line 6, strike out all after "Nations." down through and including "loan" in line 7, and insert "The proceeds of such loan"; on page 1, line 8, strike out "states"; on page 1, line 10, after "assessments" insert ", and shall not be used to reduce regular or special assessments against any such members"; on page 2, line 1, after "The" insert "total"; on page 2, line 1, strike out "to be lent" and insert "that may be loaned"; on page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "by more than $25,000,000"; on page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "or agreed to be made"; on page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike out "makes unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing" and insert "will avoid any future large-scale deficits"; on page 2, line 19, after "borrowing." insert "the The Department of State is hereby instructed to submit to the Congress, not later than January 31, 1963, a report on steps taken in the 17th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations."; on page 2, after line 19, insert:

SEC. 5. The Congress hereby expresses its satisfaction that the International Court of Justice has decided that the expenditures authorized in resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly relating to operations in the Middle East and in the Congo are "expenses of the Organization" within the meaning of the United Nations Charter, thereby providing a sound basis for obtaining prompt payment of assessments for such expenditures by making them obligations of all members of the United Nations.

On page 2, after line 19, insert:

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should take immediate steps to give effect to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the financial obligations of members of the United Nations in order to assure prompt payment of all assessments, including assessments to cover the cost of operations to maintain or restore international peace and security.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before moving that the Senate concur in the House amendments, I wish to remind Members of the principal provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate, and then note the changes made by the House.

The Senate version authorized the appropriation of $100 million for a loan, or loans, to the United Nations. However, at no time were the loans of the United States to exceed by more than $25 million the aggregate amount of loans to the United Nations by other nations.

The House amended this provision so as to require that at no time should the sums loaned by the United States exceed the aggregate loaned by other nations. In other words, the U.S. loans are not to be more than the total amount loaned by other states.

This change tightened the provisions of the bill and I believe it is desirable.

A second change made by the House was insertion of a provision which states without qualification that U.S. funds loaned to the United Nations are not to be used to reduce the regular or special assessments of any other member. The administration had already made that decision last spring when it made public its opposition to any continuation of the past practice of applying voluntary contributions to reduce the obligations of other U.N. members to pay their fair share of United Nations expenses.

A final change of significance concerns the advisory opinion of the World Court finding that assessments levied for peacekeeping purposes are regular expenses of the organization and as such members are obliged to pay such assessments. The House of Representatives commended this opinion and expressed the hope that the General Assembly will make it clear that states which may in the future become delinquent will be subject to the penalties of the charter.

I believe all these amendments have strengthened the provisions of S. 2768 and that the Senate should adopt them.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the explanation by the Senator from Alabama is an accurate description of the conference report and its contents. I concur with him in the statement that the Senate would be acting wisely to accept the House version. It is a better-written and stronger bill than the one which passed the Senate. It makes very clear to the United Nations that it must put its financial house in order if it is to expect generous support from us. I hope the amendments of the House will be concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to develop the intention behind the requirement that there be a purchase of bonds by other member states of the United Nations before we match their purchases. I should like to inquire about the manner in which we would match purchases. Let us assume that one of the member states is seriously delinquent in its assessment. Let us say further that it is over 2 years behind in assessments. Nevertheless, it purchases some bonds. In that situation, would we purchase bonds to match their purchases?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If they paid their money for the bonds, under the terms of the bill, we would. The Senator will remember that an amendment was offered in the Senate which would have provided that no bonds would be subscribed for if nations were behind in their assessments. That amendment was voted down by the Senate. Every effort will be made to collect the back assessments. As a matter of fact, one item to which I called attention finds favor with the decision of the International Court with reference to the obligation on peace and security operations, and calls upon the United Nations to approve that decision, so that hereafter nations which get behind will be subject to penalty.

Mr. MILLER. The point I wish to make is that if we have a situation in which a delinquent member nevertheless somehow or another finds the wherewithal to buy some bonds, how is this going to affect that provision which states that no part of the proceeds of these bonds shall be used to satisfy any of the obligations of any of the member nations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There would be no effect on that provision. If we look at the United Nations Charter, we find—and I believe I am correct in this—that any member of the U.N. which is more than 2 years behind in the payment of its dues is supposed to lose its right to vote. Whether that provision is being enforced, I do not know. I recall that that is a part of the charter. There is no connection between this provision and delinquent dues.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have with us a new member of our delegation to the United Nations, the Senator from Colorado, who may be able to shed some light on this subject.

Mr. MILLER. I am familiar with what the Senator from Montana has said. What I am trying to bring out is whether there might be a subtle way of getting around the provision which is now in the bill, to the effect that the proceeds of these bonds cannot in any way be used to defray or cover the expenses or the delinquencies of any of the member nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is no connection between the case the Senator is talking about and these payments, the sums that might help other nations, because the proceeds of these bonds are for the purpose of paying the peace and security operations. Provision is made that none of the proceeds shall be used for the purpose of helping delinquent nations.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that to be the situation. However, let us say that the Soviet Union, for example, which is so very much delinquent, suddenly decides that it will use some money for the purchase of bonds instead of paying its assessments for the Congo operations. Would it not be a frustration of the objective of this provision in the bill, that the proceeds of these bonds will not be used to cover these delinquencies of any of the members, if the Soviet Union were to do that? The Soviet Union in that situation would in effect strap the Congo operation by refusing to pay its assessment for that operation and turn the money into an investment in U.N. bonds. I am wondering if the Senator might not agree with me on that point, namely, that there could be a frustration of the objective which has now been written into the bill by the conferees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. There is no connection between those situations. I do not see how there could possibly be a frustration of the purposes of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. This is only a temporary solution of the United Nations financial troubles. If the entire $200 million worth of bonds were sold or loans to the amount of $200 million were made, that would probably suffice to carry the United Nations expenditures in the Congo and elsewhere only until sometime next spring, and the United Nations would then have to make other arrangements.

It is true that some countries—and it it is a little disgusting, too—which have declined to pay their assessments for the Congo have been willing to buy bonds because the bonds are repayable over a 25-year period; and if the nations do not pay their assessments, they perhaps think they will be in so much. However, I think most nations were waiting to see whether the World Court would hold that assessments for the Congo and the Middle East were binding assessments or not. Now that the World Court has found that the assessments are binding, it is up to the United Nations itself to implement the court decision and require the delinquent nations to pay their dues.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. One of the amendments of the House in which the Senate is being asked to concur is an expression of the sense of Congress—of the Government of the United States—to the United Nations that the United Nations should implement the decision of the World Court. It is believed that if that is done, the nations which heretofore have refused to pay for peace and security operations will pay for them, because if they do not, they will be subject to a penalty, the same as with respect to the regular budget.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, a brandnew member of the United Nations delegation.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for yielding.

With respect to the question which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has just asked, the record ought to be perfectly clear that I do not believe there is any connection between the purchase of bonds and the matter of assessments or becoming delinquent. As the Senator from Vermont has said, one of the first tasks which faces the United Nations is to implement the decision of the World Court in such a way that it will become a part and parcel of the record of the United Nations. In that case, Russia's payments to the United Nations on the special assessment for the Congo and the Middle East operations would fall in the same category as do the regular assessments. This may be a difficult task to accomplish, but it will have to be done during this session of the General Assembly.

If the proposed legislation is enacted—and I like the present bill; I think the matching provisions are very good—we can expect that we will not have any trouble with the sale of the bonds. There has been a recent interest and an influx of promises by nations which have been waiting on us to do the job. This will make it much easier to finance the bonds.

With respect to the 2-year limitation, I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Iowa that Russia is not badly in arrears now; and the cumulative effect of the provisions should be understood. Most people claim that if a nation has not paid for all or a part of 2 years, it is in arrears and therefore cannot vote. Actually, the rule provides that a nation must be in arrears for as much as a total of 2 years' assessments.

Mr. AIKEN. The 2 preceding years.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. So a nation could, by paying a certain amount, stall for some time; but eventually the arrears must creep up on it to the point where it would actually lose its vote, although this has not been done. No member of the United Nations today is in arrears to the extent provided by the 2-year rule.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a matter of interest to note that Russia has never been in arrears with her regular assessments.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. She has kept up her payments, and so have practically all the other nations. One nation that I think of has not. Only one of the larger powers has been behind in its payments, and I think the reason is quite understandable. But, as I recall, that nation has never been more than 2 years behind in its payments.

Mr. AIKEN. If Russia does not pay anything on the Congo and Middle East assessments, she will doubtless become delinquent about 1964.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is only a guess on my part, but I believe it will be about 1964.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that Russia will not permit herself to become delinquent to the extent of losing her vote in the General Assembly, although she would still retain her position in the Security Council and the veto power in the Security Council whether she were delinquent in assessments or not.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The denial of the right to vote is not automatic; it must be imposed by a vote of the General Assembly. The importance of that rule is that it makes a very clear distinction that there is no forgiveness of any arrears, because the General Assembly could act notwithstanding whether a nation bought bonds or not in an effort to shade the situation for itself. But it does require affirmative action; therefore no obligation is canceled or forgiven, because affirmative action by the General Assembly remains capable of being taken at any stage of the proceeding, whatever may be bought.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the information which the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Colorado have provided. The Senator from Iowa is still not satisfied. I am more than happy to see the United States put up dollar for dollar on the purchase of bonds to match the purchases by some member nation which has been practicing fiscal responsibility at the United Nations and is reasonably current in its payment of assessments. But I am not very happy about the United States putting up dollar for dollar to purchase bonds to match the purchases by a member nation which is not practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations and is delinquent.

I suggest that any nation—and I understand from the Senator from Vermont that there are a few—which has seen fit to use money which otherwise should be used to pay for the expenses of the United Nations according to its legitimate assessments in order to buy United Nations bonds is not in very good face before the membership.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I find nothing to quarrel with in the statement of the Senator from Iowa. I, too, should like to see bonds bought by nations which are completely paid up in every respect. But what we are deciding today is whether the House bill is preferable to the Senate bill. In other words, would the Senator from Iowa prefer to take the amendments which the House added to the bill, or would he prefer to send the Senate to a conference to arrive at some adjustment as between the two versions? I am proposing that we accept the House bill. I think the Senator from Iowa would say that the House bill pleases him more than does the bill which passed the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Alabama knows that I believe I speak for most Senators on this side of the aisle when I say we recognize that the House provisions make this a tighter bill, and that it has a tendency to provide for greater responsibility on the part of the membership of the United Nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree.

Mr. MILLER. So the Senator from Iowa is much happier with the House bill. Nevertheless, I think I have a duty to point out that a situation could develop—and apparently it already has developed—under which some member nations would seek to try to save face, as they think, by continuing to refuse or persisting in refusing to pay their proper assessments, and would take money they might well use to do so in order to buy bonds, so that the United States and other nations which are practicing financial responsibility would underwrite the bond purchases.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am confident that the U.S. delegation to the 17th General Assembly will have in mind the House amendment in the bill which calls upon the United Nations to help to implement the opinion of the World Court and to instill greater fiscal responsibility in the United Nations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The senior Senator from Colorado has been assigned to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was about to say a few minutes ago that I hoped the Senator would be placed on the Fifth Committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. I assure the Senator, with respect to the statement he has just made, that the situation will be amply called to the attention of the General Assembly.

I also wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I really do not think any nation will save face, so to speak, by purchasing the bonds, whether that nation is delinquent in the payment of its assessments or not. I can conceive of Russia's not paying her assessments, although I do not agree to any extent with such a course. But once we have implemented the decision of the World Court in the United Nations, these become assessments in the regular sense, and Russia will be before the gun, the same as any other nation will be; and then we can see what will be done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we should make a part of the debate the point that under the House version of the bill and under the Senate version, as passed, the President is not required to buy these bonds. He can use the money for making short-term loans or long-term loans or to purchase the bonds.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and that provision of the House version is identical with the corresponding provision of the Senate version.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. By giving the President that leeway, he will have a great deal more leverage to exert in insisting that the United Nations put its house in order. When that is done, he can assist it in getting out of its financial stringency, so long as he does not make loans or purchase bonds in amounts in excess of the amounts purchased by other members of the United Nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And not to exceed $100 million.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

As regards smaller countries which agreed to purchase bonds, even though they are behind in their assessments, I think most of them were waiting to find out what the decision of the World Court would be. I have felt that now that the World Court's decision has been implemented by the General Assembly, nearly all of them will meet their obligations—most of them being rather small.

I am glad the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is a member of the Fifth Committee, which is the workhorse committee of the United Nations; and since the veto power has rendered the Security Council almost impotent on important matters, the Fifth Committee is perhaps one of the strongest factors in the entire United Nations establishment. I am sure the Senator from Colorado will do an excellent job there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Inasmuch as I served on the Second Committee, perhaps I would not be willing to agree to all that the Senator from Vermont has said about the Fifth Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I was on the Fifth Committee. Its work is frequently so unglamorous that there are seldom many persons in the galleries.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether the House amendment that states that—

> It is the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should take immediate steps to give effect to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice—

And so forth, is purely expressing our opinion, and has no binding effect on the United Nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Except to this extent—and I do not believe the Senator from South Carolina heard the statement of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], made a few minutes ago. I stated that I felt certain that the U.S. delegation to the United Nations would have this point in mind and would do its best to get it implemented; and the Senator from Colorado stated that he had been assigned to the Fifth Committee—which is the fiscal committee of the United Nations—and said he could give us assurance that this matter would be pressed. I feel certain not only that it will be pressed by our delegation, but also that it will be accepted by the United Nations.

Mr. THURMOND. If this section had been worded as follows:

> No funds shall be made available under this authorization until such time as the United Nations gives effect to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice—

And so forth, then we would be assured, would we not, that proper action would be taken before this loan arrangement would take effect?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course the Senator from South Carolina is correct. But it is too late to speak of what might have been, because the bill has already

been passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate; and now the question is either on concurring in the House amendments or on arriving at some version between the two.

Mr. THURMOND. I feel that the House has improved the bill by means of its amendments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. But the bill still does not overcome my objections.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course the bill is not perfect, and I do not suppose it entirely pleases any of us.

Mr. THURMOND. I am also of the opinion that the various nations should pay their assessments, under the decisions of the International Court of Justice, which is known as the World Court.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. And I believe we should pay our part, but no more, and that we should not be required to put in any additional funds or to make loans to the United Nations to make up for the failure of other countries to pay their fair share. If the various countries paid their assessments, this loan would not be necessary, would it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If they had paid them as they went along, yes. But now it will take the United Nations some time to work out of this fiscal situation. However, I am confident it will work out of it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the House version is an improvement over the Senate version; but I still believe we are making a mistake by granting a loan, over and above our fair share, to the United Nations.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Senators will recall that one of the objections I had at the time of the passage of the Senate version of the bill was that I thought it was premature; I thought we should wait until after the World Court had rendered its advisory opinion. Unfortunately, that was not done.

But I think the House has wisely decided to do so; and, following the opinion of the World Court, which cleared the air regarding the status of nations which are behind in the payment of their assessments, and bore out the expectations of the proponents of the bill, now the measure is again before the Senate and I think it is now timely. So I wish to make clear that I believe my original objection has been removed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this measure was the subject of long debate, much controversy, and great discussion throughout the country. I believe the controversy is now happily settled, and I believe the measure as it now stands marks a commitment by the people of the United States to the United Nations which should not be overlooked. I believe it represents a very serious and important understanding that we are relying heavily upon this agency in connection with trying to have a rule of law in the world replace the rule of force.

The significance of this measure should not be overlooked merely because the debate took place some time ago. I am delighted that this action has been taken, and I believe it important to the United States, to the United Nations, and to the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join in the remarks of Senators, and I express full confidence in two of the most able Members of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who are serving as full delegates this year and who know whereof the Senator has spoken.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the privilege of concurring in what the Senator from Montana has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 2768.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate concurred in the House amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE AND ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, acting jointly on the so-called Cuban resolution, may have until midnight tonight to file their report.

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

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, soil and water conservation is clearly a national responsibility held in common by all of our citizens. At the recent convention of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the area of community responsibility was discussed by Mr. Alf Larson. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW HORIZONS IN THE BROAD CONCEPT OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Keynote, as the word is used in the musical terminology, is that particular note which sets the pitch for a musical composition, opus, song etc., and if one is off pitch, the song is flat.

It is my sincere hope, that I, in a humble way, may be permitted to set the pitch for this area meeting at a level conducive to the regeneration of energy and enthusiasm for a program in which we are all vitally interested, a program we are proud to be a part of, a program we have helped develop, a program that has proven itself as a step in the right direction as to proper utilization and development of our natural resources, and above all, a program that has given conclusive evidence as to what farmers and ranchers can accomplish through a united and concerted effort. Yes, my friends, this is our program, and we do not want it to go flat.

"Light is the load where many share the toil" is the motto of one of our largest cooperative shipping associations here in the Twin City area. I could not resist the temptation to use it at this time, because I felt it is so appropriate and it so effectively reflects my thinking—that whatever progress we have made in promoting conservation, whatever plateau of success has been attained—it can all justifiably be credited to a fervent desire and a rigid determination for a unified approach to reach an ultimate goal—that distant horizon when some day every acre of land in these United States will be treated according to their needs and utilized within their capabilities—and I would like to add—for the most good to all people.

The theme, "New Horizons in the Broad Concept of Soil and Water Conservation," is indicative of two facts: (1) That we have reached certain horizons and (2) that having reached these horizons we discover, not only opportunities, but also the need for new ones.

Webster's Dictionary defines the word, "horizon," as a range of perception or experience, and that leaves me to conclude that with the experience gained in the past, we have grown in stature; we have learned to project our thinking to a point where it now behooves us to evaluate our present situation and to implement our knowledge and experience into a program more far reaching and more comprehensive than any we have heretofore attempted.

Engaging in a bit of retrospect, we are reminded of the fact that districts were originally established for the primary purpose of erosion control and soil conservation.

With your indulgence, I would like to use a little more picturesque hyperbole. It was a mild attempt to salve the wounds inflicted upon Mother Earth through improper land use, indifference, carelessness, and ignorance.

Although there is still much to be done to get more conserving practices on the land, other methods of approach, to solve the same problem, were initiated. We learned that soil conservation and water conservation went hand in hand and that the two were inseparable.

We learned that one farmer's efforts was not enough to effectively protect him from the excess water runoff from the rest of the neighbors above him in the same watershed. This became the start of the small watershed program, which has been so successful where completed.

The Great Plains program has proven to be an effective tool in the implementation of more conservation practices in the Plains area.

The ASC program, with its cost sharing features, has proven effective. I always like to refer to this program as the one where the American public invests, with cooperating farmers, tax money for the assurance of permanent protection of our soil resources of benefit to present and future generations.

The soil stewardship program has called our attention to our moral obligations as custodians of God's possessions. Educational programs, in cooperation with State and local institutions, are steadily improving the teaching methods on conservation, correlating it with various subjects in the curriculum.

Many districts have already cooperated in the development of wildlife and recreational areas, reforestration and forest management, tree planting, shelterbelting, and tree planting for farmsteads. Field days and plow matches, tours, and many, many other promotional features that all add up to one big factor—that the local soil conservation district has definitely shown its ability to work not only with land, but also with people, and I wish to state most emphatically that any

program contemplated to work with land and people may well be directed through the local district.

The local district in its pursuits and with capable leadership will need, can find, and can use and cooperate with people of various professions in all walks of life. It is in a position to provide additional services, help, and information to any program designed to make your community a better place to live in.

The decision is up to you. Are you going to sit back and let somebody else take a hold, perhaps a new agency, or are you going to offer your services and leadership as well as willingness to accept added responsibility?

I can visualize opportunities for the attainment of distant horizons through an ambitious program designed to meet the needs of our modern agriculture through long range planning, not precluding the part land and water and people will play in a coordinated effort to satisfy the anticipated need for rural area development, industrial expansion, locations for bigger and better highways, airports, and recreation. I can visualize local parks with artificial ponds or small lakes suitable for swimming, boating, and fishing.

For the small farmer, supplemental income opportunities must be provided through an area development program that gives credence to the proper and most effective use of all natural resources within the district.

Rural zoning and planning have gained prominence as a tool for effective regulatory and protective laws for proper use of resources commensurate with needs and locations. Remember, soil conservation districts are in an enviable position. They not only know what is in, on, or above the ground, but they also have a pretty good idea what is under it.

Urban expansion into rural areas is becoming more and more in need of help and attention.

Many districts find themselves in a position to help metropolitan areas solve their water shortage problems as well as controlling air and water pollution. The small watershed program is working well in some States, in others not at all. What is the reason? Are your laws too cumbersome? Is there lack of advance information and education? Are the farmers indifferent and fail to recognize the need, or is the cost factor the main reason for poor participation? How do you purport to attain this horizon?

Yes, friends, there are many horizons yet to mention, but we better stop a minute and ask ourselves the question, Where is the technical help coming from if we take on these added responsibilities?

With the complexities involved, we no doubt will need men specially trained to cope with specialized problems, and my first suggestion would be that every district take another long look at the area involved, dig out the old work plan, and then with projective thinking, begin to make the proper changes implementing into the new work plan every conceivable idea that will make for an expanded and comprehensive program inclusive of what you have heard and will hear. On the basis of this, request a new memorandum of understanding with the Secretary of Agriculture at which time you can also mention the need for additional manpower. If all districts in the United States would do this, I believe we could stir up a commotion sufficiently loud to open up the doors of our Treasury Department.

Let us also bear in mind there are other agencies, State and Federal, capable of providing assistance to districts. In Minnesota, for instance, districts have signed agreements with the forestry, and also, the game and fish division in our conservation department. We have also approved the wording of an agreement with the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service.

Coming back to the theme of this area meeting, I am fully convinced it is going to take a great deal of imagination, fortitude, and perseverance to not only sell this program to districts, but more so, to sell districts to the program. A report issued by the Department of Agriculture states: "How we conserve, manage, and develop these natural resources will effect our economic growth, the strength of our Nation, and our long-range statures in world affairs." In the recently issued Policy Guide of the USDA, it makes reference to 12 recommended elements considered of major importance:

1. Resource uses that will yield continuing maximum benefits.
2. Opportunities for earning adequate farm income.
3. Conservation of land and water resources.
4. Owner operation of family enterprises and an equitable distribution of land and water resource income.
5. Efficient family-type operations.
6. Intensified rural area planning.
7. Expanded participation in rural-urban planning.
8. Increased efficiency in water use.
9. Prevention of water and air pollution.
10. Improved fish and wildlife habitat and expanded recreational facilities.
11. Utilization of all resources and authorities of the Department.
12. Participating in planning at all levels.

I believe you will concur with my thinking that this is a tailormade program for districts. Of necessity, this type of program will have to be administered on a local level, by people familiar with local conditions and local thinking. If local people want to maintain their identity and manifest their belief in home rule and self-government, now is the time to come forward and be counted. This is the type of program that will separate the men from the boys, and I am confident we have the men as well as the ability.

Lest we forget, ladies and gentlemen, we raised this national association from a little infant. We nursed it and pampered it through trials and tribulations; we fed it a balanced ration of hope, sincerity, faith, and devotion, where today it has emerged as the acclaimed leader in the problems on soil and water conservation. We have reached this favorable and important position because of people like you who were willing to give of your time, energy, and finances in support of an organization you have helped reach national recognition. I hope the time will never come to pass when we will consider ourselves incapable of coping with any situation and problem that may arise, and resort to others to do our thinking for us. This is our organization, let us keep it that way.

In conclusion, I would like to paraphrase a statement taken from a church bulletin: "Our greatness will lie, not in the land, the food, or the resources we possess, but in our administration of them for the welfare of all men."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12711) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Tuesday, Sept. 18, 1962, pp. 19698–19703, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a very important bill. The total of the bill is about $12 billion. It involves 24 independent agencies of the Federal Government. It was a long time in coming over from the House. We held quite lengthy hearings, and finally went to conference. The bill is in the amount of $11,567,292,100.

The conference between the House and the Senate was quite satisfactory on most items. Most of them were resolved, I think, to the satisfaction of both the Senate and the House. There was a little give and take here and there.

For civil defense in the Department of Defense, the item for "Operation and maintenance" is covered in the conference report. The estimate was $126,245,000, the House allowed $65 million, the Senate amendment raised it to $91,200,000, and the conference agreed on $75 million.

Also under this item are the matching funds for administrative expenses in the States, estimated at $18 million. The House allowed $12 million, the Senate amendment restored the estimate, and the conference agreed on $13,500,000.

The item for "Shelter, research and development, and construction," together with a modification of the fallout shelter language, was in actual disagreement and was taken back to the House for a separate vote, as shown in the message from the House to be next considered.

On that item, the estimate of $568,755,000 included $460 million for a new program of shelter incentives in the form of grants to cover a portion of the cost of constructing fallout shelters in certain nonprofit institutions, which has not been authorized, and the President has requested that hearings on such authorization be held early next year. The House allowed $10 million for research only, and the Senate amendment restored the amount for the complete item to $93,800,000, mainly for the purpose of continuing to survey, mark, and stock existing shelters.

It will be recalled that this is being done by the Department of Defense under an Executive order. Specifically, the Army Engineers are doing the survey and marking. The House cut the budget amount of $568 million to $10 million, and that was for research only. The Senate provided for $93 million. This is one of the items in dispute and in disagreement.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I complete my statement first?

For helicopter operations, the estimate was $5,850,000, the House allowed $4,975,000, the Senate amendment raised the amount to $10 million with a proviso, suggested by the Senator from Georgia, that not to exceed 25 percent shall be available in any one area. The

conference agreed to strike the proviso and allow $5 million for the subsidy, and stated in the report:

The conferees agree that the subsidies for helicopters should be ended shortly—that this service should either be made self-supporting or concluded. It is recommended that the appropriate committees of the Congress give their earnest consideration to this problem in 1963.

For construction of public buildings projects, the Senate amendments restored the amounts for fallout protection and the average reduction of 7 percent in cost levels, and added funds for Billings, Mont.; Baltimore, Md.; Tulsa, Okla.; Montpelier, Vt.; and Richland, Wash. The conference agreed to all the projects added by the Senate, adjusted the cost levels to a 5-percent reduction, and eliminated all funds for fallout protection.

These are the main items in the conference on which there was some disagreement, but which have been worked out, with the exception of the ones on civil defense.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I make my motion first?

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, do I have the floor? A motion has been made. I understand that means I can obtain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. A parliamentary inquiry. If we adopt the conference report does that have the effect of denying us a separate vote upon the item in disagreement which the Senator referred to with respect to the identification and stocking of civil defense shelters?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported as being in disagreement are voted on after the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. So the whole conference report may be adopted without depriving us of that opportunity?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. My second parliamentary inquiry is, on the motion to recede on the item in disagreement——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am going to make a motion to insist upon our $93 million item, but first we must agree to the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. That is just the point. Am I to understand that the Senator from Washington intends to take the position that the Senate will insist on our amendment, and, if the Senator is sustained in that motion, we will return to conference on that item?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I intend to move that the Senate insist on amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 119, and we would like to have the others agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. If the motion of the Senator from Washington which he has just stated he intends to make is carried, is the parliamentary situation that the same conferees will return to conference for the limited purpose of dealing with the particular items in disagreement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has the right to appoint new conferees if it desires to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the conference be limited to the item or items in disagreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe it would be a great mistake for us to do anything but insist on this item. I am delighted to hear the Senator from Washington say what he has said. Personally, I would back him to the hilt. The parliamentary situation, so far as I can see, would fully protect us.

Before I conclude my remarks, I wish to compliment the Senator for the solution in regard to helicopter service. What was provided was much better than the rather strange limitation previously stated. I think everyone would be more than anxious to give Atlanta an opportunity when, as and if it is ready to get into helicopter transportation.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Do I correctly understand that the helicopter item was in disagreement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I merely reported what we agreed.

Mr. KEATING. What the Senator reported has been agreed upon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It has been agreed upon.

Mr. KEATING. It will go through, then, barring unforeseen trouble.

Again I reiterate my discomfort over the fact that there is no way, by looking at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to know what the House has done with regard to the conference report. The House considered it yesterday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yesterday afternoon.

Mr. KEATING. When a person looks at the RECORD he does not see any reference to helicopters. When a Senator looks at the RECORD, he does not see any reference to what the House has done. It is necessary to wait until the question is discussed on the Senate floor, before we can know what is the issue.

I think the issue has been well resolved. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Washington. I think what has been provided is preferable to what we previously did.

This has worried me, as it has some other Senators who have mentioned it. We cannot tell from this "numbers game" of "amendment numbered so-and-so" by looking at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what has been done with respect to helicopters. As I understand the situation, there is nothing in the entire RECORD of yesterday's proceedings in the other body which contains anything on the subject, or which gives any clues to what has been done.

The Senator from Washington is very busy. We cannot all call him whenever the appropriation bill is to come before the Senate.

I wish there could be some joint action on the part of the Appropriations Committees. I wish my distinguished friend from Washington would take this subject up with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee in the other body, who I am sure is a relatively flexible man in his dealings and who will be happy to conform to what seems to be so reasonable, to see whether there is some way that we who are uninitiated and uninformed members of other committees can know in advance what the other body has done, so that we can be ready to take a position when the question comes up in the Senate. Will the Senator please talk to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations on that subject?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Naturally, the RECORD of the House proceedings refers to the conference report, which was printed. All the amendments are numbered. The report points out what was done. The report was printed before the bill was taken up in the House. This must be done by reference.

Mr. KEATING. By reference to the House proceedings?

Mr. MAGNUSON. By reference to the conference report. There is a report by the conferees.

Mr. KEATING. That was printed and available?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. When?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over the weekend.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me, if the Senator from New York has completed his questioning?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know there are certain items of interest to several Senators. That is why I referred to certain items in the presentation.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did that even though the items were agreed to by both bodies.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will recall that in the conference committee the amendment which denied the right of the General Services Administration to use appropriated funds to make long-term leases of new buildings was discussed by the conferees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am quite interested in the situation in regard to the Federal Aviation Agency Center at Oklahoma City.

I am advised by the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices that he has written to the Administrator of General Services Administration that language in the committee bill is not intended to affect in any regard the projects that have previously cleared the Appropriations Subcommittee and had secured their approval. I would like to ask the Senator in charge of consideration of this bill if that is his understanding. I want to be doubly sure that we have a correct interpretive understanding in regard to this matter. Since last year certain projects at Oklahoma City in the Federal

Aviation Agency Center were approved, and GSA and FAA were given authority to proceed, I wish to be sure that what the conference on appropriations did last year is still effective in regard to those projects.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is the understanding of the conferees of both the House and the Senate, based upon the facts, that there are two lease construction facilities for FAA at the Oklahoma City airport—a base maintenance facility and a records storage and cafeteria building.

A year ago the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. THOMAS], in a meeting with Mr. Halaby, of the FAA, and the GSA public buildings group, agreed they could go ahead with these lease construction projects.

On the base maintenance facility, there is no problem as it is now under contract and will be ready for construction about March 1.

For the records storage and cafeteria building, the proposal has just been received by GSA from FAA and is being reviewed. To receive bids and award a contract will require several weeks—after the pending bill has become law.

In agreeing to recede on Senate amendment No. 97, the conferees understood that the requirements to get authorization for such projects would not apply to the Oklahoma City airport project.

This agreement could be confirmed by letters from the appropriations committees, in order to allow the GSA administrator to go ahead on the basis that this project was agreed to beforehand and not meant to be covered by the restriction in the general provision.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, it was cleared previously by the committee on conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. This makes it doubly sure that we have a correct interpretive understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the chairman.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say a word first about the civil defense functions.

There was $568 million in the budget estimates. The committee made a recommendation of $93 million, which was passed by the Senate. The House was quite adamant in its position. The House conferees insisted that only $10 million be retained.

Sometime, somewhere, we in the Congress of the United States must decide what to do about civil defense. If we are not to appropriate anything worth while, we might as well throw out the $10 million and save it, also. We eliminated the provision for some 750 mobile hospitals, which were requested. Already there are 3,000 available. We felt that was sufficient to serve the purpose.

The present program contemplates the marking, the stocking, and the fixing up of buildings, not merely around in a little center, but around the peripheries of areas, where the Defense Department has decided the program would be worthwhile. Mr. Pittman spoke for the office. He said it would be possible to save the lives of 60 million people from radiation and fallout if we do the job.

We heard a lot said in the conference committee, making fun of dog biscuits and storing water, or something like that, but it is not possible to put people in fallout shelters and expect them to live without food and water for a period of 10 days, 2 weeks, or 3 weeks.

I do not like skirting around the edges of the problem, poking fun at the whole program. I know the program has never gotten off its feet. I know it has never been supported by the American people.

We serve as Senators representing the American people. At some time we must "fish or cut bait" on this issue. This is the place to do it. This is the reason why we must send the item back in disagreement, because the absolute minimum with which the agency can begin to do the job is $56 million.

If we do not wish to do anything, let us strike out all the appropriation for civil defense and get rid of it. Let us then get rid of the albatross around our necks, and forget about it.

But whether the American people as a whole can become enthusiastic enough about the program to support it, as an individual Senator I feel that it is my duty to take the responsibility for seeing that we do what I have proposed with relation to civil defense. In the present situation of the world, I for one cannot see abandoning my responsibility. We must face the question. We are not talking about the difference between an appropriation of $10 billion and $93 million. What we are really trying to decide, and what we must decide, is whether we are going along with the civil defense program or whether we are going to kick it out and forget about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. That was the point I was trying to make before. I identify with him fully in his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I can save a good deal of time by saying that the Senator from Colorado has stated the case eloquently and factually. I thoroughly agree. I believe we should put up a fight on this subject and finish it once and for all. The civil defense program is as much a part of national defense as Offutt Air Base or any other part of our defense structure. We cannot have a serious defense program unless we try to protect the public. It seems to me that what we provided for in the Senate bill was a modicum, only a small beginning. I hope that we will retain it. We should go back to conference on that point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for stating the case so well. He has sustained the views of the chairman. We stated the same case to the House conferees. I finally said, "We will take it back in disagreement." That is what we had to do.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished chairman and associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. Actually the figures are a little worse than have been stated, as far as what the House did, and what the able Senator reported. The appropriation for shelters was cut from $93,800,000 to $10 million.

I present to the Senate the fact the original civil defense request of the administration was less than one-half of 1 percent of the military budget. That figure was reduced by the Senate, then further heavily reduced in the House.

A poll was taken by Elmer Roper Associates with respect to the program of the civil defense agency. Eighty-six percent of those polled approved the program. As one who saw in the Battle of Britain what a very modest civil defense program, started late, could do from the standpoint of saving lives, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress in effect, as the able Senator from Colorado pointed out, would ditch this program at this time. If there is any justification for the great military budget the American people are now paying for—and I believe there is—surely it makes little or no sense to take this part of the defense budget—considerably less than one-half of 1 percent of the total—and scrap it, for reasons which do not stand up under the facts as they exist in the world today. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] are aware of these figures, but I should like to state for the record that three-quarters of the cost of the project has already been allotted in the 1962 funds. The proposed appropriation would merely complete shelters for about 60 million people at a cost of $3.50 per person.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The overall cost would be $3.50, but a cost of only about $1 per person would be involved in this figure, based on about 185 million people.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I have said so many times, when people in local communities are interested in the subject, an action such as the one proposed would psychologically undermine the morale of the entire program. We have started to build up a fine program through the agency handling it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The able chairman of the committee is so right. If we go through with this almost washing out of the civil defense program, it would be the last time we would get any real interest on the part of the States and the municipalities. As the Senator has pointed out, not only would the proposal not permit us to go forward, but such a sharp retrenchment in funds would cut to pieces what is now being done today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I agree fully with all that has been said with respect to the item of civil defense. We get down basically to the question of how many days during any one session we have an opportunity to vote with confidence on a program that would improve materially the survival opportunity of 60 million American people. We spend a great deal more money than we are discussing now for certain aircraft or rockets. On balance we think we need it. But there is less certainty with respect to the ultimate utilization of those things, if there is a war, than with respect to the utilization of shelters. To stop when we are three-quarters of the way along—to pull the rug out of present operations, as has been said here—when, for the first time, we have a program that has excited the imagination and encouraged the active participation of local communities in civil defense, makes no sense at all. I had hoped that the House would be given a further opportunity to consider the measure. We are not talking about raising the excellence of education or reaching the moon. We are talking about whether we shall put food and water aside in order that mankind may survive in the event of a casualty.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. First, I thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for their kind remarks. In a world in which fallout, radiation, and nuclear hazard exist, if such a pushbutton war should occur, we would have the means of making possible a good chance that 60 or 65 million Americans would rise out of the dust and perpetuate what we have in our country. It is as simple as that. Let us not befuddle and bemuse ourselves any longer.

One other item to which I would like to call attention before we vote on the measure is listed under the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was my impression that in the conference we had inserted words to the effect that we thought helicopters might have to operate under subsidy for as long as 2 years. That was language which was suggested by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

However, I notice that the conference language reads as follows:

> The conferees agree that the subsidies for helicopters should be ended shortly, that this service should either be made self-supporting or concluded.

My recollection about the conference committee could be faulty. I am not casting any aspersions on anyone. But I wish to make perfectly clear what this Senator's understanding of the amendment is. In the hearings and in the conferences with the House I have said over and over that the story of the three-helicopter operation—to which I must confess I was primarily opposed when I first started to study the subject—we were repeatedly told, again and again and again, that the operation of the piston-operated helicopters could never result in anything but an almost complete subsidization by the Government. The idea for legislation which would make possible, in the first instance, the development of turbine-powered or jet-powered helicopters was devised in order that we could find out if such craft could be operated with complete economic feasibility. This subject has been gone into to a great extent, both by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the committee, and by the senior Senator from Colorado, who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. We have been told again and again the same story. They have never pretended that they could operate this year without a subsidy, next year without a subsidy, or the year after without a subsidy. They are just now phasing into their turbine helicopters.

They do not have all. It is obvious they cannot operate without a subsidy. We have a choice. If we stop the subsidy entirely, we shall never find out whether we can create an industry which can operate on its own. Therefore, I do not like the word "shortly." I wish to make it clear that, so far as the Senator from Colorado is concerned, he does not accept any interpretation of "shortly" which means next year, because the operators have said repeatedly that it would take them into the year 1964 or 1965 to start substantially reducing their subsidy, although this year New York Airways was able to reduce its subsidy by several hundred thousand dollars.

This is the point I wish to make. I do not want to be put in the position of accepting the term "shortly" as meaning that we are saying we will not give a subsidy next year. I want the record to be clear on that point. We will undoubtedly have to do it next year and perhaps, to some extent, the year after. Nevertheless, if the situation does not show substantial improvement by that time, I believe the House and the Senate should take another look at it, and perhaps withdraw it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is correct. The House wanted to cut it off next year. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] suggested that we provide for 2 years. We delegated him to write the language, and this is the language he wrote, in which he used the word "shortly." The Senator from Colorado has cleared up the record. The word "shortly" will not be taken to imply anything else. That is the understanding of the Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to identify myself with that understanding. I will not feel in the least inhibited in asking for a subsidy. I am grateful to the Senator from Colorado for what he has said. When we think of what the 707 and the D–8 have meant to our Nation in terms of really hard money in business, as well as standing in the world, we begin to appreciate the fact that a little financing and a little help to these efforts, which represent industrial initiative, can pay off very big dividends.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that there may be clear identification in reference to this point, and an understanding that this feeling is not merely limited to one side of the aisle, I, too, feel that the subsidy program is justified and ought to be continued, at least for a period of time, to develop a better understanding and knowledge of what can be done with helicopter operations.

I should like to ask one final question. I have been concerned about the report that I have received in connection with GSA in the bill, namely, that the so-called construction savings that may come about in GSA, which under previous appropriations have been available to GSA for its use in new construction projects, are now to be held, and any new projects will have to come back to the Appropriations Committee for clearance. Is that the situation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate rewrote that language as a substitute for the provision which was deleted in the House on a point of order and we did it in our version. The House wanted to keep control by making GSA get approval. We finally agreed upon this language, to the effect that nothing in the bill shall authorize the expenditure of funds for the acquisition or extension or conversion of construction without approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

That procedure, I believe, will be satisfactory, and I do not think it will cause a great deal of inconvenience. The House insisted on this language, but said that it would be simply a matter of a letter being written to the committees, and unless the two committees were to rise up and say, "Don't do it," such a letter would be sufficient to take care of the situation. I do not know how we can go back to the House with this provision, because we agreed that we should have some semblance of control, and this is about as good language as we can work out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wanted to make sure that this subject had been discussed with the Administrator of GSA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. Boutin is doing an excellent job.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He certainly is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When we see a man doing such a fine job, we should not place unnecessary restraints on him. If we are to understand that this is more or less a procedural matter in order to keep the Committees on Appropriations informed, that is one thing. After all, these are funds that are saved by efficient management on the part of GSA. If it is understood that this language will not unduly delay the activities of GSA, that is all right, especially if the Agency can live with it. Frankly, I feel that if an agency has had money appropriated to it and if out of that money it has been able to make some savings, that in itself is a measure of good man-

agement, and it ought to be permitted to utilize the money for projects which have been authorized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a practical matter, that is the situation. So far as I am concerned, this is a procedural matter. It will not delay the work of GSA. Unless there is a project that we decide should be further investigated, nothing will be done about it, and no delay will occur. If there is a project which we think should be investigated, we will say, "Do not do it until we approve it." The House was very adamant on this point. It considered this to be one of the really important parts of the bill. We tried to modify it or water it down as much as we could.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the civil defense appropriation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I commend Mr. Pittman on the job he is doing. When we have such a good administrator doing such a fine job, and producing such excellent results through good management and sound organization, we have an obligation to support the programs we have approved, and to follow through on them and give the administrator the support he needs.

So I join the Senator from Colorado and others in support of the civil defense appropriation, in support of those who are attempting to give us a good civil defense program.

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

CIVIL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION COMMENTS ON UNRESOLVED HOUSE-SENATE DIFFERENCES

The Senate-House conferees on the independent office appropriation bill report agreement on one of two major civil defense items and disagreement on the other. The figures, in millions, are as follows:

[In millions]

	Conference action	House action	Senate action	Administration request
Operations and maintenance	$75	$65	$91.2	$126.2
Shelter and research	Open	10	93.8	108.8
Total	Open	75	185.0	235.0

The remaining difference between the House and Senate conferees will determine whether or not the current phase of the Defense Department civil defense program can be completed.

1. SURVEY, MARKING, AND STOCKING

Of the $83.8 million unresolved difference, $56 million is to continue the survey, marking and provisioning of existing shelter space started last year. If the Federal Government fails to provide promised provisions and fails to complete the verification of survey data and keep it up to date, the national civil defense effort will suffer a long-term setback. It is doubtful that hard-pressed mayors, county commissioners, school superintendents and private owners of buildings would respond after an interruption of 1 fiscal year, to another Federal appeal to participate in a joint Federal, State and local undertaking to make use of the shielding from radiation which is now a valuable but unused national asset.

State and local governments have had every reason to anticipate that the executive branch and the Congress meant to follow through with this program; last summer Congress appropriated $207 million for this purpose; in the intervening year rapid progress has been made in the Defense Department survey which has found more shelter space than the most optimistic estimates; more recently a public letter from the President to congressional leaders clearly emphasized that this operation is important to the national security and must be completed.

To take inventory of the protection which already exists, to bring it into use as part of improved civil defense systems in many communities throughout the United States, and to locate austere food rations, protected water, and medical supplies where people would take cover under nuclear attack are the kinds of low-cost, high-priority civil defense measures which clearly make sense. The only known poll of public attitudes toward survey, marking, and stocking existing shelter space was conducted by Michigan State University and Elmo Roper Associates; it showed 86 percent in favor of this operation.

The difference between the two Houses presents a clear issue of whether it is worthwhile to spend $3.50 per person (the cost of surveying, marking and stocking shelters) to improve significantly the chance of survival under nuclear attack for about 60 million Americans. Last year both Houses found this to be worth while.

2. RESEARCH

The Senate appropriation would permit carrying through with the research started with fiscal year 1962 funds. This carefully conceived research program has been coordinated with the total Defense Department research, of which it comprises less than one-half of 1 percent, and with the National Academy of Sciences Advisory Committee on Civil Defense. Expansion of knowledge of probable effects of large-scale nuclear attacks, and improvement of methods of minimizing the effects of the damage, are a high priority element in the total national defense program.

3. FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Last year Congress appropriated $17.5 million for a program to take advantage of low-cost opportunities to include shelter space in Federal buildings. This work is in process. The survey has identified previously existing shelter space in Federal buildings for 3.7 million people, which will be brought into use. For the Federal Government to stop doing what it recommends that State and local governments and private owners of buildings should do would undermine the current civil defense program. Design experience and cost data resulting from this work is contributing to the development of a sound nationwide shelter program at minimum cost.

The Senate voted 68 to 14 against an amendment which would have eliminated the $83.8 million excess over the House figure for shelter and research. The full $93.8 million in this account is vital to materializing on the substantial progress made with the fiscal year 1962 appropriation of $255 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator from Colorado will agree with my statement that the RECORD should show that it is our understanding that the savings in GSA could be used for some other projects; that they would write us a letter, and that then if we did not make any objection with respect to an item, it would be presumed to be approved.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There may be some project into which we may want to go further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would be on our initiative, of course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If a letter comes to the committee, and there is no response by the committees, that will be taken as approval.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is my understanding. I believe Mr. Boutin is doing an excellent job. The senior Senator from New Jersey spoke to me about the GSA appropriations. He is just as much interested as we are. We had to more or less shortchange the GSA in several respects, although not drastically, but I believe Mr. Boutin can live with what he has. Of course, a bigger revolving fund is needed, and the agency will probably have an opportunity to get it later, perhaps next year, if it is needed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House was adamant on this item.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join Senators who have approved the course of action whereby the report will be returned with our insistence upon the appropriations for civil defense. I am not speaking on the subject for the first time. When the bill was before the Senate I raised this issue. I remember that last year and also this year I spoke on it. I believe that the failure of policy—and that is what we have, a failure of policy—represents a great gap in our defense and foreign policies.

I know that many persons object to the civil defense program because of its expense. Also, many look upon it as a sign of weakness. Some believe it might be an indication to the Soviet Union that the United States is actively thinking of an aggressive attack.

My own thought is that so long as the danger persists, the administration and Congress have a duty to anticipate the worst and to do all that is possible to protect the lives of those who would be in danger—and millions would be—if an attack should come.

Further, I believe that instead of being a sign of weakness, it would be a sign of our determination to survive and rise again and fight. It would be a strong addition to our deterrent power.

Expensive as the program might be, so long as the danger lasts I think Congress has a duty to provide for the safety of the people. I believe this is a field in which the administration has not clearly defined its policy. I do not believe any effective action will be taken by Congress, and the people will not know where they stand, until the administration clearly defines its policy with respect to civil defense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Am I correct in understanding, as I have been told, that the work of stocking shelters is 60 percent completed?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Seventy-five percent.

Mr. JAVITS. And that if left in the middle, it may cause a certain amount of retracing of steps by those in areas where the work has already been started?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the clear vice of leaving the situation in the middle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Seventy-five percent of the work would have been done and 25 percent would have been left undone.

Mr. JAVITS. Mayors would be doubly embarrassed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12711, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
September 18, 1962.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 28, 71, 93, 109, and 113 to the bill (H.R. 12711) entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes", and concur therein;

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,958,500."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and also include the matter proposed.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Before the period, add the following: ": *Provided,* That nothing herein shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Expenditures heretofore made pursuant to contract or stipulation from, and unexpended obligations heretofore incurred against, appropriations under the heading 'Construction, Public Buildings Projects' in prior Appropriation Acts for the purposes of acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, are hereby ratified."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$725,000".

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, and 119 to aforementioned bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 72, 92, 95, 96, and 116.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 119 and request a further conference with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KERR, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

QUINCY COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1963, H.R. 11164, the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11164) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and for other purposes.

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

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

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, one of the most serious obligations Congress must meet before adjournment is that of emergency assistance to the long-term unemployed. In the last few days of this session we must report and enact an extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961.

It is clear that there is insufficient time at this session to accomplish general revision and improvement of the unemployment compensation system along the lines of the administration bill, S. 2084, which I introduced last year. A general revision of the system is long overdue. In 1958 proposed legislation was introduced in the Senate and in the House to provide changes and improvements which were clearly needed at that time. Since then the necessity of revision has become even more evident. We have had to enact two emergency programs to prevent a breakdown of the State systems and to provide a minimum of protection for the unemployed. Now there is serious need for another emergency action.

It is not the fault of the unemployed that the Congress has not had an opportunity to consider the long-needed revision of the unemployment compensation system. Had we done so, millions of citizens would not face the privation that now threatens them this coming winter. Their problem is not that of the international balance of payments nor of adjustment of taxes or any of the other serious matters with which the 87th Congress has dealt. Many of the measures enacted, of course, do have an indirect effect insofar as they improve the general economy or at least prevent more serious economic declines. But at the same time we must consider their immediate problem which is that of securing the bare necessities of life.

The emergency measure of 1961 provided up to 13 weeks of additional benefits for those workers who exhausted their benefit rights under a State program. Eligibility under this measure terminated last April 1, and payments for those qualifying before that date ceased entirely on June 30.

President Kennedy recommended a bill (S. 3411) to extend this measure for an additional year, to March 31, 1963. Since the temporary program of last year was not as costly as anticipated, the President has estimated that $184 million from the special 1962 and 1963 tax will be available to finance the extension. The estimate of the President was that the extension could be financed by an increase of one-tenth of 1 percent on the normal Federal unemployment tax rate, for the year 1964 only.

Since there would be administrative difficulties in making a temporary extension retroactive to April 1, it may be advisable to extend the act for 6 months only, from October 1 to March 31, 1963. In that case the proposed increased tax of 0.1 percent could be cut in half. I want to emphasize that about three-fourths of the funds required for an extension are available from the surplus of revenue provided by the temporary tax increases last year.

Mr. President, the August unemployment figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on September 11 provide further evidence of the need for action. The rate of unemployment rose from 5.3 percent in July to 5.8 percent last month. The number of unemployed was 3.9 million.

In August the rate of unemployment among adult men rose 0.4 percent and among adult women by 0.7 percent. The Department of Labor statement indicates that these increases were unexpected, but in any case the rates for both these groups were the highest of any month since the beginning of the year.

Although the number of unemployed this year is down from the total last year, the rate of unemployment has averaged above 5.5 percent for 1962, and there is no indication of a substantial reduction in the rate in the next few months. In my judgment we should adopt the proposed emergency measure to provide some degree of protection for the long-term unemployed during the next few months. This will provide some protection for the long-term unemployed

until the new Congress convenes, but it will not solve the larger problem of general revision and improvement. The greatest concern, of course, is the welfare of the unemployed and the need to extend coverage and to increase the amount and duration of benefits.

In addition the method of financing requires study and revision. A recent report on the Minnesota unemployement compensation fund illustrates a situation which has developed in many States. The news report states that the danger point has been reached. The Minnesota fund reached a peak of $134 million in 1953. In 1958 it had dropped to $82.5 million; by the end of 1960 it was down to $63.2 million, and last year to $41.7 million. During the first 7 months of this year the fund has been further depleted and it now stands at the lowest level in 19 years—$35.9 million.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about the Minnesota fund written by Jack MacKay, and published in the St. Cloud Daily Times, September 8, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MINNESOTA JOBLESS PAY FUND HITS PERIL LEVEL

(By Jack MacKay)

ST. PAUL.—The danger point has been reached in Minnesota's unemployment compensation fund.

This means the legislature will be faced with raising contribution rates of approximately 43,000 Minnesota employers.

A check by the Associated Press showed that the fund dropped to $35,930,000 at the end of July—the lowest point in 19 years.

The employment security commissioner has power, under a 1949 law, to raise the rates if the fund drops below $50 million. But that occurred at the end of 1960 and he already has levied the maximum rate schedule provided by the law.

The depletion has been heavy the last 19 months despite the fact that the automatic increase in rates was ordered in January 1961.

Rates in effect now range from six-tenths of 1 percent to 3 percent of payroll. Before January 1961, the rates ranged from three-tenths of 1 percent to 2.7 percent.

During the first 7 months of this year, the State paid out about $26 million in unemployment compensation benefits. Contributions from employers are running lower.

At the beginning of this year the fund had a total of $41,700,287, according to a report by Commissioner Frank Starkey to Gov. Elmer L. Andersen.

This represents a decrease of $21,527,514 from the $63,227,801 balance on the same date of the previous year.

The State paid out in benefits in 1961 a net total of $45,730,347, while contributions and interest earned during the year amounted to only $24,073,443.

Last year 42,997 employers were assigned contribution rates for 1962 as compared with 41,491 employers assigned rates for 1961.

In 1937, the first year of the fund's existence, there was available only $11,868,121 for benefits. Year by year the fund grew and by 1946 it had passed the $100 million mark. It remained above that until the end of 1958, reaching the peak of $134 million in 1953.

In 1958 it had dropped to $82.5 million and has been declining since. By the end of 1960 it dropped to a level of $63,227,000—falling at a faster pace since then.

A boost in the economy could increase the fund, but a number of legislators are planning to renew a drive for legislation to strengthen the fund.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the lack of employment opportunities for youth continues to be one of the most serious problems of unemployment. Through the years the highest rates of unemployment are regularly among the youth group and during recessions their rate of unemployment is two and three times that of other groups in the labor force.

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 recognizes this problem and makes some special provision for youth; but a far greater effort is required by all groups in society in order to meet this growing problem effectively.

We perhaps too often think of work in terms of its value in producing income and of unemployment for its hazards of economic privation. But the social and psychological effects both of work and of unemployment cannot be wholly separated from the economic ones and in some instances they are of more lasting importance. This is particularly true for youth. Much of our thought and effort is still concentrated on the exploitive aspects of child labor, but meanwhile other problems have arisen and new questions must be asked. The value of work in the formation of a complete person is generally accepted, but as a consequence of modern technology and living, the opportunities of children and youth for learning how to work have declined drastically.

Some important aspects of this problem are well brought out in a discussion paper by Prof. John R. Ellingston of the University of Minnesota. Professor Ellingston prepared his paper on the question of unemployment among youth for the Governor's Conference on Children and Youth, held in Minneapolis last spring. I ask unanimous consent that some excerpts from his study dealing with the psychological aspects of work and unemployment be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL THREAT TO YOUTH

It is bad enough to be one of too many people who are together scratching a bare subsistence from the soil, like the peasants of India and of most of the rest of the world. It is worse, or at least less endurable, to be on the dole in the midst of affluence, to be sidelined in a bustling society.

In the depression of the 1930's the unemployed averaged 10 million or about one-fifth of the labor force for a whole decade. That depression caused immense suffering to young and old and did great harm to some. But not even the unemployed thought that their labor was not needed. Closed factories assured people that it was a depression reflecting the defects of the system, the failure of fiscal and monetary policies and of political and social institutions to keep pace with a rapidly developing industrial economy. In the great depression most of the unemployed took for granted that sooner or later the economy would again need them. The prospect facing the unemployed of today and tomorrow, especially the young beginning workers, is quite different. It is that the economy will move forward, producing more and more with fewer and fewer workers, so that many will really not be needed, not wanted. Should this prospect be realized the psychological harm will be devastating.

THE MEANING OF WORK TO MAN

For man, work (as distinguished from exhausting toil) is something more than the means of earning his bread and butter. To live is to act, to use one's resources of hand and muscle, mind and spirit, to study, to make or accomplish something, in short, to work. Life without work of some kind, which for the great majority means a job, is a form of living death. To do nothing is to be nothing. Without work in this large sense of constructive effort there can be no growth of mind or spirit. It is suggestive that in their play children imitate the work of the adult world—keeping house or store, playing mother, nurse, teacher, policeman, and whatnot.

Again, work within reasonable limits is one of the tools essential to help civilize the growing child and youth. It teaches him punctuality and responsibility. By the sweat of his body or the strain of his mind he learns that things have value and should not be wasted. Through work he learns skills and respect for materials and craftsmanship. Work teaches him to accept authority and how to get along with his fellow workers. It helps him control his inborn selfishness and accustoms him to do for others instead of having everything done for him.

A man's job is his membership card in the human community and gives him a personal stake in his society. Thus work in this broad sense is one condition of good citizenship. It is also the key to self-respect and to the respect of others. To gain acceptance and approval in our society a man has to be a worker. And the gregarious human animal cannot endure rejection by his kind. To be needed and approved is indispensable to his mental health. Not to be needed is a terrible blow to one's self-image and emotional security. And so, work is essential to human happiness.

It is in the light of these fundamental truths about human nature that the personal and social costs of the unemployment of a million or more young workers in the United States must be evaluated. At that critical moment when a youth is first ready to enter the labor force, inability to get a job is more than an economic hardship. It is a personal rejection that is likely to sap his self-confidence, particularly in a period of high general employment. It tells him that he is not wanted; he will often conclude that he, himself, is no good. In frustration and bitterness he may strike back at society. Even if he does not, what chance is there of his learning to become a competent and reliable workman, a good spouse or parent, or a good citizen?

THE THREAT TO OUR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS

Referring to the masses of unemployed young people in the slums of our large cities, Dr. James B. Conant asks: "What can words like 'freedom,' 'liberty,' and equality of opportunity mean to these young people? With what kind of zeal and dedication can we expect them to withstand the relentless pressure of communism" in an era when "the fate of freedom in the world hangs very much in balance?" [1]

The foregoing carries no implication that unemployment is the cause of delinquency and crime; nor that full employment of itself will cure these social evils. Far from it. But every worker with delinquent teenagers knows that a job may be decisive in changing antisocial behavior and helping most vulnerable youngsters grow safely past the age of high delinquency. One student of human behavior has phrased the matter in

[1] "Slums and Suburbs," McGraw-Hill, 1961, p. 34.

these words: "There is pretty strong evidence from the field of research that no other single factor has as much to do with successful adjustment as does satisfying work experience, whether we are considering the population generally, neuropsychiatric patients, or offenders." [2]

It is suggestive that 75 percent and more of adjudicated juvenile delinquents in the United States and Great Britain abandon their lawbreaking behavior as they approach manhood and find their places in the working world. What will happen if that working world has no places for them? Considerable evidence indicates that while most school dropouts are not delinquent, most delinquents are dropouts who have difficulty in finding and holding regular jobs.

DISAPPEARING CHORES HAVE LEFT A VACUUM IN EDUCATION

Although man must work if he is to be happy or well adjusted, work is something he has to learn to do just as he has to learn to walk, to read, or to play the piano. This truth is being brought home to us by the discovery that many school dropouts in urban areas do not know how to work; that they have no sense of responsibility and no self discipline; that they have never carried a task, especially an unwelcome task, through to completion; that they do not know how to take orders or get along with other workers; that they are lacking in attitudes as well as skills.

This is a new phenomenon in our experience, but the explanation is not far to seek. One can learn to work only by working. Automated living—in the form of hot and cold running water, oil or gas furnaces, electric lights, stove, washer, iron, vacuum cleaner, refrigerator, automobiles, ready-cooked food and readymade clothing, etc., etc.—plus compulsory school attendance and work restrictions in today's urban areas deprive many children, including the dropouts referred to, of the opportunity of learning to work by having to contribute to the daily physical needs of the family and home. The deprivation may have effects scarcely less serious than the closing of the job market to many young people.

The postwar generation in the United States, with the exception of migrant farmworkers, has forgotten that the children of the masses of Americans in all preceding generations were economic assets, as they still are in the less industrialized areas of the world. Such children learned to work as inevitably and automatically as they learned to walk. As soon as they were old enough children had to throw in their strength and skill to help feed and maintain the family. On the farms—and even as late as 1910 half the Nation's children still lived on farms—sons and daughters as soon as they were big enough chopped and carried in the wood, pumped water, filled lamps, watered horses, fed chickens, milked cows, and worked in the fields and orchards. Even in the cities children were needed to help with the daily cooking, washing, sweeping, mending, carrying out the ashes, beating rugs, stringing beans, shelling peas, and so on.

TOIL THAT BLIGHTED

Some of this sounds desirable, and it was. But much of the toil was brutalizing. The farmer's son whose daily chores included milking and caring for a half dozen cows morning and evening had little energy for the enrichment of his mind or the expansion of his horizons in the few hours of school. Any talent that he might have had was almost certain to be blighted.

As late as 1904 when the National Child Labor Committee was organized, its records show that this Nation's labor force included 800,000 boys and girls aged 10 through 13 years, and 1 million more aged 14 and 15 who did a full day's work in mines, in mills, on farms, in tenement sweat shops, and on the city streets to help their parents scratch out a living. And there were many more thousands even younger than 10 whom nobody bothered to count.

No one will quarrel with the technological marvels that have taken the sweat out of housekeeping and largely out of all production in this country. They are inseparable parts of the greatest material achievement in human history—the conquest of want, hunger, cold, disease, ignorance, and the elimination of the back-breaking toil for survival that went with them. Before the industrial revolution Oliver Goldsmith described the condition of the vast mass of mankind throughout history: "The toil of man is irksome to him and he earns his subsistence with pain." This applied to children as well as adults and remained true for too many children well into this century in this country, as it still does in most of the rest of the world.

However, there have been losses with the gains. In the magnificent achievement of eliminating most back-breaking toil and most exploitation of children's labor, we have eliminated the age-old automatic method of teaching children to work and thus created a dangerous vacuum in the education of children for living. At the same time, incidentally, we have robbed many children of the assurance that they are useful, needed, and wanted.

THE ROLE OF PARENTS AND SCHOOL IN PROVIDING WORK EXPERIENCE

It is obvious that we are dealing with elements of character that can only be formed through work of some kind. Fortunately, despite the reduction of chores wise parents will always enlist their children's help from the latters' early years, in self-service and in service to the family. Thereby they protect children at once from a sense of uselessness and from demanding selfishness and begin the essential conditioning to work at the age when children are most malleable, when habits can be most deeply set.

Unhappily large numbers of children are not so fortunate in their parents and their homelife. Moreover, all children as they grow older need types of work or jobs that their parents cannot provide. Getting an education is, of course, work of a high order, the main hope for filling the vacuum in education created by the industrial revolution lies in the schools, functioning at new levels, as we shall see in subsequent chapters. But the schools cannot fill the need alone.

For many slow-learning children the academic and vocational education offered by the school will be meaningful and absorbed only if it is related to part-time work. Most young people want summer jobs, which in view of their lack of training have to be largely manual or menial, and learn from them respect for useful work and workers, however lowly, that they can acquire in no other way.

PART-TIME JOBS FOR YOUTH

Whatever the truth of that assertion, it is certain that American teenagers and college students find in part-time jobs benefits far beyond the cash returns that enable so many of them to continue schooling. Inevitably these are in large part the unskilled jobs that are most threatened by automation. The magnitude of the problem which the elimination of part-time jobs would create can be swiftly measured.

In 1960, the Nation's 14- to 17-year-olds totaled 11,389,000. Of this number 5,555,000, or nearly half, worked during the month of July. Some 680,000 were out of school and in the full-time labor force. This means that 4,875,000 boys and girls in this age group enrolled in school held part-time jobs in summer. As would be expected, summer work far outruns work during the school year, with only 2,227,000 students working in October—less than half the summer workers. Of the working male students under 18, those called operatives are likely to be filling station attendants, delivery boys, or workers in laundry or drycleaning establishments. More than half of those listed as sales workers were newsboys. Seventy percent of all schoolgirls working part time found jobs as babysitters, household workers, and farmworkers.

The proportion of youth under 20 in the labor force since 1947 shows sharp ups and downs, compared with the more stable participation of older age groups. The ups and downs coincide with the movement of the business cycle. A high level of business activity marked the years 1948, 1951, and 1956 with resultant peaks in part-time employment of school youth. Contrariwise 1949, 1954, and 1958 all experienced recessions which were reflected in fewer jobs for youth.

Part-time jobs appear to be increasingly harder to get for high school youth in the 14-to-17 age bracket. For the month of October their rate of unemployment moved from 7.3 percent in 1958, to 7.1 percent in 1959, and to 7.5 percent in 1960. The placement service of the Minneapolis public schools reported that more students were unable to find summer jobs in 1961 than in any year since the depression. Automation is moving in on these unskilled jobs.

Again, we must look at the future with concern. By 1965 the number of students aged 14 to 17 is expected to total 13,226,000. If, as in 1960, 48 percent of that number seek summer jobs, the Nation will have to provide 6,350,000 such jobs. Actually with higher percentages of youth aged 14 to 17 enrolled in school, the probabilities are strong that more will seek part-time jobs.

Swiftly rising numbers of college youth will add to the competition for part-time jobs. In 1960 college enrollment totaled 3,750,000 with about 36 percent in the labor force part time. For many work was essential to enable them to continue in college. By 1965 college enrollment is expected to reach 5,379,000 with a proportionate increase in the number of jobs needed. In the fall of 1961, the student employment service at the University of Minnesota reported the worst shortage of part-time jobs since World War II.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—LIMITATION OF DEBATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have spoken with the majority leader and with the minority leader in regard to Calendar No. 1741, House bill 8181, commonly known as the aquarium bill. We had hoped to take it up this afternoon and act upon it; but because certain Senators who are interested in the bill have other duties, it will not be possible to have the bill taken up and acted

[2] Dale G. Hardman, "The Function of the Probation Officer," Federal Probation, September 1960, p. 5.

on today. It is Calendar No. 1741, House bill 8181, to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia, and to provide for its operation.

Therefore, we shall take up the bill on Friday. I now ask unanimous consent that on Friday, following the morning hour, the pending business be Calendar No. 1741, House bill 8181, to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia, and to provide for its operation, and that there be available for debate and consideration of the bill 3 hours, to be equally divided—in other words, to have 1½ hours available to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The order as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, September 21, 1962, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to consider and that during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8181) to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and to provide for its operation, all debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, and final passage thereof shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

THE NEED FOR BUDGET REFORM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a fine article in regard to the need for Federal budget reform. The article was published in the August issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist.

This is a subject in which I have had a long and deep interest. I feel that it is very important that we have much more discussion and consideration of our budget processes, so that we have a realistic bookkeeping system. I have discussed this subject a number of times, and I find that there is widespread interest in it in the Nation. The article from the AFL–CIO American Federationist makes a great contribution toward a clear understanding of this subject.

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

THE NEED FOR BUDGET REFORM

The degree and range of Federal economic activities are increasing in response to the imperatives of increasing population and urbanization and unmet requirements in the public sector. These activities call for Federal budget reform—specifically, the adoption of a capital budget.

Budget reform is essential to provide the foundation for sound fiscal policy and public understanding of the Federal budget as a potentially powerful instrument of national economic policy for achieving and maintaining maximum economic growth and stability.

The present Federal budget is not designed to aid in meeting these challenges. As a matter of fact, its present organization as basically a cash income-outgo document has been turned into a weapon used with deadly effectiveness by those opposed to the use of Government programs to assist in achieving national goals of economic growth and stability.

Although there has been a succession of improvements in the budget process in recent years, the Federal budget remains an archaic document of limited usefulness. In its present form, it is neither an understandable tool of economic policy nor an adequate measure of the Government's financial and economic operations. The annual report on expenditures, for example, is an unrelated and detailed mixture of various investments and current operating outlays, with very little potential use for economic policy purposes.

There has been a serious lag in establishing a comprehensive, national financial policy in the United States, although the past 30 years have seen a revolutionary change in the role of the Government as a stimulating and stabilizing force in the economy. A major reason for this lag is the failure of the Federal Government to develop a modern and adequate system of financial reporting and planning.

Budget policy lies at the heart of the financial and economic planning of modern corporations. It can and should play an indispensable role in the formulation and execution of Government economic policies.

For many years, attention has been called by congressional committees, private foundations, economists and fiscal experts to the shortcomings of the Federal budget. Yet resistance to budget reform continues.

One of the principal fiscal recommendations of the first Hoover Commission report of 1949 was for the establishment of a capital budget.

In the section on "The Budget and Federal Capital Outlays," the fiscal 1963 budget message of the President contrasts sharply the budgetary practice of the Federal Government with that of private business—lumping together capital and current expense outlays.

The President added that "it is clearly of importance in analyzing the significance of the Federal budget to recognize that the budget includes substantial expenditures for loans, public works and other durable assets and capital items which will yield benefits in future years."

"Furthermore," the President stated, "increasing attention has been given in recent years to the significance of 'developmental' expenditure outlays for education and training for research, which have the effect of adding to the Nation's level of knowledge and skill and thereby increase the capacity to produce a larger national output in future years."

Broadly speaking, capital items are those which involve creation, improvement, or acquisition of durable assets; or acquisition of recoverable claims.

Current expense items are those which are not investments in physical or financial assets and which are also not expected to yield a return in dollars.

On the capital side, development and commercial activities of the Federal Government are large scale and varied. They include the various lending programs whose loans are repaid with interest, as well as activities of the United States in natural resource development, a great deal of which is self-liquidating.

Capital expenditures also are made for the Federal-State highway program, various grants-in-aid and loan programs, and for research and development, public health, public assistance, worker training, and nonreimbursable land and water development activities.

In addition, the United States owns a vast array of physical assets—public lands, public buildings, etc.

Despair is voiced that under such complexities an adequate and realistic definition of a capital item, as applicable to the Federal budget, can be derived.

This is a difficult, but by no means insuperable, problem. As in all accounting systems some degree of arbitrariness is inevitable, but this should not detract from the validity of capital budgeting.

The Federal capital budget should include a broad range of both wealth-producing and non-wealth-producing Federal outlays on the capital side of the ledger. Many of these are self-liquidating and are already easily identified; others could be ascertained and properly included after further study and evaluation.

Such a capital budget classification should be geared with the overall budget to comprise as capital those items properly so, whether they are self-liquidating projects or capital investments in research and development, grants-in-aid, education, public welfare, and other public programs whose benefits are tangible but less susceptible to dollar measurement.

The ledger sheet on capital investments should clearly distinguish between revenue-producing and non-revenue-producing items. Depreciation on the latter could be accomplished annually, using the Swedish example, to be included in the annual operating budget and immediately written off. Self-liquidating projects would be eligible for financing by Federal borrowing. In this fashion the equivalence between the capital accounts and the Federal Government's interest in wealth-producing assets could be ascertained.

The use of capital accounts and capital budgeting principles has become the rule rather than the exception in American private business, in the governments of most of our large cities, in a number of the States and in many foreign countries. This trend has come about by reason of an increasing role of Government in long-range public works, lending, grants-in-aid, public welfare, and research and development programs. It also has been given momentum by the use of modern budgeting to enhance management efficiency.

Capital budgeting, as an important aspect of the Federal budget's use as an economic tool, will enable the Government better to analyze the rate and level of performance of its investment programs. Accordingly, there will be more freedom of choice between alternatives and more intelligent allocation of resources to the components of such programs.

A Federal capital budget will improve analysis of the total level of capital formation in the Nation, how it is financed and the part played by the Government in outlays for goods and services currently used; the Government's contribution to creation of real assets; changes in private sector investment patterns resulting from moneys received from the Federal Government.

Although only an accounting control and analysis technique, capital budgeting will provide the necessary information on which choices between or among economic objectives or reasonable compromises can be better made by an administration.

As a prelude to wider budget reform which this administration has already begun, the capital concept will play a key part in assisting the overall Federal budget to become a truly meaningful economic document and enable the Federal Government to adjust its fiscal and economic programs and policies to changing needs.

Opponents of a Federal capital budget concept include those who advance the familiar and oversimplified arguments of the conservative banking and business community and those in the Congress who share the same view.

In addition, certain lines of opposition to the capital budget have been advanced for other than self-serving reasons:

1. It is held that a capital budget would impose arbitrary limits to the use of the total Federal budget in carrying surplus or deficit financing programs in quick response to changing economic conditions. Moreover, the fear is expressed that certain kinds of capital expenditure programs would be insulated from such decisions.

The capital budget is no more and no less than an accounting method used by management for fiscal and economic planning. Budgeting lies at the center of all financial and economic planning by the modern corporation and should play a similarly indispensable role in planning by the Federal Government.

The capital budget, of course, will not resolve differences over what kind of fiscal, economic or tax policies are required under any given circumstances.

In addition to its use in measuring results of Federal wealth-producing programs, the capital budget approach should establish a relationship between annual budget results on long-term programs and vice versa. In combination with current operating expenses as part of a consolidated cash budget a clear picture of inflationary or deflationary effects of Federal financial programs could be gained.

Without this kind of separation, the present capital and current expense budgetary potpourri overstates the amount of money that must be raised by taxes as well as generating pressures for new forms of Federal taxation, mostly of the regressive type.

Additional pressures against tax reform are self-generating in the way capital investments are now carried as current items and will benefit future generations of taxpayers at the expense of those of the present generation.

2. A second argument, akin to the first one, holds that a capital budget will tend to overemphasize economic growth programs, particularly if they are revenue producing, at the expense of tax reduction in developing anticyclical policy or against needed programs in research, education, health, and other kindred fields.

The preoccupation once again is with the end result of policy and program rather than an objective judgment as to the value of a capital budget in helping to achieve fruitful, timely, and wise decisions. Emphasis, desirable or otherwise, is supplied by human evaluation of data. Capital budget data will assist rather than impede such evaluation. The decisions that will result will be directed toward the goal of using Federal power to achieve and foster economic growth and stability.

3. The preceding objections to a Federal capital budget can be better understood in light of a trend toward outflanking a national debt ceiling and the pitfalls of the appropriations process. This has resulted in enactment of the Federal highway aid program, the TVA self-financing authority for power generation and establishment of various Federal lending agencies that operate outside the regular appropriations process and whose transactions are presented separately from the Federal cash budget.

If this trend continues, more such agencies will be created and there will be intensified problems of imposing budgetary and administrative control under the total Federal fiscal program and economic policy.

As the first long step toward immediate public discussion, debate, and resolution of the problem of Federal budget reform, the President should establish a National Commission on Budget Reform to study the problem and make findings and recommendations within a year.

When the Commission has presented its report, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress, the stage would be set for implementing legislation, accompanied by a full range of public hearings in appropriate committees of the Congress.

The presentation of the budget last January represented a great advance. This should be followed through—with the midyear budget review—as well as subsequent years' budgets.

Besides continuing to present the traditional administrative budget classified by broad administrative areas, it certainly would be wise to continue the newly initiated income and product account budget.

In addition, the consolidated cash budget should be modified to consist of a consolidated account of income and outgo, including the trust funds, and consist of two subsidiary accounts—for current expenses and for capital investments.

The capital budget should be broken down for economic purposes to distinguish between loans and self-liquidating resources programs on the one hand and other capital investments creating intangible returns to the general welfare and economic strength of the country.

The overall capital items should comprise: (a) Defense installations, (b) Government buildings, (c) Government power facilities, (d) Government loans, (e) park recreation areas, preserves, (f) conservation and development of other resources, (g) atomic energy, and so forth.

There are great difficulties and complications—both political and technical—in the path of achieving basic budget reform. The technical and political complexities can be overcome, however, by a pragmatic approach. Major segments of public opinion can be won over to support of a practical and commonsense reform of the Federal budget.

SIDEWALK CAFES IN WASHINGTON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the other day I saw with great interest an article entitled "Connecticut Avenue May Offer Variety of Sidewalk Cafes."

My colleagues know that I have been very much interested in this subject. I have always felt that the great city of Washington, D.C., should have an international atmosphere, because in a real sense it is the world's capital. I have also felt that we should take more advantage of the good climate which occasionally is enjoyed in this city. This summer would have been a good one for sidewalk cafes.

Mr. President, I cannot resist noting that the cosmopolitan restaurant proprietors of Connecticut Avenue are planning to increase the number of sidewalk cafes available to the residents and visitors of Washington. As a long-time advocate and supporter of sidewalk cafes, I welcome this development. The trend has been established, the fashion has been accepted, and the sidewalk cafe bandwagon is rolling. It is a personal pleasure to invite all of my colleagues and all citizens of the District of Columbia and all visitors to this city to jump aboard.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, which was published on Sunday in the Washington Post, and describes these developments, be printed in the RECORD; and I encourage the restaurant operators to get busy before the beautiful fall season leaves us.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1962]

CONNECTICUT AVENUE MAY OFFER VARIETY OF SIDEWALK CAFES

(By Paul D. Boyd)

Washington may soon out-Paris Paris.

An international buffet of sorts—six sidewalk cafes with six different cuisines—is now being talked about for Connecticut Avenue's 2600 block, just above Calvert Street.

A menu for sidewalk cafehoppers might begin with enchiladas at El Mexico on the east side of the street and move on to lasagna at the Marco Polo, frogs' legs at Napoleon's and steak at the Ted Lewis Restaurant.

After braving six lanes of traffic to cross the street, the hiking diners could have chop suey at Chin's and barbecued spareribs Pennsylvania Dutch style at Arbaugh's—all al fresco.

Two of the restaurants, Napoleon's and Ted Lewis, already have asked for—and should get within a week—permission from the District Commissioners to open cafes in front of their establishments. The other four intend to do the same.

The setting is appropriate. The tree-lined boulevard is wide enough for an extended view and there is room on the sidewalks for tables, chairs, shrubs and pedestrians.

With some imaginative designing, the street should become a tourist attraction to conventioneers at nearby hotels.

Ted Lewis is thinking of putting a fountain in the grass plot next to his restaurant. Arbaugh's decor would be Pennsylvania Dutch, even to hex signs on the flower boxes and typical up-country furniture.

Chin's has no drawings on the board as yet, but a rice paddy rock garden and flaming dragon designs might be a start.

El Mexico wants to have waitresses in colorful Mexican costume and a new store front if they set up an outdoor cafe. Basil Politis of Napoleon's left no doubt that he would recreate a French atmosphere and really "do it up right."

The Marco Polo might try some lacy grillwork and wine bottle candlesticks on the tables.

The way was cleared for the outdoor cafes August 15 when the District Commissioners designated both sides of Connecticut Avenue from Taft Bridge to Garfield Street NW., a business area. This is defined as an area in which 50 percent of the frontage is used for commercial purposes.

Applications from Ted Lewis and Napoleon's have now been processed by some 15 public agencies. According to Julian P. Green, Assistant Superintendent of the Licenses and Permit Division, the applications will be referred to the District Commissioners by the Public Space Committee at a meeting next week.

QUINCY-COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11164) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy-Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, H.R. 11164 is a bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy-Columbia Basin Irrigation District and to authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts. The bill also amends the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943.

This bill was introduced as a result of an executive communication and is needed to permit the development program for the Columbia Basin project to go forward on a sound basis with the water users repaying an appropriate and equitable share of the construction costs. In addition, action is needed this year because the 1962 drainage charge which was deferred by congressional action last year and the 1963 drainage charge will both become due on May 1 of next year. It may probably be impossible for the irrigation districts to meet these payments unless they become part of their long-term obligations as provided by the bill. The failure to enact this legislation will result in grave hardship for individual farmers on the project.

The bill does not authorize the appropriation of any additional funds. The project has been fully authorized since 1943. The legislation would remove a contractual limitation of $281 million on the obligation of the United States to make expenditures for the project irrigation facilities. This limitation was included in the 1945 repayment contracts executed between the three Columbia Basin irrigation districts and the Secretary of the Interior. In some repayment contracts $8,176,000 was fixed as the limitation on the amount to be expended for drainage works. The contracts provided that any drainage costs above this amount would be paid by the water users as part of an annual operation and maintenance charge. Soon after the first irrigation water was delivered it became clear that these estimated costs were inadequate in two respects. First, the total construction estimates were based on prewar costs and were totally unrealistic. Secondly, the drainage problem was much more severe than it was originally thought to be. The situation became critical 2 years ago when this ceiling on drainage costs was reached and charges were levied against the irrigation districts.

The necessity for amendatory contracts became clear at that time and there followed a protracted negotiation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the irrigation districts. Early in 1961 Secretary of the Interior Udall appointed a three-man board of consultants to make an independent study of the repayment problem and to provide recommendations for solution. On August 31 of 1961 Secretary Udall announced a "framework of solution" which framework followed the recommendations of the special board of consultants. As a result an amendatory "short form contract" has recently been negotiated with the Quincy Irrigation District and has been approved by an overwhelming majority of the water users of that district. This amendatory contract is set forth in full in the report. A principal objective of this legislation is the approval of the Quincy repayment contract, and similar contracts.

Some reference to the history of the Columbia Basin project may be helpful to the Senate. The Columbia Basin project is located in eastern Washington. Its key structure is the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River with a power installation of 1,944,000 kilowatts.

Construction of the project began December 18, 1933, with Public Works Administration funds. Grand Coulee Dam was formally authorized in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935 and the Columbia Basin project was "authorized and reauthorized" by the act of March 10, 1943. This authorization was for the irrigation of the full 1,029,000 acres of the project. The first power was delivered from Grand Coulee in 1941. Prior to that time the 1,029,000 acres of the project had been divided into three irrigation districts—the south, east, and Quincy districts—which were organized under Washington State law to administer the delivery of water to individual farming units.

Under reclamation law, assurances are required of the return to the Treasury of all construction costs over and above operation and maintenance costs. Interest is assessed on construction costs of power facilities but not on the irrigation investment. The multiple-purpose aspect of Grand Coulee Dam and, in particular, the use of power revenues for the support of irrigation repayment, was recognized from the time the project was first conceived in the 1920's. It was clearly understood that while the million acres of land in the project area could be transformed into productive farms, the cost of construction of the irrigation facilities was unquestionably beyond the ability of the potential water users to pay.

Before the project was authorized in 1943, extensive studies were made by highly qualified individuals and organizations attempting to forecast the repayment ability of the lands to be placed under irrigation. Following a series of discussions and negotiations from 1943 to 1945, an average repayment figure of $85 per acre was finally reached. This figure was incorporated into the repayment contracts executed in 1945 between the irrigation districts and the Secretary of the Interior. However, a contract limitation of $281 million was set on the obligation of the United States to expend funds to complete the irrigation work. Of this amount, $8,176,000 was fixed as the maximum amount to be applied to the construction of drainage facilities; $281 million represented an estimate of the construction costs to irrigate 1,029,000 acres of the project. As I have stated, however, this estimate was based on prewar costs and it soon became apparent that this estimate was unrealistic. No concrete explanation is available as to the background of the $8,176,000 limitation on drainage construction. It is virtually impossible to forecast with any degree of accuracy drainage construction costs before land is irrigated. The 1945 contracts required the Secretary to assess the irrigation districts for any construction costs of drainage over and above the contract limitation. This limitation was reached in 1960 and the Secretary accordingly assessed drainage charges amounting to $1.65 per acre as part of the operation and maintenance. In 1961 the charges amounted to $2.30 per acre and in 1962 the amount increased to $2.80 per acre. Rising costs of operating farm units in the basin placed the water users in a vicious cost-price squeeze. Now these water users face the prospect of ever-increasing drainage charges. In 1960 drainage charges were paid from the reserves of the irrigation districts and in 1961 by the water users under assessment. In 1962 the drainage charges were deferred by congressional action. On May 1 of next year the 1961 and 1962 drainage charges will become due, and there is grave doubt as to whether the irrigation districts can meet these charges which with operation and maintenance charges and construction charges will be in excess of $15 per acre for some irrigation blocks.

Furthermore, the contract ceiling of $281 million has now been reached, and unless this ceiling is removed by amendatory contracts all work on the project will cease at a point where less than half of the total authorized acres to be irrigated are actually under irrigation.

Without burdening the Senate, Mr. President, I should like to examine briefly the provisions of H.R. 11164.

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to execute the amendatory contract approved by the voters of the Quincy Irrigation District on February 13, 1962. The Secretary is also authorized to execute either a short-form amendatory repayment contract with the South and East Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts with the same repayment provisions as the Quincy contract or long-form amendatory repayment contracts of similar provisions with any districts. The amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy district which is the model for either short or long-form contracts with the other districts makes provisions for the following:

First. Adjusting the net irrigable acreage in the district;

Second. Removing the limitation on the amount to be expended for construction of project irrigation and drainage works and substituting a requirement for a finding of economic and financial feasibility;

Third. Capitalizing the cost of drainage works now being charged to and paid as a part of the cost of annual operation and maintenance of the irrigation system;

Fourth. Authorizing performance of project drainage construction work by the district under suitable agreements with the United States;

Fifth. Increasing the district's maximum construction charge repayment obligation;

Sixth. Increasing the average construction charge from $85 to $131.60 per irrigable acre;

Seventh. Extending the construction repayment period from 40 to 50 years; and

Eighth. Reducing the annual construction payments in the early years and increasing them at periodic intervals during the remaining years of the 50-year period.

Section 2 of the bill provides for a capitalization of the irrigation districts'

share of operations and maintenance funds expended for the construction of drainage works for the calendar year 1960–62, with the result that these charges will become part of the long-term obligations of the districts and they will receive an appropriate credit or refund for amounts previously paid.

Section 3 of the bill also repeals those sections of the Columbia Basin Project Act of March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14), which are peculiar to that project and the repeal of which would in all essential requirements eliminate the difference between the Columbia Basin project and other Federal reclamation projects.

The repeal of these provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act would, first, eliminate the requirement for farm unit conformance; second, permit the delivery of water to farm units without regard to whether they are conformed; third, allow delivery of water to 160 irrigable acres held by an individual and to 320 irrigable acres held by a husband and wife without regard to when the lands were held or reacquired by them or to the irrigable lands held by their minor children in their own right and for their own benefit; fourth, confine the antispeculation provisions or recordable contracts to lands in excess of those to which water may be lawfully delivered under this section of the bill; fifth, eliminate reference to companion State legislation which has already been enacted; and sixth, eliminate need for consent to sale of State-owned lands at approved prices.

Section 3 of the bill also amends section 4 of the Columbia Basin Project Act to permit farm units owned by the United States which the Secretary determines are not suitable for settlement purposes to be sold to resident project landowners as supplemental units, subject to the applicable acreage limitations.

In regard to the antispeculation provisions contained in the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 which are modified by this bill, I should like to take this opportunity to make the legislative record clear. Accordingly, I should like the RECORD to show at this point my recent correspondence on this subject with the Department of the Interior. Under Secretary Carr's letter sets out clearly what action the Department of the Interior intends to take to prevent any speculation in Columbia Basin project lands. I should like to emphasize again that this correspondence is offered as part of the legislative history of H.R. 11164.

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SEPTEMBER 12, 1962.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the consideration of S. 3162 and H.R. 11164 a question has arisen concerning the possibility of speculation on Columbia Basin project lands if such legislation is enacted. I am particularly concerned that it might be possible for a person or persons to buy large areas of land presently within one or more of the irrigation districts and, after enactment of the legislation, sell such land at a speculative profit thereby gaining a windfall by reason of the legislation. It was the intention of the Interior Committee and I know of your Department to insure that such windfalls should not occur.

Your framework statement of August 31, 1961, made it clear that you proposed to remove the antispeculation provisions from the nonexcess lands and retain such provisions as to excess lands.

Accordingly, I would appreciate your views on this question before this legislation comes before the Senate for consideration during the week beginning September 17. I intend to incorporate your reply into the RECORD as part of the legislative history of S. 3612 and H.R. 11164.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senator, Acting Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1962.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Acting Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Thank you for your letter of September 12, 1962. You are correct in your statement that the Department's proposal of August 31, 1961, intended to refer to the lifting of the antispeculation provisions of the existing Columbia Basin Project Act only as to the nonexcess lands and to retain the existing antispeculation provisions under the Federal reclamation laws as to excess lands.

The date as of which the status of land is to be determined as in excess or nonexcess status has not heretofore been explicitly stated. The Columbia Basin Project Act requires that all lands be covered by recordable contracts. At the present time all or substantially all of the lands legally within the present districts on the project are covered by recordable contracts executed by the landowners which contain specific antispeculation provisions as to those lands whether they will be excess or nonexcess.

Until the Columbia Basin Project Act is amended there is no authority to remove any antispeculation provisions from recordable contracts covering any lands in the project. If the pending legislation is enacted, there would be authority to amend the recordable contracts to remove the antispeculation provisions from lands deemed nonexcess. The date upon which the lands would be considered excess or nonexcess would be the date of the approval of the pending legislation which would be the authority to reform the contracts to provide for the lifting of the antispeculation provisions as to the nonexcess lands. This would remove the possibility of unscrupulous speculation with project lands as they might apply to large areas which would be excess.

A person who owns excess lands as of the date of the enactment of the legislation would be governed by the existing antispeculation provisions applicable to excess lands under the reclamation laws.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES K. CARR,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JACKSON. Section 4 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary to amend or modify all existing contracts, instruments, rules, regulations, forms, and procedures to conform to the provisions of this act.

Section 5 is designed to retain provisions of existing law allowing the delivery to nominal quarter sections even though they exceed 160 irrigable acres. While carrying out the cadastral surveys of the United States there were frequent errors which were rectified by a procedure which made all sections regular except those along the west side of a township. These sections along the west side were sometimes slightly short or in excess of 640 acres, and a quarter section would, of course, be similarly irregular. Section 5 also preserves the right of a vendee or a grantee the right to sue for an overpayment made under the Columbia Basin Project Act prior to the repeal of section 3 by this legislation.

Section 6 is a housekeeping provision which eliminates language in the Columbia Basin Project Act which the enactment of this bill makes unnecessary or inappropriate.

Section 7 amends an act of June 23, 1959 to permit the delivery of water to 640 acres of State lands used by Washington State University for agricultural research purposes whether or not these lands are in conformed farm units.

Mr. President, these are the provisions of H.R. 11164.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the pending bill, H.R. 11164.

As a person who was born and reared in the West, where water is literally the lifeblood of the economy and of the life of the people, it is with the greatest of reluctance that I rise in opposition to this particular bill. I shall offer an amendment at a subsequent time which I hope will cure the problem.

All of us know how important it is in the West to have reclamation projects, to have dams to preserve our water. Without water there cannot be farms. Without water there cannot be municipalities. Without water there cannot be industrial development.

Only through the development of water resources of the West have we been able to achieve some of the really great—almost fantastic in some cases—developments characteristic of the West. Without water this would not have been possible in our sister State of California, nor would it have been possible in the State of the Senator from Washington, who is now floor manager of the bill, nor would it have been possible in the State of Colorado.

Most of our efforts in legislative matters are devoted to the sheer task of trying to find ways of creating water in our Western States, of better using it and of preserving it.

With this background, it is very difficult for anyone like myself to oppose such a bill as the one before the Senate. I do not oppose the principles of the bill or its reclamation features. I oppose certain provisions in the bill which I think would cast a great burden upon the Northwest itself and eventually would cast a great burden upon the American taxpayers.

While the stated purpose of the bill, H.R. 11164, is to approve a short-term amendatory repayment contract with one of the three irrigation districts in the Columbia Basin project, the effect of the bill would go far beyond this. The bill would open the door to expenditures of an additional $400 million and the development of an additional 500,000

acres of new lands to be brought under irrigation.

This new development would be undertaken on the basis of construction costs of the year 1962 and beyond, but the repayment of these costs would be largely geared to the repayment capacity of irrigated lands in the agricultural economy of 1945. It is true that the project has already been authorized. It is also true that the original authorization for the Columbia Basin project in 1943 was for the ultimate development of 1 million acres of land. When the repayment contracts on this project were first executed in 1945, it was estimated that the entire irrigation development of the 1 million acres could be completed at a cost to the Federal Government of $280 million. Because of this 1945 estimate, and because of apprehension among Members of Congress that this cost figure might be exceeded in the absence of any ceiling on Federal expenditures for irrigation developments, there was inserted in the 1945 repayment contracts a provision placing a limit on the obligation of the Federal Government to make expenditures for facilities devoted to irrigation in the proposed 1-million-acre Columbia Basin project.

Today that contract ceiling of $280,782,180 has almost been reached. But instead of completion of irrigation facilities for 1 million acres, this $280 million will be sufficient to develop facilities for only 481,000 acres by the year 1966. Because of the existing contract limitation, the Bureau of Reclamation has been gearing its construction and development program for the past few years to a 481,000-acre development. Over 500,000 acres of the project, originally proposed to be developed and served with water from this project, is still used for dryland farming and remains undeveloped, so far as irrigation is concerned. It is now estimated that under present costs of construction, it will take an additional $400 million to complete the million-acre project so as to get water to the additional half-million acres. This means that the total cost of irrigation facilities for the project will become $678,126,000 instead of $280 million.

The Senator from Washington recently said that this was not a new authorization. Speaking strictly and legally, the Senator is correct. Factually speaking, what we are asked to do is to expand the limitations of a contract to the extent that we really would be authorizing by the proposed legislation the expenditure of $400 million more, and no one should make any mistake about what we are asked to do.

It would cost the Government of the United States $400 million more.

However, this additional $400 million cannot now be spent because of the ceiling on expenditures placed in the present repayment contracts. This bill, H.R. 11164, would remove this ceiling on expenditures, and no ceiling whatsoever would remain, either by contract or legislation.

The effect of this bill then is to make possible the expenditure of an additional $400 million so as to provide irrigation development for the additional 500,000 acres of land.

I am not in a position at this time to say whether I would favor this additional development or be opposed to it. I do not think any member of the Interior Committee has sufficient facts to make an intelligent stand one way or the other on this matter. Congress has not taken a look at the financial and engineering feasibility of this irrigation project since its authorization in 1943, almost 20 years ago. Since that time, construction costs on this project have increased 140 percent. The irrigation and farming practices have changed considerably. The needs of the agricultural economy have changed. And most important, from the standpoint of this project, the ability of the irrigator to pay his fair share of the project costs allocated to irrigation has increased substantially.

That is one of the main points, which I repeat. Most important from the standpoint of the project is the ability of the irrigator to pay his fair share of the project costs allocated to irrigation. Those costs have increased substantially.

Despite the fact that the estimated total construction costs of this project have increased 140 percent from the 1945 figures, that is, from $280 million to $678 million, it is proposed that the costs to be repaid by the water user on this 500,000-acre development be increased only 60 percent, that is, from $85 per acre to $131 per acre, and much of this modest increase will not be noticed because this bill would extend the repayment period an additional 10 years.

I repeat, that costs of the project have increased 140 percent. We know that the ability of the irrigator to pay a fair share has increased. Yet the irrigator himself would only be required to pay an increase of 60 percent as compared with an increase of 140 percent in the cost of construction.

I do not mean to suggest, by quoting these figures that the amount which the water user ought to pay should be increased in the same proportion as the cost of construction has increased. It has long been the policy of reclamation law, in multipurpose projects, to allocate the construction costs to the irrigators on the basis of their ability to pay. However, this standard of repayment ability, which is applied to every other reclamation project in the United States, is to be disregarded by the new development made possible through this bill.

The total cost of this new irrigation development will average something over $700 per acre. According to testimony of Mr. Stamm of the Bureau of Reclamation on July 18, 1962, the irrigators on this project will have the ability to repay annually the sum of $5.28 per acre. Over the 50-year repayment period, this would amount to a total of $264 per acre as against a project cost of $700 per acre. However, it is proposed in these new repayment contracts that the water user repay not $264 per acre, not even $200 per acre, but only $131 per acre over a 50-year period.

So it is proposed in the present measure that, based upon the contract which was made in 1943 and the provision with relation to the ability of the irrigator to pay in 1943, of the $700-per-acre cost which we are now asked to assume, the irrigator would repay only $131.

The balance of the $700-per-acre cost will be loaded on power revenues of the project. I point out that it was only in recent weeks that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] came before the Senate and procured a preferential use for the power in the Columbia River Basin. By way of comparison, I might point out that in the recently approved Fryingpan-Arkansas project in my State, the water user is scheduled to repay 70 percent of the project costs allocated to irrigation.

This desire of water users in the Columbia Basin project that their payment ability be ignored and that a disproportionate share of the burden be carried by power revenues was commented upon by the present Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Floyd Dominy, in 1960 when he said:

> It is inevitable, too, that where reclamation law says we should write contracts according to the ability to pay and there is a large powerplant with revenues available, the water users obviously are interested in loading as large a portion of the total on the revenue-producing elements other than irrigation.

Whether this amount of power assistance to irrigation under this project is justified under these circumstances, again I cannot say. Under this bill, there would be no reevaluation by Congress of the financial feasibility of this new 500,000-acre development costing an estimated $400 million. I, for one, think Congress should take a new look at this 20-year-old project before we pass this bill—a bill which will have the effect of opening the door for another $400 million expenditure.

I do not voice any objections to the other features of the bill. I believe amendatory repayment contracts are undoubtedly warranted to grant relief to existing irrigators from undue hardship arising out of the drainage problems in the districts.

In order to separate the desirable features of this bill from the potential development of an additional one-half million acres, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 4, it is proposed to insert the following section:

> SEC. 8. No irrigation works or facilities shall be constructed, pursuant to any existing authorization of the Columbia Basin project, which will provide for the irrigation of more than a total of 500,000 acres of land within the project.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in my few remarks I have stated the reason for the amendment. The facts of the situation are very easy to understand. They are very clear and plain. When the project was authorized in 1943, a limitation on the Federal expenditure of $280 million was put in the contract. Repayment contracts were entered into based upon cost estimates at that time. Now

it is proposed to construct facilities for another half million acres in 1962. Of course, the cost today would be based upon the construction costs of today. But instead of the irrigator paying what he is able to pay under today's prices, situation, and conditions, he would only repay $131, compared with the $85 repayment then.

The gist of the reclamation law is that the irrigator must repay in accordance with his ability to repay, which depends upon the location of the land, the condition of the soil, the part of the country, and the crops. All these factors are taken into consideration.

The amendment is not subject to the objection which many amendments face. I offered it in the subcommittee and in the full committee and discussed it there. The subject has been considered. What we are here to determine is whether we should abandon the basic concept of irrigation law, which is the ability of the irrigator to repay, and let these irrigators take a free ride—because that is what it is—on our 1962 costs based upon the contracts of repayment which were executed in 1945.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. As the Senator from Colorado has said, the amendment was considered in both the subcommittee and in the full committee, and in both places it was decisively disapproved.

The Senate should understand that the effect of the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would be to permit development of the project for only 1 more year.

I realize that when we talk about the Columbia Basin project, there is some feeling of envy, because this is indeed one of the most highly feasible projects that Congress has ever authorized. Grand Coulee Dam is the central part of the project. Fortunately, Grand Coulee Dam got underway when costs were low. The total cost of the power part of the project was about $180 million. By 1978—and that is not very far away—all of the cost of the Grand Coulee Dam, as it relates to commercial power—and that is virtually all of the dam structure—will be paid back with interest. This is a significant point. By 1978 all the present allocation from power revenues from the dam will be applied to the irrigation and reclamation features of the project.

Currently, we are paying in $12,800,000 a year from the power revenues from Grand Coulee. Reference has been made to the amount the irrigators are paying per acre. In the Colorado Basin Storage Act the costs that the irrigators are paying per acre are similar to that proposed in the amendatory contract approved by this bill.

Let me cite specific figures. In the central Utah vernal unit, the irrigation allocation is $6,787,400. The water users will repay $1,500,000, which is $102 an acre, or 22.1 percent.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the Senator would not wish to contend that we can, carte blanche, compare repayment features of one project with any other project. For example, all of the areas in the Colorado River Basin, without exception, are of a completely different kind. The quality of the land conditions is different. The atmospheric conditions are different. The crops are different. All factors are different on the Colorado River Basin.

Mr. JACKSON. The Columbia Basin is different. It is different in all these things. It is more feasible than other projects. That is the significant point. I wish to continue along this line, as long as the cost-per-acre figure has been mentioned.

Mr. ALLOTT. If it is so feasible, why are the irrigators unwilling to pay in accordance with their ability to pay?

Mr. JACKSON. I will come to that point in a moment. The Senator recalls the testimony from the three distinguished persons who went out into the basin to look over the project and who made their findings for the Secretary of the Interior as to the ability of the irrigators to pay. They came forward with the recommendations which are to be found in the contract. The irrigators in that area are not in a very good financial position. They are in a difficult situation because they are pioneers in the area, so to speak; and few have the resources and the funds to meet the ever-increasing costs. My senior colleague from Washington will concur in what I am saying, I am sure. We have had a great deal of difficulty in that basin. There have been a number of bankruptcies and forfeitures of real estate contracts due to the inability of the farmer to meet the total costs which have been imposed upon small farms. The farm unit, on the average, involves an investment of between $30,000 and $50,000.

I agree that there are differences, but I point out what the record shows with reference to other projects.

In the Emory project, a part of the Columbia Basin Storage Act, the irrigation allocation is $9,277,000. The water users will repay $2,550,000. That is $136 an acre, or 27.5 percent.

In the Florida irrigation project, the irrigation allocation is $9,030,604. The water users will repay $1,600,000. That is $82 an acre, or 17.7 percent.

In the Hammond project, the irrigation allocation is $3,656,303. The water users will repay $425,000, which is $109 an acre, or 11.6 percent.

In the Paonia project, the irrigation allocation is $7,540,874. The water users will repay $2,320,000, which is $152 an acre, or 30.8 percent.

In the Smith Fork project, the irrigation allocation is $4,128,394. The water users will repay $875,000, which is $92 an acre, or 21.2 percent.

In addition—and I emphasize this in view of the pending amendment—the Colorado Basin Storage Act provides for contracts with participating projects. These contracts do not contain a ceiling limitation on the obligation of the Government to expend funds or a feasibility clause—permitting the Secretary of the Interior to stop construction if the costs become excessive.

I believe that sufficiently answers the contention made in behalf of the amendment. The project in the Columbia Basin is one of the finest in the Nation. The water users will pay for a part, and the power users will pay for the other part, when they pay their power bills. This is something that the people in the Pacific Northwest agreed upon a long time ago. In the end, the Government will be amply repaid. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, if adopted, would mean that there would be 1 more year left to work on the project, and that the effect would be to deny us the right to have the potential of the whole concept of Grand Coulee and the Columbia Basin. The reason it has such a good feasibility ratio is the great acreage of more than a million acres, which will ultimately be developed.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure the Senator will agree that adoption of the amendment would make it impossible to properly plan the project. I point out that the Colorado Basin project is an open-ended one. What is good for one place ought to be good for another. Congress previously fully authorized this project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not true that before these contracts were entered into, they were subject to long hearings in the field, which were attended by many people, both government officials and water users; and that this problem has been threshed out pro and con until we arrived at this figure after almost 2 years? Surely any suggestion that there has been no testimony as to the ability of water users to pay is not well taken, because the question has been considered at length, even to the extent of having three or four elections on the types of contracts.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I very seriously considered several methods of handling this problem. I thought the bill ought to be returned to committee. However, one thing occurred during the proceedings to which I think the attention of the Senate ought to be called.

We in the Government frequently get into unusual situations and positions. A hearing was held upon this question, and representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation testified. I think we spent an hour or two on the question one morning. During that hearing we heard much about amendatory contracts.

I was very much in sympathy with the problems of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who was trying to solve the contractual problems. The reclamation officials went out to the area to try to solve the problems. But not once during that entire morning was one word said about increasing the expenditures by $400 million. I suppose $400 million is merely pocket money to those people; but I believe the average American—and I think I am average—cannot conceive of $400 million. I know I cannot comprehend so large a sum.

When the question rose, I called it to the attention of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is chairman of the subcommittee. He told me very frankly that he was not aware of the problem. That was why I called it to his attention. I do not wish to imply that he would try to pull a "fast one" or to pull the wool over my eyes. I think in respect to this problem he was as much misled as was the Senator from Colorado.

At the next hearing, the chairman of the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], presided. At page 29 of the hearings, the Senator from New Mexico said:

> The CHAIRMAN. The main problem we had when we got into this was that in the testimony given before the committee there was very little said about the fact that this would raise the authorization $400 million, and some of us believe that $400 million is not an insignificant sum; but not one word of that ever appeared in the testimony, so far as I can tell.
>
> There was a sort of limitation as to how many acres could be developed. I think it is the plain intention of everybody that in time the entire million acres be developed, but the Congress has been very careful about authorizing additional reclamation at the present time, and from what was being proposed by your Department, let us say quietly, at least, it was to raise the authorization from 400,000 acres to the full 1 million acres.
>
> I did not find anywhere in the testimony where that was made plain or even mentioned, and I wonder if it was the purpose of the witnesses to conceal that fact from the committee.
>
> Secondly, I know of nothing in this that said that the money limit which had been placed in the contract by Secretary Ickes was being expanded from $200 million.

I call this situation to the attention of the Senate merely to show why I am concerned. The junior Senator from Washington and I are very good friends. He understands my reasons for opposing this bill. As he has told me, he was not aware of the situation any more than I was.

As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the committee, said, in the 2 hours of hearings not one word was said by the Bureau of Reclamation about an expenditure of $400 million.

I am attempting by my amendment to cure the problem in the only way I know how. During the hearings, I was afflicted by the thing known as "proxyitis." I did not have enough votes, so far as proxies were concerned, to carry my point in the committee. I say that in good grace and in friendship. Nevertheless, I think this proposal is a bad mistake. It would deal a mortal blow to reclamation. We are writing out of reclamation law or the policy of reclamation law in respect to multipurpose projects the allocation of construction costs to irrigators on the ability to pay, and we are allocating it here on the ability to pay in 1943.

CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the time for effective action by President Kennedy and others in authority in connection with the protracted strike which has tied up all shipping in a nine-State area on the Chicago & North Western Railway is not only here and now; it is, in fact, long past. Unless immediate action is forthcoming, the farmers and shippers of this great agricultural area will suffer an irreparable economic loss bordering on a financial disaster.

For more than a week, friends of the White House, both in and out of the Senate, who presume to speak with authority on the strike negotiations, have been counseling the people to be calm and confident in view of the fact that a strike settlement could be expected momentarily. It was freely predicted by those speaking for the White House and the Department of Labor that on the basis of their inside pipeline information from these areas of authority, the strike would be settled during the past weekend.

When those predictions turned to ashes in our hands, we were told the strike would be settled certainly not later than Monday night. Then we were advised to expect an end of the strike and the resumption of rail service by Tuesday at the latest.

Mr. President, it is now late Wednesday afternoon. Yet no firm word of assurance that the strike has been settled has come from either the White House or the Secretary of Labor. The farmers and the many citizens generally who are suffering from the strike, which is now in its 20th day, can no longer survive on expressions of pious hope that the strike settlement is just around the corner. Even though the strike were settled tonight and the trains began to carry farm produce tomorrow morning, the economic loss to the farmers of South Dakota and elsewhere would be staggering. Many of our farmers having perishable products on their hands have already reached the corner of disaster.

Every passing day of delay in getting the trains back on the tracks is expanding the economic suffering of our nine-State area. Action is needed now. Further postponement may well make the eventual settlement of the strike far too late to help those who will already have suffered serious economic tragedy.

Ever since his press conference last week, in which the President disclosed a double standard of morality in dealing with strike settlements, as revealed in the conflicting manner in which he has handled strikes on missile bases as compared with this railroad strike, editorials have been appearing all across America calling attention to this discrepancy and urging that the President himself move into this prolonged railroad strike in order to seek a settlement. In connection with the missile controversy the President stated that he had appointed a factfinding board, and that the factfinding board had made recommendations that the companies comply with the demands of the union; and the President virtually ordered the companies to comply.

But in connection with the railroad strike, although the President also appointed a factfinding board, and although it found that the union should have its members return to work, and recommended that it agree to a procedure which was acceptable to the railroad and was devised by the factfinding board, in this case no such stirring words urging the striking workers to return to their jobs were used. So the strike continues this Wednesday afternoon.

Merely shifting the controversy from the President's factfinding board, which already has studied all the evidence, and has made its recommendations, and has urged that the union accept them, over into a new area of study and discussion by a new factfinding panel or arbitration committee—as was suggested on Monday in his telegram to the railroads and to the union—has not brought relief from this disastrous strike.

All day I have been keeping in touch with the situation. Conferences were held this morning, and have taken place during the day, downtown; and I presume that negotiations are continuing. But what is required is action in order to get the trains back into operation before the sugarbeets deteriorate and before the farmers who have been forced to store their grain outdoors lose their crop, and before a million-dollar loss is suffered by the farmers of this area, through no fault of their own.

Yet, although they were prudent and efficient enough to produce a good crop, they are now denied an opportunity to market it, because of a controversy in which they are not involved in any way.

Certainly this situation should not be permitted to continue. Great damage has already occurred to the national defense, and great construction works have been delayed, because of the inability to obtain the necessary supplies to continue the work on them. This development is occurring in our area, where winter is only a short time ahead of us, and where, because of the weather conditions, the construction season is normally short.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the time has clearly arrived when we should call for, and should expect, effective action from the White House. The President could call into his office the officials of the unions and the officials of the railroad, and urge them to abide by the decisions and recommendations of his factfinding board. If either refused to cooperate—and up to now the Telegraphers Union has refused to cooperate—the President could go on the television and the radio, and could marshal public opinion against those who would perpetuate, or even further this strike, which already has slowed down our national defense program in a widespread area and already has caused grave economic suffering to farmers and producers.

Or, as a second suggestion, the President could send to Congress proposed legislation specifically granting to him authority to deal with this emergency-type situation. I am sure Congress would respond in the course of 48 hours to such a proposal—as Congress did respond, in a like amount of time, to the President's request for authority to call up the reservists.

As a third suggestion, Mr. President, President Kennedy could explore and utilize the other steps available to him through the prestige and authority of his high office, which would enable him to undertake to bring the strike to an immediate end.

It seems to me that if the strike is not settled by midnight tonight, the least that should be done is for the President to call into his oval office those who are delaying the solution of the strike, and exercise the prestige of that position and the impressive environment of the President's office to go into this problem himself, because it is one of serious consequences. It involves not only South Dakota, although our farmers have been badly hit, and we have a rich and ample sugarbeet crop which needs to be hauled at once to the mills. In addition, this matter has become one of national concern and national consequences.

To illustrate how widespread is the concern about the strike, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of editorials dealing with the problems involved, which have appeared in the press of the country from virtually coast to coast.

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

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 19, 1962]

RAIL STRIKES CAN'T BE TOLERATED

After 20 days of inconvenience and hardship for thousands of people in nine States, a strike of telegraphers against the North Western Railway appears to be nearer settlement. Both sides have accepted a proposal by President Kennedy that the remaining issues of the dispute be submitted to binding arbitration by a new three-man board.

A Presidential emergency board, created under the Railway Labor Act, already has studied the dispute and made recommendations which the C. & N.W. agreed to accept. The union balked on a recommendation that it should have no veto over job reductions, and insisted on a settlement like one made a year ago with the Southern Pacific Railroad.

Under the Railway Labor Act the report of a Presidential emergency board is not binding upon the parties; it is merely a recommendation of terms for a settlement. The theory of the law was that public opinion would force a settlement according to the board's terms. Framers of the law thought also that bargaining between the parties would be conducted realistically and in good faith, because neither side would dare risk unwelcome recommendations.

The act worked for a while just as its sponsors hoped it would, until former President Franklin D. Roosevelt began to overrule the findings of the boards, giving the unions more than the boards recommended. The practice was continued by former President Truman. Since then there has been no real bargaining in railroad labor disputes until after emergency boards have made reports.

The railroads have never opposed the recommendations of such a board, but the unions have not been under similar restraint. They begin bargaining after a board already has sought to reach a compromise.

In the current C. & N.W. strike there was no pressure from the White House upon the union to accept the recommendations of the Presidential emergency board, although in other disputes the Kennedy administration has put heat on employers to accept the findings of similar boards.

Railroad executives, trying to work within the double standard imposed by the administration, have concluded that the Railway Labor Act needs strengthening. Clair M. Roddewig, president of the Association of Western Railways, says he has come to the conclusion reluctantly that the findings of Presidential emergency boards should be made binding through an amendment of the Railway Labor Act.

The unions surely would oppose such a change in the law because it would deprive them of their most powerful weapon—the strike. But if they continue to ignore the findings of Presidential boards, and continue to call devastating strikes, they will exhaust the patience of the public. The result is very likely to be congressional action for compulsory arbitration.

The strike against the C. & N.W. is a kind of pilot for other disputes involving other companies and other unions. If it results in improvement of the procedure for keeping peace in the railroad industry, the country will have received something in return for the troubles which the strike caused.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 19, 1962]

HALLELUJAHS AND HARD FACTS

Everyone affected will welcome the resumption of North Western Railway Co. train service. At this writing, however, hallelujahs would be premature. The strike by the Order of Railroad Telegraphers has not been ordered ended although both sides to the dispute have agreed to President Kennedy's proposal that the differences between them should be settled by arbitration. The union is unhappy with the President's proposal and is being cagey about what questions ought to go to the arbitrators.

As we understand the President's proposal, the entire dispute between the railroad and the union will not go to arbitration but only those differences concerning the interpretation and application of a Presidential emergency board's report and recommendations in the case.

The arbitrators would not try to rewrite the earlier Presidential board's report, but only try to get both sides to agree to what those recommendations mean and to decide this for the disputants if they can't agree.

It seems to us that the Presidential board's report that is now to be interpreted by the arbitrators was lucid enough for men of ordinary intelligence and good will to interpret. The stickiest problem between the railroad and the union concerns the need—acknowledged even by the union—for cutting back the number of telegraphers' jobs. In today's operation, railroads do not need as many telegraphers as they once did.

The union has insisted that it does not demand a job freeze or the right of veto over abolishing jobs. It says it merely wants the same settlement on the issue that was made in the case of the Southern Pacific Railway Co. 11 months ago. With certain important exceptions, this would limit the cutback of telegraphers' jobs to 2 percent a year, which in the Southern Pacific's case was no block to its progress.

The union's demand was investigated thoroughly by the Presidential board and it stated specifically that the Southern Pacific formula should not be applied to North Western. It would be harmful to North Western's modernization program.

Nevertheless as late as September 10, while the strike was in progress, the union put out a flyer giving the facts about the strike. It said, "Our union is seeking from the North Western the same kind of agreement it has on the Southern Pacific. This provides an orderly procedure and timing for job abolitions, plus protective conditions for those men adversely affected by job changes."

The union then added, "Or, if Mr. Heineman prefers, our union has offered to negotiate any other agreement providing reasonable job security and stability."

Heineman is Ben W. Heineman, chairman of North Western.

This statement by G. E. Leighty, president of the union, shows the maddening difficulty of dealing with a union that wants what it wants regardless of the merits of its case, or the public interest. It completely ignores the fact that the Presidential board flatly recommended against the Southern Pacific formula in the North Western case. There can be no misinterpretation of the board's views on that matter. They are spelled out in considerable detail. It will not take an arbitrator to tell the union that the Southern Pacific formula is out in the case of the North Western.

And what of the union's demand for "any other agreement?" The board recommended other plans for retraining displaced telegraphers, for separation, furlough, and displacement allowances and other ways of easing the inevitable changes that are necessary. The railroad agreed.

There should not be too much for the arbitrators to decide in interpreting the Presidential board's findings. The union could have spared its own members, other North Western employees and the public a costly strike if it had accepted the Presidential board's report. Instead it had to be forced by the President of the United States himself, somewhat belatedly, to take a reasonable position and we are not even certain that it has yet done so.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 14, 1962]

OUT OF STEAM?

President Kennedy moved swiftly to stop a proposed increase in the price of steel. But when a railroad system serving nine States is shut down with disastrous consequences to the communities along its 10,800-mile right-of-way he, as well as the railroad, seems to be out of steam.

While the President was journeying about the country informing us what we may some day do in outer space the people served by the Chicago & North Western Railway, were concerned with what can be done on their particular section of this earth to get the railroad moving again.

That 1,000 or fewer railroad telegraphers can immobilize a vast community in a union's losing battle to stop automation, freeze jobs and otherwise prevent an efficient operation of the Chicago & North Western system is a ridiculous example of irresponsibility by both the telegraphers and the other unions which refuse to cross their picket lines. It is especially so when the railroad, accepting the recommendations of a Presidential factfinding board, has agreed to institute an adjustment program for the telegraphers whose jobs would be lost.

The union has had and has been granted every legal and moral right inherent in the collective bargaining process. Its present intransigency is without justification.

The President has sent several hundred messages to the current congressional session, messages which, in most instances, have requested increased grants of power. But he has yet to send one to the Hill suggesting that he be given the power to seize the Chicago & North Western and put it back in business.

Members of his administration have sometimes indicated concern over charges that he and his colleagues are unfriendly to business. Some of his apologists have contended there is no substance to such charges. Maybe not. But a President who can move so swiftly and effectively to stop an increase in steel prices should be able to move swiftly and effectively in getting the Chicago & North Western rolling again. Mr. Kennedy used the prestige of his office to keep steel

prices down. Why can't he use the prestige of his office to force the union to accept the recommendations of his own emergency board? Or is there one rule for business and another for unions?

Perhaps what we need to get the railroad to moving again is to get the President to moving again.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Sept. 8, 1962]

IT MAY BE A LONG STRIKE

Ben Heineman, chairman of the Chicago & North Western Railway, says that the line will stay shut down for months if necessary to win its strike with the Order of Railroad Telegraphers. "The principle involved here is such that it would stop progress not only on the North Western, but in the whole railroad industry," he stated. "For that kind of principle we will continue our present stand for as long as the Telegraphers Union continues theirs."

With the strike becoming more and more important to many people in this area it is vital that the public understand the principle Mr. Heineman refers to.

In recent years the relatively new management of the railroad has taken a number of somewhat drastic steps to try to reduce its operating expenses below its operating income. One of these steps was the elimination of stations in many small communities, throwing telegraphers and other employees out of work.

Faced with the probability that this trend will continue, the Telegraphers Union has demanded a contract clause stating that no jobs which existed on the railroad December 31, 1957, can be eliminated without union consent.

The management of the North Western has the right to assume that such consent would never be forthcoming, and hence refers to the proposed clause as a "job freeze proposal." The management also takes the position that submitting to this proposal would be giving the union a veto over management's right to run its business.

The situation on the North Western is similar to the problem in other industries where automation of production processes leads to laying off workers. This issue has brought on long and bitter strikes in a number of other instances.

Management of any business must have the right to adopt policies which make its operations more efficient, even if it means laying off workers. On the other hand, in our modern concept of fair employee relations, management also has the responsibility to alleviate as much as possible economic hardship to workers thus displaced.

In the North Western case a factfinding commission appointed by the President recommended a number of measures to aid the displaced telegraphers, including displacement allowances, furlough allowances, separation allowances, moving and traveling expenses, extension of pension and hospitalization benefits, preference of employment, and training and retraining programs. The railroad accepted these liberal conditions, but the union has refused to give up its primary demand.

It is unfortunate that this union has resorted to a strike to try and settle a basic issue which in the end can only be solved by compromise. No enlightened management can give up its right to manage its own business and long stay in business. That is why Mr. Heineman says his railroad will stay closed a long time unless the union gives up its primary demand.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record Herald, Sept. 10, 1962]

THE NORTH WESTERN IS RIGHT

A factfinding emergency board appointed by President Kennedy has made recommendations aimed at settlement of the strike by telegraphers of the Chicago & North Western Railway. The railway has indicated that it will accept the recommendation of the emergency board. But the telegraphers do not.

It would seem like an appropriate time for the President to take action. And we mean action—not consideration of action. The Chief Executive lost only a few minutes in clamping down on Big Steel some months ago when he disagreed with a price increase and considered it to be contrary to the public interest. Now he has the assurance from his own factfinding board that this strike can be settled in the public interest if both parties will accept the recommendations.

The seat of the problem involves the following proposed rule:

"No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

Carry this to its extreme and the railroads would be forced to employ people to shovel coal for steam locomotives which are no longer in existence. The firm is being asked to sign an agreement to make absolutely no progress, but to guarantee to stand still—and lose money, if necessary, to keep unessential employees on the payroll.

The board recommended a fair and reasonable method of abolishing unnecessary jobs. Employees moved to other jobs would be paid a differential between their new pay and old. Those released would be paid monthly allowances equivalent to 60 percent of wages in the prior 12 months. Workers who have been with the railway for 5 to 14 years would receive this furlough allowance for 3 full years and those with 15 years or more would be paid for 5 years.

There are other similar provisions, all recommended by Mr. Kennedy's board and accepted by the railway, but the telegraphers will not accept.

Wausau area industry could be hurt soon unless this strike is settled. The President should act.

[From the DeKalb (Ill.) Daily Chronicle, Sept. 13, 1962]

NORTH WESTERN STRIKE

A needless and useless strike is beginning to pinch hard at the Nation's breadbasket, all caused by a walkout of approximately 1,000 members of the telegraphers union.

Hundreds of towns and cities which are served by the Chicago & North Western are being seriously affected by the walkout.

Such commodities as coal, wheat, iron ore, and the seasonal processing of agricultural products are directly affected. In many areas, important industries, largely dependent upon this railroad may soon be forced to curtail operations.

For instance, the Midland Electric Coal Co. has reported that the strike of the telegraphers is costing the firm $30,000 each day and has idled over 300 miners.

The purpose or plan of the union evidently as has been stated in reports is the taking away from management the right to decide what jobs within this union's jurisdiction are needed or not needed.

If the union's demands are met the result can have far-reaching effects on the Nation's business and economy. Sixteen thousand five hundred persons have been idled by the walkout of these 1,000 telegraphers, and has caused the following:

Forced 70,000 commuters to seek other means of transportation to and from work.

Sixteen thousand five hundred workers and employees have been idled which will cost them $10 million in wages.

The railroad stands to lose about $18 million in revenues, the bulk being in freight, grain, coal, pulpwood, and machinery.

Other products too many to enumerate, which depend on the road will themselves lose millions of dollars in business.

If there ever was an attempt to featherbed, this is it. These jobs are in no way necessary to the efficient operation of the road because if the demands are met approximately 620 telegraphers would presumably be reinstated dating back to December 3, 1957.

These jobs have been rendered obsolete by elimination or consolidation of small station agent positions. Even with the job eliminations the North Western's net loss for the first 6 months of 1962 has been set at nearly $3,800,000.

The company has, in accordance with recommendations of the Presidential factfinding board announced its willingness to provide substantial financial cushioning for those laid off; to pay moving and traveling expenses for those transferred to other areas, and to finance training and retraining programs for those displaced.

If the tail ever wagged the dog, this is it.

By prolonging this strike George Leighty, president of the union, and his few hundred telegraphers are causing a $600,000 daily loss to the Chicago & North Western railroad, many thousands and perhaps millions to hundreds of businesses and industries in the Midwest.

If the strike is not settled soon the railroad, the telegraphers, and many others concerned will go down to ruin wishing they had been given another chance. This is no time for stubbornness, this is no time for bickering, this is no time for halting the productive flow of goods to our markets.

If the strikers are permitted to win, if the same policy should be allowed to prevail elsewhere, then we might as well throw in the towel—for technological advancement might as well be halted.

Had such a policy prevailed 50 years ago—men today would be sitting in buggy factories drawing pay for just sitting there.

[From the San Francisco News Call-Bulletin, Sept. 8, 1962]

THE SILENT TELEGRAPH

The economy of an important part of the Midwest has hit another bump along the road of changing industrial patterns.

The Chicago & North Western Railway, third longest in the Nation, has been shut down 2 weeks by a strike of telegraphers with consequent pinches on commerce and stranding of 36,000 Chicago area commuters.

The North Western has eliminated several hundred telegraphers' jobs since 1957 in a modernization program and plans to cut more. Technology is catching up with the telegrapher at his key in hundreds of small stations along the line.

Presidential fact-finding boards have agreed with the railroad's contention that its program is essential for efficient operation. They approved the job eliminations but recommended measures to ease the plight of the displaced telegraphers. The boards proposed severance payments, replacement in other jobs on the road, moving expenses and other means to soften the blow.

The railroad accepted, but the union refused.

American railroads are hard pressed and are entitled to make what economies they can consistent with the public safety.

In doing so, they are obligated to do everything in their power to ease the plight of the displaced. Undeniably, whatever they do will not in all cases be enough because it is impossible to compensate a man and his family adequately for being uprooted and moved into new and unaccustomed living and working conditions.

But other thousands of jobs are dependent on the soundness of the railroads and the good of the greatest number must be paramount.

[From the Scottsdale (Ariz.) Progress, Sept. 1, 1962]

NEEDLESS STRIKE

The strike called by the Order of Railroad Telegraphers (AFL–CIO) against the Chicago & North Western Railroad is a direct challenge to management's right to conduct its own business. Behind the union protest is opposition to the road's reorganization program which has removed 500 surplus union members from the payroll and which will involve others.

Telegrapher officials may use fancy words in trying to defend their action, but what they actually are trying to do is retain featherbedding in its most offensive form.

Featherbedding is the term used to denote retention or creation of jobs, which are not actually needed in the operation of a railroad or business. Its objective is to keep union membership at high levels.

In other words, featherbedding is used for the benefit of unions and officials who receive big salaries but not for the advantage of the employer. The latter pays the bill and in the case of the railroads, that is the situation which is causing financial distress in the industry.

Another point which the Telegraphers Union will find difficult to explain is that the bulk of its membership is not connected with actual communications. The old Morse operators are as scarce as proverbial hen's teeth. Modern methods in communication are now used to send messages and control traffic.

Members of the striking union are ticket sellers, station employees, and tower operators. Ask most of them to take a message and they would reach for a phone.

While these employees may have reason to be concerned about their jobs, they are taking the wrong way to save them. The strikers will lose pay; thousands of other employees will be deprived of paychecks and communities in nine States will face extraordinary hardships.

This strike is unwarranted and indefensible.

The union officials who called it are open to criticism, for the harm they are doing will be felt throughout the area served by the railroad. The strike is certainly not in the national interest.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Sept. 10, 1962]

THERE ARE NO OUTSIDERS

"Let's not have any outsiders interfering with our strike" was the gist of a letter from a railroader printed in the Journal.

But there are outsiders who are very much concerned.

If you didn't count the importance of moving sugarbeets or missile equipment, then you have Oahe and highway projects which require transportation of tons of material by rail.

The Chicago & North Western Railroad has been tied up with the strike order by members of the National Order of Telegraphers. All other union members on the railroad struck in sympathy. The complete tieup of the big rail system puts the problem into national focus.

Conversation with members of the railroad unions indicates they realize the pattern for railroad operation in this area has changed. Sympathetic walkouts are made because union members claim they must hang together or hang separately. It was Patrick Henry who said that as he talked of a union of States.

But there are economic facts which union members, management, and all the people should recognize.

Telegraphers for nonexistent stations sounds like some Federal governmental bureaucratic waste which every American criticizes. Yet such positions do exist. The telegraphers would never put themselves in the same category, but what other category is there?

Offers at Belle Fourche to take care of beets and almost run a railroad are symbolic of the manner in which South Dakotans will rise to meet an emergency—but ordinarily those emergencies are tornadoes, fires, or floods.

Some sense must be made to settle the North Western strike.

The rail employees know that private firms have unloaded freight cars stopped at the crossings, they know that trucks are in demand to move more goods all along the line.

Railroads in the United States have been operating in recent years at losses and the charges of featherbedding have never ceased. Passenger service on trains has diminished to zero for South Dakota because the companies simply could not keep operating, the business wasn't there.

Pay where there is no job can be costly for any firm. Jobs which demand skill and knowledge must be filled by personnel who deserve adequate wages.

As the years go by, management understands that competent employees are required and they should be compensated accordingly. Some jobs can be eliminated as efficient and modern methods are used. Employees and employers ordinarily recognize this.

There are farmers today who are holding their cattle, sheep, hogs, grain, and other produce off the market with the hope that reasonable prices can be obtained.

As of now, the National Farmers Organization has members who refuse to go to market. The farmer strike has slowed packing plant operations in the Midwest and several packers have laid off employees because there were no animals to process.

Loss of revenue for the railroad in the case of the telegraphers' strike is tremendous. The inconvenience is costly and diversion of traffic to trucks could mean permanent truck use by some shippers.

The farmer strike doesn't mean this Nation will go hungry, because demands for beef and pork, flour, and breakfast cereals will be met from other sources.

Economics and fair prices and fair wages are linked for this Nation. All the people must recognize these facts. And it is best to keep negotiating and keep working these days. Strikes focus attention on problems, but how often is the overall good served?

[From the Mankato Free Press, Aug. 31, 1962]

THE RAILROAD DISPUTE

Any assessment of the validity of the Chicago and North Western Railway telegraphers' strike must consider carefully the central point involved. The average American when he hears of a labor walkout, usually takes it for granted that involved are such things as higher pay, shorter hours, and working conditions. This is not true in the telegrapher union's dispute.

The telegraphers walked out because the railroads would not agree to their demands that no position existing in 1957 be abolished without the union's agreement. The jobs involved were principally those of station agents, tower men, and others for whose services there is a declining need. The union wants the jobs to continue as always whether or not it is necessary to have people fill them.

This is comparable to having firemen in diesel locomotives or four men in the cockpit of an airliner which needs only three, and standby musicians for an orchestra. It provides employment for people for whom there is no work.

The railroad offered to retrain or make other provisions for workers who may be displaced by the decline in the number of jobs available. However, the union would not listen to this proposal. The issue as far as the telegraphers are concerned is the retention of jobs that existed 5 years ago whether or not there is still work to do.

This is the kind of dispute that is designed to bring an entire railroad to a standstill and to put a total of about 16,000 workers out of jobs. In addition, it will inconvenience many travelers, including about 70,000 commuters in the Chicago area, and will delay the movement of a great deal of freight in the Middle West.

In other words, the issue of whether jobs for which there is no need will be retained, is allowed to tie up a major industry. This apparently makes sense to the telegraphers but the average American cannot be blamed if he finds that it makes no sense at all.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, Sept. 4, 1962]

C. & N.W. STRIKE CASTS SHADOW

Although extremely serious, the strike of 1,000 telegraphers against the Chicago & North Western Railroad is but a preliminary skirmish over whether railroads must retain jobs that have become outmoded and are no longer necessary.

It is not a problem peculiar to the railroads. New equipment and machines mean a shifting of jobs in every industry, eliminating some and creating others. But a full-scale crisis is developing on the railroads because of the failure of railway management and union labor to reach a compromise after years of negotiation.

A recommendation by a Presidential Commission, spelling out what appears to be a reasonable solution to a difficult situation, was accepted by the railway management but rejected by the unions. The purpose of this Commission was to cut through the claims and counterclaims of the disputing parties to get at the facts, and try to outline a solution in the best interests of the railway employees, the railroads—and the public.

This particular telegraphers' strike affects only the North Western, but a similar issue, largely revolving around the forced employment of firemen on diesels, involves all the railroads. Basically it is the problem of the right of management to abolish unnecessary jobs.

A nationwide railroad strike cannot be tolerated, and with no hope of a compromise in sight, the Federal Government may be forced to intervene, and, eventually, may have to virtually dictate the settlement.

If this happens it will be a serious breakdown of collective bargaining. It will plunge labor-management relations into the vagaries of politics, which not only is a poor substitute for round-the-table discussion by the parties directly involved, but also sets a dangerous precedent that could undermine the independence of both management and labor.

In many ways this is the most serious labor-management problem that has faced the Nation since World War II, because it involves basic concepts of the rights of both labor and management.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Aug. 30, 1962]

1851–1962

Ever since the Erie Railroad first experimented in 1851 with the transmission of train orders over copper wires, the telegrapher has been as much a part of the romance of the rails as the engineer, the conductor, the fireman, or the brakeman. For generations, every way station on every U.S. railroad had its faithful brass pounder, held in awe by all small boys for his ability to interpret the clicks of his instrument and throw sidetrack switches to keep the fast mail from a disastrous "cornfield meet" with a slow freight.

But times change, and with the development of microwave radio, automatic switches

and centralized traffic control (CTC), the job of the telegrapher has become less vital and his numbers steadily fewer. The telegraphers naturally dislike this trend, and their union, the AFL–CIO Railway Telegraph Order, has fought hard against railroad efforts to eliminate jobs. Their president, G. E. Leighty, is chairman of the Railway Labor Executives Association, the counterpart of the Association of American Railroads in the bitter struggle over union work rules and featherbedding.

This is the basic issue in the threatened strike of the telegraphers against the Chicago & North Western Railroad. The C. & N.W. in the past 6 years has eliminated 620 telegraphers' jobs on its lines serving Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, and currently proposes dropping 70 more. The 1,139 survivors in the C. & N.W. branch of Mr. Leighty's union want job security provisions in their new contract. They have rejected the findings of President Kennedy's emergency board which on July 14 said the retention of unnecessary jobs by the railroad is not an acceptable form of job security, and that the C. & N.W. should have the latitude to discharge superfluous employees if it provides increased severance pay and other benefits.

The dispute thus is remindful of the continuing squabble between the railroads and their firemen and rear end brakemen, and the airlines and their flight engineers. It is difficult to see how such controversies can end other than along the lines suggested by the presidential board. The telegraphers must be philosophical enough to accept the fact that technological progress created their jobs 111 years ago, and the same process now has made them obsolete.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Aug. 31, 1962]

NORTH WESTERN STRIKE

The Chicago & North Western railroad has station agents who in some cases, according to official findings, work only a few minutes a day. It wants to close some of these stations and to consolidate some. To ease things for the telegraphers who now man these stations, it has offered retraining, preference in other jobs, all moving expenses, a separation allowance of up to 16½ months of full pay.

To this the telegraphers say no. They insist that no telegrapher may be let out, regardless of whether he has anything to do. The union, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, insists also that no telegrapher's job may be abolished without the consent of the union, even though machines may be doing the telegrapher's work. That might mean, as the railroad puts it, that the union could force the company "to keep unnecessary positions on its payroll for persons not yet born."

That is the issue involved in the strike which has shut down the vast North Western system. Rarely has the issue of featherbedding been presented so badly.

The 1,000 telegraphers who are on strike, backed by other rail unions, can do incalculable harm to the North Western and to the area it serves. If the strikers are permitted to win, and if the same policy should prevail elsewhere, technological advancement might as well be halted.

Had such a policy prevailed 50 years ago, men today would be sitting around in empty buggywhip factories drawing pay for doing nothing.

[From the Indianapolis News, Sept. 5, 1962]

DEFEATING ITS PURPOSE

A 5-year-old dispute over job security has culminated in a strike against the Chicago & North Western railroad that can only be harmful to all concerned.

The strike was called by 1,000 telegraphers of the railroad, and operation of one of the Nation's largest rail systems has been tied up. Sixteen thousand other employees have been laid off and 70,000 Chicago commuters have been denied the transportation on which they had depended.

Nobody will contend that workers have no right to strike to support the position they believe to be right. But it is highly questionable under the circumstances whether a strike against a railroad can do anything to strengthen job security. In fact, it would seem to do otherwise.

Railroads generally are in a precarious position because of loss of business to other forms of transportation. When a system is forced to suspend operation, its patrons through necessity will turn to substitute carriers.

It is quite possible many of them will never return. Thus, additional business has been lost which the North Western, or any railroad, can ill afford to lose in these times. And if its business continues to decline, the railroad simply does not need nor can it afford as many telegraphers as it once did.

There obviously is stubbornness on both sides in this dispute. But whether the strike is of short or long duration, it is a clear example of an effective means of destroying job security.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 6, 1962]

EVERYONE IS LOSING IN THIS STRIKE

"It wouldn't surprise me," said George E. Leighty, president of the telegraphers' union, "if the strike runs a month or more."

Taking the statement at face value, this means that fewer than 1,000 men, striking the Chicago & North Western Railway, will prolong and compound this havoc:

A rail system employing 15,500 persons and serving the vital interests of nine States will remain paralyzed. The employees will lose nearly $10 million in wages.

Thirty-five thousand commuters will have to shift for themselves, jamming the expressways, straining other commuter facilities beyond capacity, suffering inordinate inconvenience.

The railroad will lose $18 million in revenues. The great bulk of this business is freight, which means that shippers of grain, pulpwood, machinery, and other products dependent upon C. & N.W. will themselves lose millions of dollars in business.

As one example of the beating suffered by shippers, the Midland Electric Coal Co. reports the strike is costing it $30,000 a day, and has idled 300 miners at its Middle Grove mine.

This is calamity on a vast scale, affecting in one way or another every resident of the territory served by the big railroad.

The public is entitled to ask Leighty and his relative handful of telegraphers why.

The answer is totally inadequate.

The strike was called in an effort to blackjack the railroad into giving the union the right to freeze telegraphers' employment. Since the freeze would be as of December 3, 1957, this would presumably mean the reinstatement of some 620 telegraphers whose jobs have been abolished since that time.

These are jobs in no way necessary to the efficient operation of the railroad. They are mainly feathered jobs, rendered obsolete by elimination or consolidation of small station agent positions. Even with these payroll slashes, the C. & N.W.'s net loss for the first 6 months of 1962 was nearly $3,800,000.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Presidential emergency board, the railroad has announced its willingness to provide substantial financial cushioning for those laid off; to pay moving and traveling expenses for those transferred to other communities, to finance training and retraining programs for those displaced.

Unless the Nation's third most extensive railroad is to be pushed into bankruptcy, a settlement must be reached on some such basis.

Do Leighty and his few hundred telegraphers intend to prolong the strike—and the company's $600,000 a day losses—until the railroad, the telegraphers, and all others concerned go down to ruin together?

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Sept. 4, 1962]

THE TELEGRAPHERS STRIKE

Because about 1,000 telegraphers have struck the North Western Railroad in a dispute over job policy, 15,500 other rail workers have been laid off and literally millions of persons living in the nine States served by the North Western Road have been inconvenienced.

The dispute started over about 700 telegraphers' jobs that have been eliminated in a company streamlining program started in 1955. The union has been demanding a contract agreement that would prevent the elimination of any jobs which existed on the railroad December 31, 1957, without union consent. The railroad officials call this a demand for a job freeze which would give the union "an absolute veto over technological improvements and over modernization and increases in efficiency." Spokesmen for the union say they are not asking for a job freeze but they merely want the company to notify the union 90 days before doing away with a job. This they say is "a form of stabilization with protective benefits for those who have their jobs abolished."

Persons discommoded may wonder whose rights are being trampled by a strike which ties up 10,000 miles of rail line, throws thousands of rail workers out of their jobs and causes literally millions of dollars in business loss to customers of the railroad who have no voice whatever in this dispute. If this strike goes on for any length of time it could cause an economic loss reaching a sum which properly invested would bring a return sufficient to pay the wages of the telegraphers who have been displaced and those who may be displaced in the future forever.

The solution of the problem can only come through understanding of the issues, their effects upon the railway employees and upon the public. This must be an intellectual exercise leading to a judgment. It is difficult to see how pickets trudging about with placards, how engines and cars standing idle on the tracks, how vacant railway stations can contribute anything to the understanding of the problem or to its final solution.

The fact that the problem involving a comparatively few telegraphers can bring chaos to the economics of millions of people living in nine States indicates that we are not really civilized. Years ago the Federal Government realizing the danger that could come to the people with the shutting down of its railroads, set up means of delaying strikes until the issues could be studied and presented to the public. The theory was that when the public understood the issues it would bring pressure upon the management and the workers to yield on the points which they could not rightfully defend. This program has worked well in the past but it does not always work. Obviously it has failed to work promptly enough in this instance. But that it will work eventually is certain. The strike will bring the issues painfully to the attention of the public and the decision will be made. But we should be able to make this decision without punishing the public.

What we need is better machinery for handling such disputes. The telegraphers have gone on strike because they feel they have nowhere else to go. Management is resisting because it feels that that is the

only way to bring the matter to a final decision. We have learned to settle other disputes by courts and juries. Civil courts and juries decide matters more important and involving more personal and economic rights than are involved in the telegraphers strike every day without interrupting the normal flow of business. A way must be found to provide a court, perhaps a special court that will have the confidence of management and labor, to bring about settlement of such questions without interrupting such an important business as transportation.

When the North Western Road telegraphers walked off the job, management and labor of the Kohler Co. were meeting in Sheboygan in an effort to settle a strike that has been going on for 6½ years. Tremendous losses have been suffered on both sides in this strike and the terms of settlement when finally announced will not be far from terms that would have been provided had the case been taken to a judge and a jury for final decision 6½ years ago.

We have found a means to settle personal injury cases which result in disputes between the employer and the injured worker without strike, without judges, without jury, but merely through commissions. We can find a way to settle other disputes between employers and workers if we really try.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, Aug. 31, 1962]

THE NORTH WESTERN STRIKE

The Chicago & North Western railroad was shut down yesterday by a strike of telegraphers because the telegraphers' union insisted on the right to veto any job eliminations.

This is a simple issue and a clear one. A segment of railroad labor tells its employer that the employer must continue to hire people which the employer either no longer needs or feels it cannot afford. Otherwise the employer will not be allowed to operate its business.

If the telegraphers win this strike other unions will be encouraged to load payrolls as they please under the threat of forcing other employers to go out of business. And then the free enterprise system, which has brought America to the highest standard in human history, will gradually languish.

One by one essential services will have to be taken over by the Government. And eventually we'll all be working for Big Brother at whatever wage Big Brother chooses to pay. There will, of course, be no independent unions and no strikes. Big Brother's army will see to that just as it does in Russia and China.

The Chicago & North Western railroad is a sick railroad. It possesses a large amount of trackage reaching out into thinly populated farm regions which is not used much except in the harvest season. It competes with five other lines on its main routes between Chicago and the Twin Cities and Chicago and Omaha. Under pressure from the city of Chicago and the North Shore suburbs it recently spent millions buying new equipment for its Chicago suburban service. Then Chicago opened a couple of free expressways to the north and northeast and the railroad suburban service is in the red again.

The battle with the telegraphers arose over the attempt by the company to close a number of stations and to serve them with traveling agents. Switch towers in which union telegraphers have been employed were also to be automated. Does the North Western need to save money?

Its common stock has lost more than half its value in the past year. It hasn't paid a dividend for 12 years. Its current liabilities are greater than its current assets. For the first 3 months of this year the North Western lost $6.58 per share.

This is the turnip out of which the telegraphers' union is now trying to squeeze the blood of job security. The union wants the right not only to determine the amount of the wages but also the size of the payroll.

The company will, however, retain one freedom—the freedom to go bankrupt. And then the taxpayers will have the freedom to take over the railroad as a public necessity—and pay the union what it demands.

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, Sept. 4, 1962]

JOB SECURITY FEARS

Job security is increasingly a major problem in labor-management relations. Fears and disputes revolving around abolition of traditional positions through technological progress form a common thread running through controversies in numerous industries.

The North Western Railway strike is one example. The company has no need for the services of many telegraphers and station agents formerly required. The telegrapher's union insists jobs of its members should be preserved. Similar disputes continue between the railroads generally and the operating brotherhoods. Airlines have problems of the same kind.

Different in nature but also reflecting intensity of concern over future job opportunities are some of the bitter attacks by farm organizations against the Committee for Economic Development proposal for a heavy shift of small farmers out of agriculture.

If the Nation were not plagued by a persistent 5-percent unemployment rate, the fear of change would not be so great. The basic need for technological progress in a competitive world is admitted by almost everyone, including labor leaders. But the practical problem of finding new jobs for those displaced by automation and other efficiency developments continues to be a source of worry. This is mainly what caused the AFL–CIO to announce its support for a 35-hour workweek, against the opposition of the Kennedy administration.

Both Arthur Goldberg, former Secretary of Labor, and his successor, Willard Wirtz, are opposed in principle to artificial retention of jobs that are no longer necessary for efficient operations. They favor liberal provisions for smoothing out job changes to prevent individual suffering, but they are against freezing outmoded, inefficient methods into today's changing situations.

No one is likely to come up with easy answers for the complex problems involved, but a faster growth of the economy, providing job opportunities for more people, is a fundamental need. How that is to be accomplished is a question on which neither economists nor the Congress have been able to agree. Every specific proposal thus far brought forward has been subject to immediate opposition, including tax reduction plans. A national consensus on constructive solutions is yet to be obtained.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Sept. 2, 1962]

STRIKE AUTHORITY GIVEN BY COURT

Although the Order of Railway Telegraphers has borne the brunt of the criticism for the strike it called against the Chicago & North Western Railway, most of the criticism could be more properly directed against the Supreme Court of the United States.

This is a proper subject for public discussion on the day before Labor Day, for it is highly important that American citizens realize the extent to which the present high court can directly and indirectly influence the lives, convenience, and economic position of all of us.

The controversy between the union and the railway is a long one. The union has sought to write into its contract with the North Western the following clause:

"No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

The railway took the position that whether railroad jobs should be established or abolished was a matter for determination by management. The North Western held that the job-freeze proposal was not a matter of negotiation because it was outside the area of pay rates, work rules, and working conditions. That position was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals, which held that the union could not strike to enforce this particular demand.

In April of 1960, however, the Supreme Court in a 5 to 4 decision reversed the appeals court's ruling. The majority held that the union demand was an issue requiring bargaining, and that the union could strike to enforce its position.

In a strong dissenting opinion, Justice Tom Clark pointed out that many railway stations in close-together towns had been closed, that some agents worked only 12 minutes a day, and that the average daily work time for station agents was 59 minutes. Yet all drew a full day's pay, he said, which in some cases resulted in a rate of $300 per hour.

A Presidential factfinding board this summer, after long study of the controversy, rejected the telegraphers' demands as unreasonable. The board decided that a job-freeze proposal would perpetuate present inefficiency, maintain unreasonable costs, and hamper an industry beset by competition. It recommended, instead, a 10-point proposal which would give telegraphers some protection as the railway abolished jobs for which there is no further need today. The North Western agreed to this 10-point plan.

Basically, this program calls for company paid subsidies to employees who are either shifted to lower paying positions, transferred to new locations, or dismissed. Payments to employees could amount to as much as 16½ months' pay. Telegraphers were even guaranteed against any loss on sale of their homes.

But this wasn't enough. The Telegraphers Union demanded the right to freeze jobs at the number in existence in 1957. They struck to enforce this demand, as the Supreme Court said they could.

If there had been a law on the books for the past century, providing that no job could be eliminated without the consent of the employee or an employee's organization, the United States today would have a lot of people working at driving stagecoaches, working in blacksmith shops, and building covered wagons. Few workers will readily consent to the elimination of their own jobs, regardless of the fact that there may be no economic excuse for the job any longer.

As we pointed out earlier, the basic criticism in the dispute between the telegraphers and the North Western Railway should be directed at our Supreme Court, which in recent years has stretched the law in a thousand ways to grant labor unions authority to inflict economic damage not only on business firms, but also upon the general public.

Any group—government agencies, business firms, or labor unions—will abuse power if given too much of it. In the current railway case, we have an example of the chaos that can result when a labor union with Supreme Court encouragement uses its ultimate weapon in an attempt to achieve a goal that is ridiculous on its face.

The crowning insanity comes when strikers who voluntarily absent themselves from their jobs start drawing unemployment compensation from the benefit fund financed by

the railroad. This is about like requiring the condemned to pay for the rope used by the hangman.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Sept. 3, 1962]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

The issue involved in the strike by the Order of Railroad Telegraphers against the North Western railroad is featherbedding.

The railroad wants to close some stations where, according to official findings, the station agents are required to work only a few minutes a day. It wants to consolidate some other stations. To make things easier for the telegraphers who have been manning the stations, the railroad has offered retraining, preference in other jobs, all moving expenses and a separation allowance of up to 16½ months of full pay.

The telegraphers want no part of this. They say that no telegrapher may be let out regardless of whether or not he has much to do. Also, that no telegrapher's job may be abolished without the union's consent, even though machines may be doing a telegrapher's work. The company says this could mean forcing it "to keep unnecessary positions on its payroll for persons not yet born."

In view of the company's offer to make the transition to other, and perhaps more fruitful, jobs easier for the telegraphers, it seems to us that if the strikers win this one and thereby set a precedent, it will be an immeasurable setback for technological advancements.

As the Omaha World-Herald so aptly puts it: "Had such a policy prevailed 50 years ago, men today would be sitting around in empty buggy-whip factories drawing pay for doing nothing."

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer Sept. 1, 1962]

FULL PAY FOR NO WORK

"No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discountinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

This is the clause the Order of Railroad Telegraphers insists be included in any work contract with the Chicago and North Western Railway.

In the case of the Telegraphers and the New York Central Railroad, the date is March 4, 1958, but the rest of the contract language would be the same.

The railroads refused to accept this clause. At the C. & N.W., the refusal resulted in a strike by the Telegraphers that shut down the entire operations of a vital transportation medium.

In all these cases, emergency factfinding boards appointed by the President have found the union's demands to be "absolute veto power over proper managerial functions." The demand for a job freeze could perpetuate positions for people not yet born if the railroads acceded to the outrageous stipulation. It would deny improvements in technology and in operating efficiency and would prevent modernization.

The railroads, struggling to stay alive, have agreed to the recommendations of an emergency board of arbitrators to provide a comprehensive program of employee protection including liberal displacement allowances and retraining programs.

The Telegraphers struck rather than accept the mature, considered judgment of men representing neither side but rather the public.

In effect, the telegraphers on the C. & N.W. are striking for the ultimate of featherbedding demands, full pay for no work, because radio and the telephone in most stations have replaced the telegrapher; some C. & N.W. stations aren't even open for business due to changing transportation habits but the Telegraphers insist on having a telegrapher in a boarded up shack or unused tower.

No matter how soon the railroad labor picture clears, and this would include settling of the operating employees' contracts as well, the labor movement cannot be proud of this instance when a union struck against the march of time and against the expressed wishes of Government, the public and impartial arbitrators.

This is a real black eye.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1962]

WHITE HOUSE DOUBLE TRACK

If President Kennedy wonders why so many businessmen consider his administration unfair, he might find part of the explanation in the inconsistency of the positions he took at his latest news conference on two labor disputes, both heavily weighted with public interest.

Mr. Kennedy put all his prestige behind the recommendation of a special Presidential board for union-shop elections to avert a threatened strike in plants manufacturing missiles, planes, and spacecraft. The two powerful unions in this field—the United Automobile Workers and the International Association of Machinists—welcome the board's recommendation; the employers are cold to it. The President asserted that, if the latter rejected the panel's peace plan, the country should blame them for any work stoppage.

The story was quite different when Mr. Kennedy was asked about the 2-week-old strike on the Chicago & North Western Railway, which is inflicting great economic injury on nine Midwest States. This tie-up stems from the rejection by the Order of Railroad Telegraphers of a Presidential emergency board's recommendation that the union abandon its demand for a veto over job reductions caused by changing technology or other factors. The panel recommended a formula for cushioning layoffs through liberalized unemployment, retraining, and severance benefits.

Mr. Kennedy had no word of personal endorsement for the emergency board's report, nor any censure for the union. Ignoring the fact that the North Western had always been ready to negotiate a contract based on the board's proposals, the President called on both sides to make "sufficient concessions" to effect an accord. This is not the first time Mr. Kennedy has made an orphan of a Presidential fact finding report that railroad labor did not like. A similar fate befell the comprehensive recommendations for eliminating featherbedding in train crews, which are still being resisted by all the unions involved.

The current application of a double standard of White House judgment is made more conspicuous by the differing legal status of the two boards. The board the President is supporting in the aerospace industry was created outside Taft-Hartley, without any specific legislative authority. The board he is ignoring in the North Western strike represented the final step in the exhaustive machinery of the Railway Labor Act. Mr. Kennedy will have to exhibit more consistency if the Nation is to be convinced that his sole yardstick in such matters is the public welfare.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 15, 1962]

DOUBLE STANDARD

At his press conference Thursday President Kennedy urged four aerospace manufacturers to accept the terms proposed by a special Presidential board for settlement of their dispute with two labor unions. The President said that if the companies refused and a strike resulted, the companies would be responsible.

At the same press conference Mr. Kennedy discussed the dispute between the North Western Railway and the Telegraphers Union, which has caused hardships in nine States. He expressed hopes for a quick settlement but failed to say that a Presidential board has recommended terms which the railroad has accepted and the union has rejected. Instead, he recommended that both sides make "sufficient concession."

Why doesn't the Kennedy administration, for once, put pressure on a union to accept a settlement recommended by a Presidential board? The administration never is shy about castigating employers and telling them what to do.

Last February a Presidential commission, after more than a year of study, made a report on railroad work rules. The railroads reluctantly accepted the recommendations, but the unions have refused even to bargain on the basis of the board's report. Mr. Kennedy has kept mum.

Last June a Presidential board recommended a pay increase for 450,000 off-train employees of the railroads. Arthur Goldberg, then Secretary of Labor, informed the companies they had no alternative but to accept the board's recommendations because the country would not tolerate a railroad strike. So the railroads reluctantly agreed to the proposed terms.

The mediation machinery of the Railway Labor Act and of other Presidential boards is useless if only one side is expected to heed the findings. The double standard employed by the Kennedy administration invites strikes.

What other result can you expect when the President, on the same day, tells one industry to accept a Presidential board's recommendations or be responsible for a strike, and tells a strikebound company, which has agreed to accept the findings of a Presidential board that it must make further concessions?

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 15, 1962]

J.F.K.'S SPLIT PERSONALITY

If evidence were needed that the administration employs a double standard in its approach to labor-management affairs, President Kennedy provided it in his Thursday press conference.

The President addressed himself to two major labor disputes—the one that threatens to shut down the aerospace industry, and the one that already paralyzes the North Western Railway.

Special Presidential factfinding boards have made recommendations in each industry.

In the case of the railroads the board's major recommendation was for an end of featherbedding—for elimination of useless jobs, and for special financial provisions and retraining and relocating programs to ease the impact on those displaced.

In the case of the four companies involved in the aerospace dispute, the board recommended that they accept a union shop arrangement requiring that all of the 100,000 affected workers belong either to the Auto Workers or the Machinists union.

In the aerospace industry, management is resisting the union shop recommendation. In the North Western strike, the Telegraphers' union is resisting the no-featherbedding recommendation.

In these circumstances the administration might reasonably have been expected to give equal and impartial support to the recommendations of the two presidential boards.

It didn't happen.

Asked for comment on the aerospace dispute, Mr. Kennedy said:

"The economic proposals made are not excessive. * * * The unions are accepting a financial settlement which is not particularly generous in relation to certain other unions in recent years. * * * I would hope the company would accept it because if a strike comes * * * the responsibility would be very clear, I think, to the American people * * * for such an action."

The President's response to a question regarding the North Western strike was quite different.

"I think," said Mr. Kennedy, "it's important that the parties come to an agreement immediately, because * * * the interests of nine States are affected.

"I'm hopeful that both sides will make the sufficient concessions, if that's the word, to permit an agreement, because the public interest suggests an agreement is due."

Boiling it down, the President asked the employers in the aerospace industry to accept the board's recommendation without reservation or accept the responsibility for a damaging strike. In the North Western case, making no reference to the board's recommendations, the President merely asked "concessions" of both sides. Any concessions made by the railroad would necessarily constitute a back-away from the recommendations of the presidential board.

This double standard may be shrewd politics at the moment; the November elections are coming up, and labor casts more votes than management.

But it falls far short of equitable application of the influence of the presidential office.

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Sept. 12, 1962]

PRESIDENT KENNEDY SHOULD GET CHICAGO NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY MOVING AGAIN

We applauded President John F. Kennedy when he used "big Government" to make "big steel" roll back its price increase last spring.

The President saved the American consumer untold millions of dollars that a price increase in steel would have cost in boosting the price of everything from automobiles to farm equipment.

He made "big steel" live up to the promise they left by implication in negotiations with "big labor," that there would be no price increase as a result of the settlement on wages and working conditions.

Now we think it is time for President Kennedy to use all the muscle of his "big Government" to make the handful of union telegraphers act in the public interest.

One thousand men in the Telegraphers Union have thrown 15,000 other employees of the Chicago & North Western Railway out of work. They have caused great economic damage to localities in nine States.

In South Dakota, the telegraphers have halted laying of communication cable to 150 Minuteman missile sites and 15 control sites. If the news on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers is as bad as it looks, this country can't afford to lose a day in preparing its defenses for what lies ahead.

There's a $2.5-million sugarbeet crop still in the ground in South Dakota. It has to be harvested and moved to market within the next several weeks—or it will be lost. The farmers and the sugar company are at the mercy of the railroad telegraphers.

We think it is time for the Telegraphers' Union to drop its insistence on perpetuating jobs whether today's railroad operations require them or not. They should agree to the recommendations made by President Kennedy's emergency board to settle the dispute.

For better or worse, big Government has become irrevocably tied to negotiations between big business and big labor. Big Government should treat both alike.

There has been a lot of talk from the administration in Washington about getting the country moving.

We think it is time for the young man in the White House to get the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. moving again.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 12, 1962]

MR. LEIGHTY CALLS FOR COLD FACTS

George E. Leighty, president of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, denies that his union is striking against the Chicago & North Western Railroad to enforce a job freeze. He declares that the union does not insist on the retention of useless jobs or employees who have no work to perform. All the union wants from the North Western, he says, is the same kind of agreement which the union made with the Southern Pacific Railroad last October.

In his statement outlining the union's position Mr. Leighty strangely neglects to mention that the Southern Pacific agreement was considered by the Presidential emergency board which studied the telegraphers' dispute with the North Western. The board found that the Southern Pacific settlement was not an applicable precedent in the North Western case, for a variety of reasons.

The Southern Pacific agreement provided that jobs would not be abolished at a rate greater than 2 percent a year. When the agreement was made, telegraphers' positions on the Southern Pacific had dwindled from about 1,500 to 1,000; the railroad had closed 160 agencies [stations] and was not planning to abolish many more. Nothing in the agreement would prevent the Southern Pacific from carrying out its modernization program, the North Western board pointed out.

The North Western, on the other hand, is engaged in a program of eliminating little used stations in rural areas, replacing them with central agencies serving groups of stations. Planned extensions of the central agency plan would abolish about 70 positions covered in the railroad's present agreement with the telegraphers. A formula limiting the attrition of positions to 2 percent a year would impede these plans, the emergency board found.

The board noted also that the situation of the two roads differs with respect to employment of telegraphers. In 1961, the Southern Pacific had 1,069 telegraphers among 41,302 employees, or 2.6 percent of the total. The C. & N.W., on the other hand, had 1,189 telegraphers out of 16,505 employees, or 7.2 percent.

"Although Southern Pacific has fewer telegraphers, and fewer agency positions, than the North Western, it is a much bigger railroad," said the Presidential board. "Its net investment is approximately twice as great; its revenue ton-miles of freight and operating revenue are more than three times as great. * * * Such being the case, it is understandable that Southern Pacific may have been relatively unconcerned over the controlled attrition formula whereas the North Western believes it would be extremely damaging.

"But even if the burden were approximately equal, which it is not, the two carriers differ greatly in their ability to absorb it. The Southern Pacific is one of the half dozen most profitable railroads in the Nation, while the North Western's financial condition is marginal."

The telegraphers' union, in trying to impose the Southern Pacific agreement upon the North Western, is beginning a campaign to impose the same terms on the entire railroad industry. The next railroad scheduled to be hit with a strike is the New York Central because another Presidential emergency board has made virtually the same findings as in the case of the C. & N.W.

President Leighty of the telegraphers has accused the North Western management of failing to submit a definite proposal for ending the strike.

"This seems incredible, but it is cold fact," he said.

It is also cold fact that the Presidential board has recommended a definite proposal for ending the strike and the North Western has accepted it. The union has not.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, Sept. 1, 1962]

TO WIN IS TO LOSE

However much one may yearn for the "good old days" of railroading, as members of the striking Order of Railroad Telegraphers do, it is difficult to rationalize the action they have taken. Putting aside the very real chance that they may lose out in their demands, the results of a victory are less than attractive.

A strike victory would impose an unconscionable burden on a railroad already struggling to remain solvent. The public is being penalized while the strike continues and can expect even more limited service if unions are successful in imposing their employment and wage demands. The overhead resulting from outmoded employment practices can only mean continued deterioration of the North Western, an observation which can be extended to other roads as well.

Except from the shortsighted viewpoint, employment in a financially strapped industry holds nothing for the future. Employees, in their own best interests, would be wiser to cooperate in reforms and help the railroads regain their old place in the economy.

Among the chief grievances cited by the telegraphers is the closing of many small North Western stations which formerly employed one of their number. These little stations were located every few miles along the lines in the days when patrons drove to them behind a horse, or perhaps walked to the station to catch a train. The stations are an unquestioned survival of the horse and buggy age and the efforts to keep them in operation in these times is not sensible.

Such a practice would be unprogressive under any circumstances, but in the light of today's competition it is impossible. The railroads for years have had no monopoly in transportation, as the workers certainly are aware. To pretend that such jobs which once were vital must still be filled is to live in a dream world.

Virtually every other business has modernized—merchandising, factories, construction, agriculture. Railroads too, have made great technical and mechanical progress, but against great odds. It is interesting to speculate on what they would be like and the type of jobs they would now offer had they been freed years ago of the double deterrents of Government control and stand-pat unionism.

As an essential to better public service and to the rehabilitation of rail service, the North Western as well as other roads ought to be given something of a free hand to set their houses in order. Obviously, this must be done if the railroads are to survive. It could be done far more easily with labor cooperation, and in expectation that the ultimate benefits to rail workers would be substantial. Instead the telegraphers are seeking to perpetuate a vanishing era.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1962]

PRESIDENTIAL IMPARTIALITY

The President, at his press conference on Thursday, had an opportunity to exhibit an appropriate impartiality toward the backwardness in both labor and industry. Instead, his remarks on the aerospace dispute and on the railway strike showed a curious ambivalence toward the disregard of Federal agency recommendations.

He had a nice lecture for the aerospace industries, on the virtues of the union shop, and urged the industry to accept Federal recommendations made by Dr. Taylor for the settlement of the strike by permitting the union shop.

For the striking telegraphers, who have shut down the transportation facilities of several States in order to enforce an outdated manning of posts no longer required, the President had no homilies on featherbedding, make-work and supernumerary positions. He did not urge the union to accept the recommendations of the board operating under the Railway Labor Act.

The President would speak on these matters with more force if he were equally in favor of recommendations that require concession by labor and those that require concession by industry.

[From the Madison (Wis.) State Journal, Sept. 11, 1962]

THE PUBLIC LOSES PATIENCE

The issue in the Chicago and North Western Railroad strike, initiated by the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, is not over wages, hours, or working conditions.

The question, as simply as it can be put, is whether the railroad management shall have the right to run the business it is responsible for, hiring only such help and using only such services as it needs and can afford. This comes down to eliminating some telegraphers' jobs, part of the broader question of a complete review of all railroad jobs which has simmered along for 3 years.

The telegraphers' union wants to save every job of its members, as is natural. But those jobs will not be saved by bankrupting their employers, nor in pushing rail costs to where more small business goes to their employer's competitors.

The North Western has accepted a Presidential commission's recommendations which offered generous furlough allowances, retraining programs, and severance pay for telegraphers whose jobs are eliminated. It is a fair order, and one that costs the company a lot more in money than a straight businesslike approach could justify.

It is a foolish and unjustified strike, and one that is costing the unions dearly in public good will. They are pushing their luck by continuing such demands.

[From the Dunlap (Iowa) Reporter, Sept. 13, 1962]

STALEMATE

We are always appalled at the useless waste involved when a major labor union thinks it necessary to call a strike. This seems to be the case in the present stalemate between the telegraphers union and the Chicago & Northwestern Railway.

The effect of the dispute has gone far beyond the parties involved. It has already begun to affect the economy of many lines and businesses not directly involved. Too often it is the public that suffers in these affairs and that is beginning to be the case here.

It may be humorous, but it is indicative of the thing involved. A remark was overheard recently that a person said they would have to cut down on their bowling. Their wages had been reduced to token a payment for their union, not because they were involved in the dispute, but because they happened to be employed by the North Western.

No increase in wages or benefits the telegraphers hope to gain can ever add up to the loss to themselves, other employees and businesses all along the line.

As we read it in the papers, most of the dispute seems to be over job security. The union insists on keeping the status quo. They insist that jobs be kept as they were in 1957. Actually it amounts to the old system of featherbedding, that has so long plagued the railroads.

It is the same old story. If a business puts in a machine that will do two or three men's work, then those employees are made available for work elsewhere in the plant. But not if the telegraphers win their point. They will keep the three men sitting there watching the machine while they draw full pay for doing nothing.

The sad part of it is—the man on the street and the man on the farm is the person who pays: He pays for the economic waste involved in higher prices for the products made and services rendered.

In this sort of strike the telegraphers union or any union will find little sympathy among the general public for their attitude.

A factfinding board, appointed by the President has turned in its report. The company has accepted it and will go along with that report—but not the union. They insist on their job freeze with the resultant increase in freight and traffic costs.

It seems to us the case is not so much different from the steel dispute a few months back, when economic factors indicated a raise in steel prices necessary. President Kennedy was not so slow in jumping on business with both feet—all for the good of the economy of the country. It is now about time, if he is to be consistent, to do the same thing to the telegraphers union.

After the steel episode the administration was tagged as being antibusiness. This they flatly denied. Actions speak louder than words. In this case no action is speaking rather loudly. If the administration wants to prove its point—it had better get on the ball.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) World News, Sept. 3, 1962]

REAL ISSUE IN THE C. & N.W. STRIKE

The strike of less than a thousand telegraphers which has tied up the Chicago & North Western Railroad, third largest in the Nation, must be regarded as a key test in current effort of all railroads to cut down or eliminate featherbedding.

Since 1957 the Order of Railroad Telegraphers has been seeking to achieve with management an agreement that none of their jobs as station agents or communications operators be abolished without agreement between union and carrier.

In spite of last minute efforts by Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg on the eve of his appointment to the Supreme Court, the telegraphers walked off the job last week, paralyzing the 10,600-mile line, throwing thousands of other employees out of work and inconveniencing throngs of daily commuters.

Newly appointed Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has taken up where Goldberg left off and with Francis J. O'Neill, of the National Mediation Board, is seeking to effect a compromise.

The dispute is entirely apart from that between the operating brotherhoods and the railroads who are seeking to reduce crews on diesel locomotives by eliminating unnecessary firemen.

The C. & N.W. case appears to be fundamental. Should the telegraphers' point of view prevail or be upheld by the Government it would mean the union could dictate continuation of stations and jobs, both outmoded and uneconomical. It amounts to an effort to block progress.

It stands to reason that a railroad should not have to operate facilities it does not need, nor should it be required to maintain on the payroll employees for whom there is not enough work to justify their retention. Should the opposite condition prevail under Government protection we will have arrived at state socialism. Thus, in effect, the C. & N.W. is fighting the battle for all other roads.

[From the Highmore (S. Dak.) Herald]

UNNECESSARY RAILROAD STRIKE

It seems as though the railroad operating unions are trying to turn back the clock. Evidence of this is the costly strike against the Chicago & North Western Railway—a strike that affects Highmore and every other town serviced by the company.

In striking against the method of laying off excess employees they are saying, in effect, that the operating conditions of 30 to 40 or even 50 years ago must be considered the operating conditions of today * * * despite the enormous technological advancements made in railroad in the modern era.

They seem to be saying, in effect, that all railroad jobs must be maintained even when the need for them has passed and the cost imposed by obsolete work rules has been a major element in bringing much of this vital industry to near insolvency. And they are saying, in effect, that the recommendations made by a distinguished Presidential commission which studied the problem for more than a year, should be disregarded. The commission proposed not only a modernization of the work rules, but generous benefits of many kinds for displaced and transferred workers. Apparently, the industry accepted the plan * * * and the unions will have nothing to do with it.

These seem the only conclusions that can be drawn from current union actions. The strike against the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. is doing immeasurable damage to the economy, to the public interest, and to labor itself. For we believe that labor, from Jimmy Hoffa on down, is now weaving the rope that will hang it.

Meanwhile, some things can be said with certainty. One is that no group, whether it be railroad, teamster, newspaper, etc., no matter how powerful, can blatantly ignore the national interest and get away with it indefinitely. Another is that a depressed industry cannot long be a source of highly paid, necessary jobs, much less those that progress has made useless. A third is that railroads must continue to serve this country. And fourth, if worse comes to worse, the Government would be forced to take them over. No one in his right mind would want that.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Sept. 12, 1962]

THE NORTH WESTERN SHUTDOWN

The recommendations of the Presidential factfinding board for settlement of the job-security dispute between the Chicago & North Western Railroad and the Order of Railroad Telegraphers offer in our opinion the most equitable basis for ending the strike which has been going on since August 30.

They provide the union with as much protection for displaced workers as can be afforded while at the same time leaving the railroad free to go ahead with economies dictated by, in the board's words, the "remarkably inefficient" condition into which it had fallen 6 years ago.

We believe with the board that the union should withdraw its demand that no position in existence December 3, 1957, should be abolished except by agreement between union and company. A similar demand on the Southern Pacific last year was withdrawn on the recommendation of the Presidential factfinding board set up for settlement of that dispute.

The factfinding board for the C. & N.W. dispute advances cogent reasons why the 2-percent attrition limit placed on work force reductions and the limit of five station closures a year except by mutual agreement, provided for in the Southern Pacific contract, and again demanded by the union, are not properly applicable to the C. & N.W.

Southern Pacific, one of the half dozen most profitable railroads in the country, has

fewer telegraphers than the C. & N.W., constituting only about a third as much of its labor force, though it handles three times as much freight.

It had closed most of the stations it planned to close before it signed the contract, whereas Chicago & North Western has yet to close some 70 to 100 stations. "It is understandable," says the board, that Southern Pacific "may have been relatively unconcerned" by the limitations on its authority to close stations and reduce work force "whereas the North Western believes it would be extremely damaging."

The now protracted shutdown of the Chicago & North Western is causing heavy losses to the farming, industrial and mining complex in the nine States where it operates. We believe the union and the company owe it to these innocent bystanders to compose their differences promptly. A Presidential factfinding board's recommendations command respect, and are not to be disregarded in the absence of strong contrary evidence.

[From the New Ulm (Minn.) Daily Journal, Sept. 10, 1962]

ALL ABOARD

The tail is wagging the dog in the telegraphers' strike against the Chicago & North Western Railroad. The union has tied up 10,000 miles of track, including all service into New Ulm, because of a few jobs eliminated in the North Western trying to stay modern and meet competition.

The cutback in telegraphers came since 1957 in the dualization of stations; in other words, the putting of one man in charge of two stations at small towns where the volume of business justified.

The key issue is a rule in the contract between the union and the railway which states: "No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

This rule, which would give the union veto power in attempts by the line to adopt technological improvements, came before a Presidential factfinding board last spring. The board recommended the union withdraw its rule, and that the railroad provide protection for the employees displaced.

North Western accepted the board recommendation. The telegraphers didn't, and have now shut down the line. The result is causing a bind on business along the line, some unemployment and hardship. Telegrams and letters went out from local people last week requesting the Federal Government require the telegraphers to accept the board recommendation. North Western would like more public support.

Getting trains rolling again is important. Vital, too, is the right of business to modernize so as to maintain a competitive position. North Western can't keep up if it has to tie its service to the hitching-post era.—W.E.M.

[From the Mapleton (Iowa) Press, Sept. 13, 1962]

RAILROAD STRIKE

The railroad telegraphers strike against the Chicago & North Western Railroad affects nearly every small community in our area as well as the cities. With the railroad shut down, employees living in each of these small towns are out of work.

Is there a need for this strike? The Presidential board says there is not.

The whole strike boils down to one question. Should the railroad be forced to hire employees that it doesn't need?

The Presidential board made a series of recommendations after a careful study. The railroad agreed to accept the board's recommendations, but the union is still holding out for a job freeze.

The commission has recommended a long list of worker benefits, including retraining of displaced labor at railroad expense, wage increases for three-fourths of the operating workers, improved conditions and retirement privileges, and other human issues involved.

The board recommended that the union withdraw the rule from its contract: "No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

This rule would give the unions the veto power over improvements or changes that would increase the efficiency of the railroad. They want to keep on the payrolls, men who work only a few minutes each day, yet draw pay for a full day's work.

The Portland, Oreg., Journal, in an editorial said, "Union leaders are doing their membership no favors by refusing a compromise based on the findings of the President's commission, while the climate is still favorable, and while there is public sympathy toward easing the problem of displaced union workers."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that instead of having a great many more pious statements urging farmers, Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Governors of the States in the area to sit and wait, saying that everything will be all right, and that tomorrow or the day after tomorrow or in a very short time the strike will be settled, we now shall find someone getting down to the brass tacks of settling the strike, and that we shall receive the good news that the men have returned to work and that trains are again available to haul the produce to market.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I invite attention to the fact that 11 days ago my senior colleague [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I sent to the President an urgent telegram in which we pointed out to him the seriousness of the situation and requested him personally to take part in settlement of the strike. Eleven days have now elapsed since then. I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota thinks that if the President or the Vice President had intervened in the same manner in which the Vice President intervened in the steel strike in late 1959 or early 1960, there might now be a better opportunity for settlement of this strike than the one which has occurred—and, I may add, a more rapid settlement of the strike.

Mr. MUNDT. If the President or the Vice President had intervened a week or 10 days or 2 weeks ago, I would have very much hoped that the strike would long ago have been settled and the trains would again be running.

I, too, made that recommendation to the White House. I have sent such telegrams, and I have been in telephonic communication with officials in the Department of Labor, as well, in trying to impress upon them the seriousness of this situation. I am not particularly critical of Secretary Wirtz, who is new to the job. I suppose this is his first experience with strike-settlement negotiation. But I cannot understand why the President, himself, has not called the opposing parties into his office, and gone into this matter with them, and at least undertaken to get the trains running, so that perishable crops can be hauled.

Last week my colleague [Mr. BOTTUM] introduced proposed legislation which, if it received the approval of the Department of Labor and the White House, could be passed by Congress in 48 hours. That measure would give the executive branch of the Government the power to move in and get the trains running again, insofar as that is necessary for the movement of perishable commodities.

After that was done, things would return to the status quo. Once the sugarbeet crop is gone, once the farmers lose their perishable products, all the tears and all the lamentations occurring over the protracted strike settlement negotiations will not put a dime in the pockets of the farmers and will not help recapture the assets which have been exhausted.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Would the Senator not agree that the situation has actually deteriorated in the respect that, instead of having the President or Vice President call these parties in and use the high offices of those officials to develop an atmosphere of urgency and great importance to the Nation, there has developed an atmosphere which could well be looked upon as hostile upon the part of the North Western Railroad? It has observed that the President has made the statement that he believes in the aerospace dispute the aerospace management people should accept the findings of a Presidential board, whereas, when a Presidential board has already made findings in the railroad industry, he has not made the same statement in that case. He did not say it was hoped that the railroads would follow the recommendations of the Presidential factfinding board, as he did in the case of the aerospace industry. No; he said he hoped both parties might get together.

A considerable discussion has arisen as a result of that unfortunate statement, and there has been considerable intimation that there is a double standard.

Would the Senator not agree that if management received the impression there was a double standard, it might be reluctant to agree upon the issues, and particularly agree upon the arbiters involved in a compulsory arbitration arrangement, which I understand has been tentatively agreed upon, but the mechanics of which have not been agreed upon?

Mr. MUNDT. The difficulty with the present situation is that authority to make recommendations has simply been shifted from a Presidential factfinding board, which has already made recommendations, to a new board. President Leighty has said it is going to be more difficult to reach agreement on what the issues are going to be than perhaps to arrive at a settlement. Since he is the head of the union, he speaks with some authority.

Anyone who reads the editorials I have inserted in the RECORD must come to the

conclusion that the Senator from Iowa is correct in that the editorial writers and news commentators of this country are interpreting the President's so-called double standard of morality, as applied to companies versus unions, as being another evidence of an antibusiness attitude. We do not want any further evidence of an antibusiness attitude at a time when we are still trying to recover from the most severe stock market crash in American history, save only the crash of 1929.

I have hopefully expected and waited for the development of some sort of modus operandi whereby a better understanding could be arrived at between the White House and business following the unfortunate statement the President made about the steel executives. I have been hopeful that business and the White House could work together in trying to pull the country up from the economic consequences of the stock crash. The unfortunate reaction has been triggered again, according to the editorial writers. They say this is definitely an antibusiness attitude; that one should not look at one set of circumstances and in that case, not only caution, but threaten, them to yield in the missile base situation, whereas, under a set of circumstances exactly the same, but affecting the telegraphers' union, the President has said, "You ought to get together."

What we in the Midwest are asking is that the President get them together, that he step into the situation which has been created in part by his unfortunate discrepancy in attitude in two situations having the same set of circumstances, so perishable products can be gotten to market.

Mr. President, this is not something which can wait until Saturday night. This is not something which can wait until next week. This is something which has waited too long.

If the trains should get rolling tomorrow, we would still have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars in South Dakota alone, because of the inability of farmers to get their products to market. They are losing their products by the hour and by the day. So this is a problem of vast urgency. This is why I call on the President, himself, to come into the situation and not leave it to the new and untried Secretary of Labor, whose first experience with this kind of situation happens to be the railroad strike, on which they have done nothing but talk Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, just as we are doing here, with still no resounding news that the strike has been settled, but merely the hopeful expression that if we wait until tomorrow perhaps the strike will be settled. But by tomorrow several hundred thousand dollars of additional farm income will be lost to South Dakota, Iowa, Minnesota, and the other nine States served by the Chicago & North Western Railway.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me suggest that we must wait until at least after the America's Cup races are over at Newport.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the America's Cup races have certainly detained the President from acting, and, therefore, I would like to see him move into this situation, with his persuasive capacity, his prestige, and his authority to bring the strike to an end.

It is regrettable that the strike has continued so long. It will be calamitous if the strike is not settled within another 24 or 48 hours. Even if it is settled then, I know of no way we can recapture for the farmers of the Midwest the hundreds of thousands of dollars which have been permanently lost to them because the strike has continued for 20 days, at a time when it is important for farmers to get their products to market.

QUINCY COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11164) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW; AND UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, after consultation with various Members of the Senate, including the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and other Senators, there has been an agreement that at the conclusion of the business today the Senate will temporarily set aside the so-called Quincy project bill, now under discussion; and that tomorrow the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock in the morning.

It is understood that at the conclusion of business today the bill presently before the Senate will be temporarily laid aside and that there will be laid before the Senate, as the pending business for tomorrow, either Calendar No. 1286, S. 2800, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to make permanent a temporary increase in the maximum construction differential subsidy that may be paid under such act and to provide that such maximum shall not apply with respect to reconstructing or reconditioning of ships, or the House equivalent of that bill, Calendar No. 1637, H.R. 11586, to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

That will be the pending business. Starting at 10:30 tomorrow morning there will be a half hour for each side for discussion of that particular bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today the bill now before the Senate be temporarily laid aside and that there be made the pending business of the Senate either Calendar No. 1286, relating to amendment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, or Calendar No. 1637, the similar House bill; and that the Senate meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and at 10:30 a.m. proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1286 or Calendar No. 1637, with the time to be divided a half hour to each side, to be controlled by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, if that was not clear under the previous unanimous-consent request, the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I see no reason why the pending amendment should not be disposed of.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That will be done this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota that when the Senate concludes its deliberations this evening it stand in adjournment to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the information of the Senate, following consideration of the maritime bill to which I referred, the Senate will consider the Cuba resolution. Following completion of action on the Cuba resolution the Senate will return to consideration of the bill for the Quincy project, presently under discussion. Senators can keep the ground rules well in mind.

I ask unanimous consent that after resumption of consideration of the bill for the Quincy project tomorrow, the time be equally divided, 45 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and by the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], on the Miller amendment only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, under these arrangements does the acting majority leader anticipate any record votes this evening?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nothing more than voice votes.

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

from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreements are entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreements, subsequently reduced to writing, are as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, the pending bill H.R. 11164, the so-called Quincy project, be temporarily laid aside, and that either Calendar No. 1286, S. 2800, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, or the companion House bill, H.R. 11586, be made the pending business; that at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow (Thursday, September 20, 1962), the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill brought up for consideration, under a limitation of debate of 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware and Mr. MAGNUSON.

Following the consideration of the foregoing maritime bill, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution reported today by the Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, Senate Joint Resolution 230, relating to the Cuban situation.

Following the action on the Cuban resolution, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill H.R. 11164, the Quincy project, under a 90-minute limitation of debate, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. JACKSON and by the minority leader, on the Miller amendment now pending.

QUINCY COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11164) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and that it lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. 8. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user for the production of newly irrigated lands in the Columbia Basin project, of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. This limitation shall not apply to lands within irrigation blocks for which the initial availability of project water has heretofore been announced in writing by the Secretary of the Interior for publication in the Federal Register.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate temporarily set aside Calendar No. 1963, the bill (H.R. 11164) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN MAXIMUM CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1286, Senate bill 2800.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2800) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to make permanent a temporary increase in the maximum construction differential subsidy that may be paid under such act and to provide that such maximum shall not apply with respect to reconstructing or reconditioning of ships.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the Act of July 7, 1960 (Public Law 86-607, 74 Stat. 362), as amended by the Act of September 13, 1961 (Public Law 87-222, 75 Stat. 494), is further amended by striking out the words "two years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "five years".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill S. 2800 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. —. (a) The Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985), is amended by striking out subsection (d) of section 502.

(b) Section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1159), is amended by striking out ": *And provided*, That in case a vessel is to be constructed under this section for an applicant who has as his principal place of business a place on the Pacific coast of the United States" and all that follows in that section down through and including "maintains his principal place of business at any place on the Pacific coast." and insert in lieu thereof a period.

(c) Section 213 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1123), is amended by striking out "a report" and inserting in lieu thereof "reports" and by striking out "as soon as practicable".

(d) Paragraph (c) of said section 213 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following "; reports under this paragraph shall be made annually on the first day of July of each year.".

(e) The first sentence of subsection (f) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152), is amended by striking out "periodically" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least once each year".

(f) The second sentence of subsection (f) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152), is amended by striking out the words ", with the approval of the President,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief word of explanation in connection with the amendment which I have offered, and upon which we shall vote tomorrow. The purpose of the amendment is simple. It would repeal the present 6-percent differential which is allowed in awarding contracts to west coast ship construction companies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I understand, the pending business is the Williams amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

JENO NAGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3026) for the relief of Jeno Nagy, which was, on page 1, line 4, strike out all after "be" down through and including "impose:" in line 11, and insert "granted the status of permanent residence in the United States pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 419-420) if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act:".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on July 3, 1962, the Senate passed S. 3026, to grant a waiver of the excluding provision of the law relating to one afflicted with tuberculosis in behalf of the beneficiary, who was previously paroled into the United States as a Hungarian refugee. This would have enabled the beneficiary to adjust his status administratively.

On September 4, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 3026, with a technical amendment.

Inasmuch as the amendment does not change the intent of the bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 3026.

The motion was agreed to.

SU-FEN CHEN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2208) for the relief of Su-Fen Chen, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Su-Fen Chen. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Su-Fen Chen shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 2208, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary.

On August 7, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 2208, with an amendment to provide merely for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2208.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. HEGHINE TOMASSIAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2184) for the relief of Mrs. Heghine Tomassian, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That sections 1 through 4 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504, 505), shall be applicable in the case of Mrs. Heghine Tomassian.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 2184, to enable the beneficiary, a native of Turkey, to qualify for a visa under the quota for France, a country where she has resided for 40 years.

On September 4, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 2184, with an amendment to permit the beneficiary to be paroled into the United States as a refugee-escapee.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2184.

The motion was agreed to.

YUK-KAN CHEUK

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2760) for the relief of Yuk-Kan Cheuk, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yuk-Kan Cheuk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 2760, to enable a native of Hong Kong of Chinese descent to qualify for an adjustment of her status to that of a lawful resident alien under the subquota of Hong Kong.

On September 4, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 2760, with an amendment to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary.

The amendment is acceptable and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2760.

The motion was agreed to.

HRATCH SAMUEL ARUKIAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 273) for the relief of Hratch Samuel Arukian, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), Hratch Samuel Arukian shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act, as provided for in the said Act of July 14, 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 273 to provide that the beneficiary be chargeable to the quota for Ethiopia.

On August 20, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 273, with an amendment to provide that the beneficiary be considered to be a refugee—escapee and to have been paroled into the United States on the date of the enactment of the act pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 273.

The motion was agreed to.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it is only appropriate that Members of the Senate take cognizance of the memorial services for the late Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, held yesterday at the United Nations headquarters in New York, in Geneva and in Leopoldville in the Congo.

As we too vividly recall, it was 1 year ago that Dag Hammarskjold was killed in an airplane crash in Northern Rhodesia during the peace mission in the Congo. Mongi Slim of Tunisia, retiring President of the General Assembly, referred to Mr. Hammarskjold as a "pioneer of peace" in his remarks yesterday. Mr. Hammarskjold was a pioneer in the true meaning of the word and world peace was the objective he steadfastly pursued until his tragic death.

He was a pioneer in his understanding of the need to develop new and revolutionary weapons for maintaining the peace. He had the vision to see the increasingly important role open to the United Nations in those sections of the world attaining nationhood but threatened by the tensions of the cold war. He had the raw courage of a pioneer as he personally implemented his vision through numerous peace missions around the globe.

I think it is also appropriate to note that the memorial plaque honoring Mr. Hammarskjold was placed in the Meditation Room of the United Nations above the one honoring the late Count Folke Bernadotte, of Sweden, the mediator in Palestine, who was assassinated by terrorists in Jerusalem in 1948. Sweden can feel justly proud of these two sons who gave their life in the service of the United Nations and its quest to secure world peace.

As the 17th General Assembly of the United Nations convenes today, the delegates from every nation would do well to ponder the sacrifices of Dag Hammarskjold and Count Bernadotte. Their dedication to the objectives of the United Nations should serve as a perpetual reminder that peace can never be secured without great personal sacrifice, seemingly endless toil, and an inexhaustible determination to keep the forces of tyranny and totalitarianism under control.

Mr. President, I am sure that I speak for every Senator when I say that we are deeply indebted to Dag Hammarskjold for his years of loyal service to the United Nations, the cause of world peace, and world law and order, and that his untimely death was one of the most tragic events of our time.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every American citizen and every citizen of the Western World carried with them Monday a special feeling of pride. It was 175 years ago that the Founding Fathers of this Nation completed their labors in Philadelphia and brought forth one of the most remarkable documents ever produced by human mind and hand: the Constitution of the United States.

It is truly amazing to contemplate the results of the Philadelphia Convention. As the noted British political scientist, D. W. Brogan, noted in Sunday's Washington Post, the political institutions established by the U.S. Constitution are the oldest in the world. Professor Brogan noted that—

The office held by Queen Elizabeth has only a formal connection with the office held by George III. * * * There is no emperor in Peiping (or Delhi), no czar in Russia. Despite rumors, General De Gaulle is not the "most Christian King of France and Navarre" and Adenauer is not the Holy Roman Emperor or even the successor to Wilhelm II. President Kennedy is the successor of General Washington; this seems to me, in a world of alarming change, a merit.

These are the words of one of the most illustrious and talented and gifted political commentators and political scientists of modern times.

We are all familiar with the British capacity for understatement. I would go so far as to suggest that "merit" might appropriately be expanded upon. Indeed, the Constitution is the cornerstone of our great democracy. It has become the model for many of the democratic governments that have followed. Today it represents a perpetual source of light in the areas of the world darkened by dictatorship and totalitarianism. It is difficult to conceive of the development of human liberty and freedom in the world without the Constitution of the United States.

It has been my observation that every new country which has come into its own national sovereignty and has joined the United Nations has looked to the Constitution of the United States as a guideline for its constitutional system. We can be proud of the fact that not only has our Constitution endured for these 175 years, for the benefit of the American people, but that it has been a source of inspiration and a source of legal direction to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world who have sought to enjoy the blessings of freedom and the pursuit of happiness.

I hope Monday also served as an appropriate reminder to us, the elected

representatives of the 50 sovereign States, that the Founding Fathers placed great responsibility and faith in the legislative process. In fact, in the minds of a majority of the founders, Congress was seen as the cornerstone of the American system of government.

Woodrow Wilson, one of the great Presidents of this Nation, while he served as president of Princeton University and as a teacher in the field of political science, wrote one of the most important documents ever written about our Government. It was entitled "Congressional Government." This indicates to me that this great student and scholar of American history and American law understood the importance of the legislative process and of the legislative institutions in our constitutional system.

Each of us upon assuming his responsibilities in this body takes a solemn oath to protect and preserve the Constitution. At times I believe the Congress far surpasses the vision of the founders in fulfilling its duties under the Constitution. We have our good days; and some days are even great.

But we also must frankly recognize that other days we do not accomplish what needs to be done; we do not fulfill the vision of the founders. At such times we could hardly do better than to recognize anew the great inheritance that the Constitution grants to us. We are legatees of the most workable and equitable system of government in the history of the world. But it is ultimately our responsibility, and the responsibility of every U.S. citizen, to make this system function as effectively today as it has in the past.

In Philadelphia, President Truman formally commemorated Constitution Day. In his characteristically vigorous fashion, President Truman expressed the timeless message of the Constitution in terms relevant to our contemporary duties and responsibilities as leader of the free democratic community of nations. This message bears repeating, not only in this body, but throughout the Nation and the world. Quite simply, it is this: the United States will never sacrifice her basic freedoms in our struggle against Communist tyranny.

Surely this is the same message the founders of this Nation made in their struggle for independence and for the establishment of a viable system of government. And this is the message they would have made today in the circumstance we face.

I think it most appropriate that a former President of the United States, one who understood the Constitution and lived by it, President Truman, chose Constitution Day to remind us once again of the great tasks before us.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, September 20, 1962, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The prayer of the Master for His disciples. John 17: 21: *That they all may be one.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, at the noon hour of this new day we are uniting our hearts in the sacrament of adoration and praise, of penitence and confession, of petition and supplication.

We earnestly beseech Thee to show us the need and strength of cultivating the spirit of fellowship and brotherhood among all the members of the human family.

Make us eager to identify ourselves with mankind in its struggles and sorrows for we cannot enjoy health and happiness while vast multitudes are miserable and bearing the burdens of injustice, oppression, and inhumanity.

Help us to understand that we are all Thy creatures and children and that the injury of one, however slight and small, is the harm and hurt of all.

Inspire us to condemn and crucify that selfish and supercilious spirit which is so wholly contrary to the fundamental purpose and passion of the Master whose incomparable life was the supreme revelation of Thyself and the realized ideal of humanity.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the preceding session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the Journal be read in full.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withhold my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

The DOORKEEPER. Mr. Speaker, a message from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Secretary.

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

H.R. 12628. An act to provide additional funds under section 202(a)(4) of the Housing Act of 1959, and to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949, in order to provide low and moderate cost housing, both urban and rural, for the elderly.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11266. An act to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in the State of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4. An act to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore; and

S. 2511. An act to provide for the production and distribution of educational and training films for use by deaf persons, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I withhold that point of order.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with, today.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD with my own remarks a letter from the Secretary of State addressed to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that unanimous-consent requests will have to wait until after the Journal has been read and acted upon.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 225]

Adair	Hoffman, Mich.	Pfost
Anfuso	Hull	Pilcher
Barry	Johnson, Md.	Powell
Bass, N.H	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Blitch	Kearns	Rivers, Alaska
Bromwell	Kilburn	Rivers, S.C.
Buckley	Lane	Rogers, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	St. George
Davis, James C.	McSween	St. Germain
Diggs	McVey	Saund
Dooley	Macdonald	Sikes
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Fino	Merrow	Spence
Ford	Moorehead, Ohio	Thompson, La.
Gary	Morrison	Thompson, N.J.
Gavin	Moulder	Vinson
Goodell	Norrell	Weis
Harvey, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.	Whalley
Hébert	Patman	Yates
Hoffman, Ill.	Peterson	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS), there were—ayes 83, noes 25.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 355, nays 17, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—355

Abbitt	Collier	Gubser
Adair	Colmer	Hagen, Calif.
Addabbo	Conte	Hagan, Ga.
Albert	Cook	Haley
Alexander	Cooley	Hall
Alford	Corbett	Halleck
Alger	Corman	Hansen
Anderson, Ill.	Cramer	Harding
Andrews	Cunningham	Hardy
Arends	Curtin	Harris
Ashbrook	Curtis, Mo.	Harrison, Wyo.
Ashley	Daddario	Harvey, Mich.
Aspinall	Dague	Hays
Auchincloss	Daniels	Healey
Avery	Davis, John W.	Hechler
Ayres	Dawson	Hemphill
Bailey	Delaney	Henderson
Baker	Dent	Herlong
Baldwin	Denton	Hoeven
Baring	Derounian	Hoffman, Ill.
Barrett	Derwinski	Holifield
Bass, Tenn.	Devine	Holland
Bates	Dingell	Hosmer
Battin	Dole	Ichord, Mo.
Becker	Dominick	Inouye
Beckworth	Donohue	Jarman
Beermann	Dorn	Jennings
Belcher	Dowdy	Jensen
Bell	Downing	Joelson
Bennett, Fla.	Doyle	Johnson, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Dulski	Johnson, Wis.
Berry	Durno	Jonas
Betts	Dwyer	Jones, Ala.
Blatnik	Elliott	Jones, Mo.
Boggs	Ellsworth	Judd
Boland	Everett	Karsten
Bolling	Evins	Karth
Bolton	Fallon	Kastenmeier
Bonner	Farbstein	Kearns
Bow	Fascell	Kee
Brademas	Feighan	Keith
Bray	Fenton	Kelly
Breeding	Findley	Keogh
Brewster	Fisher	Kilgore
Brooks	Flood	King, Calif.
Broomfield	Fogarty	King, Utah
Brown	Forrester	Kirwan
Broyhill	Fountain	Kitchin
Bruce	Frazier	Kluczynski
Burke, Ky.	Frelinghuysen	Knox
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	Kornegay
Burleson	Fulton	Kowalski
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	Kunkel
Byrnes, Wis.	Garland	Kyl
Cahill	Garmatz	Laird
Cannon	Gathings	Landrum
Carey	Giaimo	Langen
Casey	Gilbert	Lankford
Cederberg	Glenn	Latta
Celler	Gonzalez	Lennon
Chamberlain	Goodling	Lesinski
Chelf	Granahan	Libonati
Chenoweth	Gray	Lindsay
Chiperfield	Green, Oreg.	Lipscomb
Church	Green, Pa.	Loser
Clancy	Griffin	McCulloch
Clark	Griffiths	McDowell
Coad	Gross	McFall
Cohelan	McIntire	Perkins
McMillan	Philbin	Shriver
MacGregor	Pike	Sibal
Mack	Pirnie	Siler
Madden	Poage	Slack
Magnuson	Poff	Smith, Iowa
Mahon	Price	Smith, Miss.
Mailliard	Pucinski	Smith, Va.
Marshall	Purcell	Spence
Martin, Nebr.	Quie	Springer
Mathias	Rains	Stafford
Matthews	Randall	Staggers
May	Reece	Steed
Meader	Reifel	Stephens
Michel	Reuss	Stratton
Miller, Clem	Rhodes, Ariz.	Stubblefield
Miller, George P.	Rhodes, Pa.	Sullivan
Miller, N.Y.	Riehlman	Taylor
Milliken	Roberts, Ala.	Teague, Calif.
Mills	Roberts, Tex.	Teague, Tex.
Minshall	Robison	Thomas
Moeller	Rodino	Thompson, Tex.
Monagan	Rogers, Colo.	Thomson, Wis.
Montoya	Rogers, Fla.	Thornberry
Moore	Rooney	Toll
Moorhead, Pa.	Roosevelt	Tollefson
Morgan	Rosenthal	Trimble
Morris	Rostenkowski	Tuck
Morse	Roudebush	Tupper
Mosher	Roush	Udall, Morris K.
Moss	Rousselot	Ullman
Multer	Rutherford	Utt
Murphy	Ryan, Mich.	Vanik
Murray	Ryan, N.Y.	Van Zandt
Natcher	St. Germain	Wallhauser
Nedzi	Santangelo	Walter
Nelsen	Saylor	Watts
Nix	Schadeberg	Weaver
Norblad	Schenck	Westland
Nygaard	Scherer	Wharton
O'Brien, N.Y.	Schneebeli	Whitener
O'Hara, Ill.	Schweiker	Whitten
O'Hara, Mich.	Schwengel	Wickersham
O'Konski	Scott	Widnall
Olsen	Scranton	Willis
O'Neill	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Ind.
Osmers	Selden	Wright
Ostertag	Shelley	Young
Passman	Sheppard	Younger
Pelly	Shipley	Zablocki
	Short	

NAYS—17

Abernethy	Hiestand	Ray
Andersen, Minn.	Horan	Taber
Ashmore	Huddleston	Van Pelt
Flynt	Johansen	Waggonner
Harsha	King, N.Y.	Williams
	Pillion	Winstead

NOT VOTING—63

Anfuso	Harrison, Va.	Peterson
Barry	Harvey, Ind.	Pfost
Bass, N.H.	Hébert	Pilcher
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	Powell
Boykin	Hull	Riley
Bromwell	Johnson, Md.	Rivers, Alaska
Buckley	Kilburn	Rivers, S.C.
Curtis, Mass.	Lane	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, James C.	McDonough	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	McSween	Saund
Diggs	McVey	Sikes
Dooley	Macdonald	Sisk
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Finnegan	Mason	Thompson, La.
Fino	Merrow	Thompson, N.J.
Ford	Moorehead, Ohio	Vinson
Gary	Morrison	Weis
Gavin	Moulder	Whalley
Goodell	Norrell	Wilson, Calif.
Grant	O'Brien, Ill.	Yates
Halpern	Patman	Zelenko

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Morrison with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Sikes with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Johnson of Maryland with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Gary with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Merrow.

Mrs. Riley with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. McVey.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Mason.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

The Clerk commenced the reading of the Journal.

Mr. PERKINS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that motion is not in order.

The Clerk will read the Journal.

The Clerk continued the reading of the Journal.

Mr. GROSS (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 227]

Anfuso	Hoffman, Mich.	Powell
Bass, N.H.	Hull	Rains
Blitch	Johnson, Md.	Rhodes, Pa.
Bromwell	Jones, Mo.	Riley
Bruce	Kilburn	Rivers, Alaska
Buckley	Lane	Rivers, S.C.
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, James C.	McSween	St. George
Diggs	McVey	Saund
Dooley	Macdonald	Sikes
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Fascell	Merrow	Staggers
Findley	Michel	Thompson, La.
Fino	Moorehead, Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Ford	Morrison	Ullman
Gary	Moulder	Vinson
Gavin	Norrell	Weis
Goodell	O'Brien, Ill.	Whalley
Griffin	Patman	Willis
Harrison, Va.	Peterson	Wilson, Calif.
Harvey, Ind.	Pfost	Yates
Hébert	Pilcher	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 26, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—341

Abbitt	Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Mo.
Abernethy	Dawson	Judd
Addabbo	Delaney	Karsten
Albert	Dent	Karth
Alexander	Denton	Kastenmeier
Alford	Derounian	Kearns
Andersen, Minn.	Devine	Kee
	Dingell	Keith
Anderson, Ill.	Dole	Kelly
Andrews	Dominick	Keogh
Arends	Dorn	Kilgore
Ashbrook	Dowdy	King, Calif.
Ashley	Downing	King, Utah
Aspinall	Doyle	Kirwan
Avery	Dulski	Kitchin
Ayres	Durno	Knox
Bailey	Dwyer	Kornegay
Baker	Elliott	Kowalski
Baldwin	Ellsworth	Kunkel
Baring	Everett	Kyl
Barrett	Evins	Laird
Bass, Tenn.	Fallon	Landrum
Bates	Farbstein	Langen
Battin	Feighan	Lankford
Beckworth	Fenton	Latta
Beermann	Findley	Lennon
Belcher	Flood	Lesinski
Bell	Fogarty	Libonati
Bennett, Fla.	Fountain	Lindsay
Bennett, Mich.	Frazier	Lipscomb
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Loser
Betts	Friedel	McCulloch
Blatnik	Fulton	McFall
Boggs	Gallagher	McIntire
Boland	Garland	McMillan
Bolling	Garmatz	MacGregor
Bolton	Gary	Mack
Bonner	Gathings	Madden
Bow	Giaimo	Magnuson
Boykin	Gilbert	Mahon
Brademas	Glenn	Mailliard
Bray	Gonzalez	Marshall
Brewster	Goodling	Martin, Nebr.
Brooks, Tex.	Granahan	Mason
Brown	Grant	Mathias
Broyhill	Gray	Matthews
Bruce	Green, Oreg.	May
Burke, Ky.	Green, Pa.	Meader
Burke, Mass.	Griffin	Michel
Burleson	Griffiths	Miller, Clem
Byrne, Pa.	Gubser	Miller, George P.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagan, Ga.	
Cahill	Hagen, Calif.	Miller, N.Y.
Cannon	Haley	Milliken
Carey	Hall	Mills
Casey	Hansen	Minshall
Cederberg	Harding	Moeller
Celler	Hardy	Monagan
Chamberlain	Harris	Montoya
Chelf	Harrison, Va.	Moore
Chenoweth	Harrison, Wyo.	Moorhead, Pa.
Chiperfield	Harvey, Mich.	Morgan
Church	Hays	Morris
Clancy	Healey	Morse
Clark	Hechler	Mosher
Coad	Hemphill	Moss
Cohelan	Henderson	Multer
Collier	Herlong	Murphy
Colmer	Hoeven	Murray
Conte	Hoffman, Ill.	Natcher
Cook	Holifield	Nedzi
Cooley	Holland	Nelsen
Corman	Hosmer	Nix
Cramer	Ichord, Mo.	Norblad
Cunningham	Inouye	Nygaard
Curtin	Jarman	O'Brien, N.Y.
Curtis, Mo.	Jennings	O'Hara, Ill.
Daddario	Joelson	O'Hara, Mich.
Dague	Johnson, Calif.	O'Konski
Daniels	Johnson, Wis.	Olsen
Davis, John W.		

O'Neill	Rutherford	Sullivan
Osmers	Ryan, Mich.	Taylor
Ostertag	Ryan, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Passman	St. Germain	Teague, Tex.
Pelly	Santangelo	Thomas
Perkins	Schadeberg	Thompson, Tex.
Philbin	Schenck	Thomson, Wis.
Pike	Scherer	Thornberry
Pirnie	Schneebeli	Toll
Poage	Schweiker	Tollefson
Poff	Schwengel	Trimble
Price	Scott	Tuck
Pucinski	Scranton	Tupper
Purcell	Seely-Brown	Udall, Morris K.
Quie	Selden	Ullman
Randall	Shelley	Vanik
Reece	Sheppard	Van Zandt
Reifel	Shipley	Waggonner
Reuss	Short	Wallhauser
Rhodes, Ariz.	Shriver	Walter
Rhodes, Pa.	Siler	Watts
Riehlman	Sisk	Weaver
Roberts, Ala.	Slack	Westland
Roberts, Tex.	Smith, Iowa	Wharton
Robison	Smith, Miss.	Whitener
Rodino	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Rogers, Colo.	Spence	Wickersham
Rogers, Fla.	Springer	Widnall
Rooney	Stafford	Willis
Roosevelt	Staggers	Wilson, Ind.
Rosenthal	Steed	Wright
Rostenkowski	Stephens	Young
Roudebush	Stratton	Younger
Roush	Stubblefield	Zablocki

NAYS—26

Adair	Harsha	Pillion
Alger	Hiestand	Ray
Ashmore	Horan	Rousselot
Becker	Huddleston	Saylor
Broomfield	Jensen	Taber
Corbett	Johansen	Utt
Derwinski	Jonas	Van Pelt
Flynt	King, N.Y.	Winstead
Gross	McVey	

NOT VOTING—69

Anfuso	Halpern	Pfost
Auchincloss	Harvey, Ind.	Pilcher
Barry	Hébert	Powell
Bass, N.H.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rains
Blitch	Hull	Riley
Breeding	Johnson, Md.	Rivers, Alaska
Bromwell	Jones, Ala.	Rivers, S.C.
Buckley	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	Kluczynski	St. George
Davis, James C.	Lane	Saund
	McDonough	Sibal
Diggs	McDowell	Sikes
Donohue	McSween	Smith, Calif.
Dooley	Macdonald	Thompson, La.
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Merrow	Vinson
Finnegan	Moorehead, Ohio	Weis
Fino		Whalley
Fisher	Morrison	Williams
Ford	Moulder	Wilson, Calif.
Forrester	Norrell	Yates
Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.	Zelenko
Goodell	Patman	
Halleck	Peterson	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Macdonald with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Halleck.

Mrs. Riley with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Zelenko with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Patman with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Johnson of Maryland with Mr. Judd.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Breeding with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the Journal.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the Journal.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WAGGONNER (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 229]

Anfuso	Hoffman, Mich.	Pfost
Auchincloss	Hull	Pilcher
Bass, N.H.	Jensen	Powell
Blitch	Johnson, Md.	Rains
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Bromwell	Kilburn	Rivers, Alaska
Buckley	Lane	Rivers, S.C.
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, James C.	McSween	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	Macdonald	Saund
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Sikes
Dooley	Merrow	Smith, Calif.
Edmondson	Moeller	Teague, Tex.
Finnegan	Moorehead, Ohio	Thompson, La.
Fino		Thompson, N.J.
Ford	Morrison	Vinson
Frazier	Moulder	Weis
Gavin	Nix	Whalley
Goodell	Norrell	Wilson, Calif.
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, Ill.	Yates
Harvey, Ind.	Patman	Zelenko
Hébert	Peterson	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the call of Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with today.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is very obvious, since the House has now been in session for 2½ hours, that we are not going to be able to get around to the youth opportunities bill today. When the House convened, I objected to the dispensing of Calendar Wednesday with the hope that we could vote on H.R. 10682, the Youth Opportunities Act, which in effect recreates the Civilian Conservation Corps on a limited scale. The Youth Conservation Corps is designed not only to advance conservation and recreational projects in our State and National parks and forests, but also to provide useful employment and income to the many thousands of young people who are out of school and unemployed. This bill authorizes pilot projects and calls for an expenditure of only $75 million for the first year.

I am of the personal opinion that this piece of legislation would do more to curb juvenile delinquency than any other legislation this Congress has enacted in a long time. We have in this country today more than a million out-of-school unemployed youngsters between the ages of 17 and 21 years and I feel that this Congress will be derelict in its responsibility if we fail to vote on this needed legislation. I regret that we were unable to get a rule before the Rules Committee and that we had to resort to this method of procedure. Realizing that we have a dozen or more votes today, I shall not object, Mr. Speaker, to the unanimous-consent request of the majority leader, but I am hopeful that somewhere along the line we will be able to get a vote on this legislation before the adjournment of this Congress.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that business in order under Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that that motion is not in order until after the Journal is read.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk continued the reading of the Journal.

Mr. GROSS (interrupting reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the Clerk has not resumed the reading of the Journal at the end of amendment 42 on page 18383 when the quorum call was made. The Clerk had finished the reading of amendment No. 42, and I ask that he resume the reading of the Journal at the point where he concluded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the reading of the Journal where he left off.

The Clerk continued the reading of the Journal.

Mr. ALBERT (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion which requires a two-thirds vote.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes, 269, noes, 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 7431

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to House Resolution 800.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the resolution.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H.R. 7431, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill sets an unfortunately bad precedent. In admitting this stained glass duty free, we are clearly injuring the domestic glass plants, many of which abound in the State of West Virginia. I hope that my colleagues will realize that we cannot maintain a healthy art-glass industry in the United States of America if we continue to subsidize foreign competition. I trust that this resolution will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HIESTAND) there were—ayes 162, noes 34.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-five Members are present, a quorum.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 12082) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 352, nays 23, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

YEAS—352

Abbitt	Andersen, Minn.	Auchincloss
Abernethy	Anderson, Ill.	Avery
Adair	Andrews	Ayres
Addabbo	Arends	Bailey
Albert	Ashbrook	Baker
Alexander	Ashmore	Baldwin
Alford	Aspinall	Baring
Alger	Barry	Barrett
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	Nelsen
Bates	Gross	Nix
Battin	Gubser	Norblad
Becker	Hagan, Ga.	Nygaard
Beckworth	Hagen, Calif.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Beermann	Haley	O'Hara, Ill.
Belcher	Hall	O'Hara, Mich.
Bell	Halleck	O'Konski
Bennett, Fla.	Halpern	Olsen
Bennett, Mich.	Hansen	O'Neill
Berry	Harding	Osmers
Betts	Hardy	Ostertag
Boggs	Harris	Pelly
Boland	Harrison, Va.	Perkins
Bolling	Harrison, Wyo.	Philbin
Bolton	Harsha	Pike
Bonner	Harvey, Mich.	Pillion
Bow	Hays	Pirnie
Boykin	Healey	Poage
Brademas	Hechler	Poff
Bray	Hemphill	Price
Breeding	Henderson	Pucinski
Brewster	Herlong	Purcell
Brooks, Tex.	Hiestand	Quie
Broomfield	Hoeven	Randall
Brown	Hoffman, Ill.	Ray
Broyhill	Holland	Reece
Bruce	Horan	Reifel
Burke, Ky.	Hosmer	Reuss
Burke, Mass.	Huddleston	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burleson	Ichord, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Inouye	Riehlman
Byrnes, Wis.	Jennings	Roberts, Ala.
Cahill	Jensen	Robison
Cannon	Joelson	Rodino
Carey	Johansen	Rogers, Colo.
Casey	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Cederberg	Johnson, Wis.	Rooney
Chamberlain	Jonas	Rostenkowski
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Roudebush
Chenoweth	Jones, Mo.	Roush
Chiperfield	Judd	Rousselot
Church	Karth	Rutherford
Clancy	Kastenmeier	Ryan, Mich.
Clark	Kearns	St. Germain
Coad	Kee	Santangelo
Collier	Keith	Saylor
Colmer	Kelly	Schadeberg
Conte	Keogh	Schenck
Cook	Kilgore	Scherer
Cooley	King, Calif.	Schneebeli
Corman	King, N.Y.	Schweiker
Cramer	King, Utah	Schwengel
Cunningham	Kirwan	Scott
Curtin	Kitchin	Scranton
Daddario	Kluczynski	Seely-Brown
Dague	Knox	Selden
Daniels	Kornegay	Shelley
Davis, John W.	Kunkel	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kyl	Shipley
Dawson	Laird	Short
Delaney	Landrum	Shriver
Dent	Langen	Sibal
Denton	Lankford	Siler
Derounian	Latta	Sisk
Derwinski	Lennon	Slack
Devine	Lesinski	Smith, Iowa
Dole	Libonati	Smith, Miss.
Dominick	Lipscomb	Smith, Va.
Donohue	Loser	Spence
Dorn	McCulloch	Springer
Dowdy	McDowell	Stafford
Downing	McFall	Steed
Doyle	McIntire	Stephens
Dulski	McMillan	Stratton
Durno	McVey	Stubblefield
Dwyer	Mack	Sullivan
Elliott	Madden	Taber
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Taylor
Everett	Mahon	Teague, Calif.
Evins	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Fallon	Martin, Nebr.	Thomas
Fascell	Mason	Thompson, La.
Fenton	Mathias	Thompson, Tex.
Findley	Matthews	Thomson, Wis.
Fisher	May	Thornberry
Flood	Meader	Toll
Flynt	Michel	Tollefson
Fogarty	Miller, Clem	Trimble
Forrester	Miller, George P.	Tuck
Fountain	Miller, N.Y.	Tupper
Frelinghuysen	Milliken	Udall, Morris K.
Friedel	Mills	Ullman
Gallagher	Minshall	Utt
Garland	Moeller	Vanik
Garmatz	Monagan	Van Pelt
Gary	Montoya	Van Zandt
Gathings	Moore	Waggonner
Giaimo	Morgan	Wallhauser
Glenn	Morris	Walter
Goodling	Morrison	Watts
Grant	Morse	Weaver
Gray	Murphy	Westland
Green, Oreg.	Murray	Wharton
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Whitener
Griffin	Nedzi	Whitten
		Wickersham

Widnall	Wilson, Ind.	Young
Williams	Winstead	Younger
Willis	Wright	Zablocki

NAYS—23

Ashley	Gilbert	Mosher
Celler	Gonzalez	Moss
Cohelan	Holifield	Multer
Corbett	Karsten	Roosevelt
Curtis, Mo.	Lindsay	Rosenthal
Dingell	MacGregor	Ryan, N.Y.
Farbstein	Marshall	Staggers
Fulton	Moorhead, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—63

Anfuso	Hébert	Pfost
Bass, N.H.	Hoffman, Mich.	Pilcher
Blatnik	Hull	Powell
Blitch	Jarman	Rains
Bromwell	Johnson, Md.	Riley
Buckley	Kilburn	Rivers, Alaska
Curtis, Mass.	Kowalski	Rivers, S.C.
Davis, James C.	Lane	Roberts, Tex.
	McDonough	Rogers, Tex.
Diggs	McSween	St. George
Dooley	Macdonald	Saund
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Sikes
Feighan	Merrow	Smith, Calif.
Finnegan	Moorehead, Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Fino		Vinson
Ford	Moulder	Weis
Frazier	Norrell	Whalley
Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.	Wilson, Calif.
Goodell	Passman	Yates
Granahan	Patman	Zelenko
Harvey, Ind.	Peterson	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Macdonald with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Zelenko with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Lane with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Johnson of Maryland with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Messrs. NEDZI and ASHBROOK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HALPERN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 11363).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 132, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—247

Abbitt	Adair	Alexander
Abernethy	Albert	Alford
Andersen, Minn.	Flood	Morrison
Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Murray
Andrews	Forrester	Natcher
Arends	Fountain	Nelsen
Ashbrook	Frazier	Norblad
Ashmore	Garland	Nygaard
Aspinall	Gary	O'Hara, Mich.
Auchincloss	Gathings	O'Konski
Avery	Goodling	O'Neill
Ayres	Grant	Ostertag
Baker	Gray	Passman
Baldwin	Griffin	Pelly
Baring	Gubser	Philbin
Bass, Tenn.	Hagan, Ga.	Pike
Bates	Hagen, Calif.	Pillion
Battin	Haley	Poage
Becker	Hall	Poff
Beckworth	Halleck	Pucinski
Beermann	Hardy	Purcell
Belcher	Harris	Randall
Bell	Harrison, Va.	Ray
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Wyo.	Reece
Bennett, Mich.	Harsha	Reifel
Berry	Harvey, Mich.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Betts	Hays	Rhodes, Pa.
Boggs	Hechler	Roberts, Ala.
Boiling	Hemphill	Rogers, Colo.
Bolton	Henderson	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Herlong	Roudebush
Bow	Hiestand	Roush
Brademas	Hoeven	Rousselot
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	Rutherford
Breeding	Horan	Saylor
Brooks, Tex.	Hosmer	Schadeberg
Broomfield	Huddleston	Schenck
Brown	Ichord, Mo.	Scherer
Broyhill	Jarman	Schneebeli
Bruce	Jennings	Schweiker
Burke, Ky.	Jensen	Scott
Burke, Mass.	Johansen	Selden
Burleson	Johnson, Wis.	Shipley
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Short
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Shriver
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Carey	Kearns	Spence
Casey	Keith	Springer
Cederberg	Kilgore	Steed
Chamberlain	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Chelf	Kitchin	Stratton
Chenoweth	Knox	Stubblefield
Chiperfield	Kornegay	Taber
Church	Kyl	Taylor
Clancy	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Collier	Landrum	Thomas
Colmer	Langen	Thompson, La.
Cook	Latta	Thompson, Tex.
Cooley	Lennon	Thomson, Wis.
Cramer	Lesinski	Thornberry
Cunningham	Lipscomb	Tollefson
Dague	Loser	Trimble
Davis, John W.	McCulloch	Tuck
Davis, Tenn.	McIntire	Utt
Denton	McMillan	Van Pelt
Derounian	McVey	Van Zandt
Devine	Mack	Waggonner
Dole	Mahon	Walter
Donohue	Martin, Nebr.	Watts
Dorn	Mason	Weaver
Dowdy	Matthews	Westland
Downing	May	Wharton
Doyle	Meader	Whitener
Durno	Michel	Whitten
Elliott	Miller, George P.	Wickersham
Everett	Miller, N.Y.	Williams
Evins	Mills	Willis
Fallon	Minshall	Wilson, Ind.
Fascell	Moeller	Winstead
Feighan	Montoya	Wright
Fenton	Moore	Young
Fisher	Morris	Younger
		Zablocki

NAYS—132

Addabbo	Diggs	Hansen
Alger	Dingell	Harding
Ashley	Dominick	Healey
Bailey	Dulski	Holifield
Barrett	Dwyer	Holland
Barry	Ellsworth	Inouye
Boland	Farbstein	Joelson
Brewster	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.	Fogarty	Judd
Celler	Frelinghuysen	Karsten
Clark	Friedel	Karth
Coad	Fulton	Kastenmeier
Cohelan	Gallagher	Kee
Conte	Garmatz	Kelly
Corbett	Giaimo	Keogh
Corman	Gilbert	King, Calif.
Curtin	Glenn	King, Utah
Curtis, Mo.	Gonzalez	Kirwan
Daddario	Granahan	Kluczynski
Daniels	Green, Oreg.	Kunkel
Dawson	Green, Pa.	Lankford
Delaney	Griffiths	Libonati
Dent	Gross	Lindsay
Derwinski	Halpern	McDowell
McFall	Olsen	Seely-Brown
MacGregor	Osmers	Shelley
Madden	Perkins	Sheppard
Mailliard	Pirnie	Sibal
Marshall	Price	Siler
Mathias	Quie	Sisk
Miller, Clem	Reuss	Slack
Milliken	Riehlman	Smith, Iowa
Monagan	Robison	Smith, Miss.
Moorhead, Pa.	Rodino	Stafford
Morgan	Rooney	Staggers
Morse	Roosevelt	Sullivan
Mosher	Rosenthal	Teague, Calif.
Moss	Rostenkowski	Toll
Multer	Ryan, Mich.	Tupper
Murphy	Ryan, N.Y.	Udall, Morris K.
Nedzi	St. Germain	Ullman
Nix	Santangelo	Vanik
O'Brien, N.Y.	Schwengel	Wallhauser
O'Hara, Ill.	Scranton	Widnall

NOT VOTING—56

Anfuso	Hull	Powell
Bass, N.H.	Johnson, Md.	Rains
Blatnik	Kilburn	Riley
Blitch	Kowalski	Rivers, Alaska
Boykin	Lane	Rivers, S.C.
Bromwell	McDonough	Roberts, Tex.
Buckley	McSween	Rogers, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	Macdonald	St. George
Davis, James C.	Magnuson	Saund
	Martin, Mass.	Sikes
Dooley	Merrow	Smith, Calif.
Edmondson	Moorehead, Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Finnegan		Vinson
Fino	Moulder	Weis
Ford	Norrell	Whalley
Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.	Wilson, Calif.
Goodell	Patman	Yates
Harvey, Ind.	Peterson	Zelenko
Hébert	Pfost	
Hoffman, Mich.	Pilcher	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of California and Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Pilcher and Mrs. Riley for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas and Mr. Patman for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Sikes and Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Kilburn and Mr. Moorehead of Ohio for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan and Mr. James C. Davis, for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. McSween and Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Yates against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Johnson of Maryland with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Edmondson with Mrs. Weis.

Mrs Norrell with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Messrs. McDOWELL, COAD, and ALGER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance

to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question of the adoption of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER moves that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 19.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. FORRESTER and Mr. WHITTEN.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 109, noes 107.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 223, answered "present" 1, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—143

Abernethy	Fascell	Magnuson
Alford	Flynt	Matthews
Andrews	Fogarty	Montoya
Arends	Forrester	Moorhead, Pa.
Ashmore	Gilbert	Morgan
Aspinall	Grant	Morris
Baker	Gray	Moss
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.	Multer
Bates	Griffiths	Murphy
Battin	Gubser	Murray
Bennett, Fla.	Hagan, Ga.	Nedzi
Bennett, Mich.	Haley	Norblad
Berry	Hall	Nygaard
Betts	Halpern	O'Hara, Ill.
Bray	Hansen	O'Hara, Mich.
Broomfield	Harding	O'Konski
Brown	Harris	Olsen
Burke, Mass.	Harsha	Osmers
Carey	Hays	Ostertag
Celler	Healey	Philbin
Chamberlain	Hechler	Pillion
Chenoweth	Hemphill	Pirnie
Chiperfield	Herlong	Price
Clark	Holland	Ray
Cook	Huddleston	Reece
Corman	Ichord, Mo.	Reifel
Cunningham	Inouye	Reuss
Daddario	Jensen	Rhodes, Pa.
Davis, John W.	Johansen	Riehlman
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts, Ala.
Dawson	Jones, Ala.	Robison
Dent	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Donohue	Karth	Rogers, Fla.
Dorn	King, N.Y.	Rooney
Doyle	Knox	Roosevelt
Dulski	Kyl	Rosenthal
Durno	Landrum	Rostenkowski
Elliott	Libonati	Roush
Everett	Loser	Ryan, N.Y.
Evins	McCulloch	St. Germain
Farbstein	McFall	Schenck
Scherer	Staggers	Ullman
Schwengel	Stephens	Waggonner
Selden	Stubblefield	Walter
Short	Sullivan	Williams
Sisk	Tollefson	Willis
Smith, Miss.	Trimble	Winstead
Springer	Udall, Morris K.	

NAYS—223

Abbitt	Fountain	Minshall
Adair	Frazier	Moeller
Addabbo	Frelinghuysen	Monagan
Albert	Friedel	Moore
Alexander	Fulton	Morse
Alger	Gallagher	Mosher
Andersen, Minn.	Garland	Natcher
	Garmatz	Nelsen
Anderson, Ill.	Gary	Nix
Ashbrook	Gathings	O'Brien, N.Y.
Ashley	Giaimo	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Glenn	Pelly
Avery	Gonzalez	Perkins
Ayres	Goodling	Pike
Baldwin	Granahan	Poage
Baring	Green, Pa.	Poff
Barrett	Griffin	Pucinski
Barry	Gross	Purcell
Becker	Hagen, Calif.	Quie
Beckworth	Hardy	Randall
Beermann	Harrison, Va.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Rodino
Bell	Harvey, Mich.	Roudebush
Boggs	Henderson	Rousselot
Boland	Hiestand	Rutherford
Bolling	Hoeven	Ryan, Mich.
Bolton	Hoffman, Ill.	Santangelo
Bonner	Horan	Saylor
Bow	Hosmer	Schadeberg
Brademas	Jarman	Schneebeli
Breeding	Jennings	Schweiker
Brewster	Joelson	Scott
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Wis.	Scranton
Broyhill	Jonas	Seely-Brown
Bruce	Jones, Mo.	Shelley
Burke, Ky.	Judd	Shipley
Burleson	Kastenmeier	Shriver
Byrne, Pa.	Keith	Sibal
Byrnes, Wis.	Kelly	Siler
Cahill	Keogh	Slack
Cannon	Kilgore	Smith, Iowa
Casey	King, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Cederberg	King, Utah	Stafford
Chelf	Kirwan	Steed
Church	Kitchin	Stratton
Clancy	Kluczynski	Taber
Coad	Kornegay	Taylor
Cohelan	Kowalski	Teague, Calif.
Collier	Kunkel	Teague, Tex.
Conte	Laird	Thomas
Cooley	Lane	Thompson, Tex.
Corbett	Langen	Thomson, Wis.
Cramer	Lankford	Thornberry
Curtin	Latta	Toll
Curtis, Mo.	Lennon	Tuck
Dague	Lesinski	Tupper
Daniels	Lindsay	Utt
Delaney	Lipscomb	Vanik
Denton	McDowell	Van Pelt
Derounian	McIntire	Van Zandt
Derwinski	McVey	Wallhauser
Devine	MacGregor	Watts
Dingell	Mack	Weaver
Dole	Madden	Westland
Dominick	Mahon	Wharton
Dowdy	Mailliard	Whitener
Downing	Marshall	Whitten
Dwyer	Martin, Nebr.	Wickersham
Ellsworth	Mathias	Widnall
Fallon	May	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Meader	Wright
Fenton	Michel	Young
Findley	Miller, Clem	Younger
Fisher	Miller, N.Y.	Zablocki
Flood	Milliken	

PRESENT—1

Sheppard

NOT VOTING—68

Anfuso	Gavin	Merrow
Bailey	Goodell	Miller, George P.
Bass, N.H.	Halleck	
Blatnik	Harvey, Ind.	Mills
Blitch	Hébert	Moorehead, Ohio
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	
Bromwell	Holifield	Morrison
Buckley	Hull	Moulder
Colmer	Johnson, Md.	Norrell
Curtis, Mass.	Kearns	O'Brien, Ill.
Davis, James C.	Kee	Passman
	Kilburn	Patman
Diggs	McDonough	Peterson
Dooley	McMillan	Pfost
Edmondson	McSween	Pilcher
Finnegan	Macdonald	Powell
Fino	Martin, Mass.	Rains
Ford	Mason	Riley
Rivers, Alaska	Sikes	Weis
Rivers, S.C.	Smith, Calif.	Whalley
Roberts, Tex.	Spence	Wilson, Calif.
Rogers, Tex.	Thompson, La.	Yates
St. George	Thompson, N.J.	Zelenko
Saund	Vinson	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. James C. Davis for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holifield with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Macdonald with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. McSween with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. HERLONG changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. GRIFFIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question of the adoption of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11151), the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1963.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the vote on a motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, would an "aye" vote be to sustain the Senate in knocking out the junk, the "occupant," mail for the legislators?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The motion has been stated.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair restate the question?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the motion.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 125, nays 248, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—125

Addabbo	Friedel	Multer
Albert	Gallagher	Natcher
Alexander	Garmatz	Nix
Alford	Gary	O'Hara, Mich.
Andersen, Minn.	Gathings	Olsen
Ashley	Giaimo	O'Neill
Aspinall	Gilbert	Perkins
Baring	Gonzalez	Philbin
Barrett	Granahan	Pillion
Bass, Tenn.	Gray	Pirnie
Beckworth	Green, Pa.	Poage
Blatnik	Hagen, Calif.	Price
Bolling	Harding	Purcell
Bonner	Hardy	Randall
Bow	Harris	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, Tex.	Healey	Riehlman
Burleson	Henderson	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Rooney
Cannon	Horan	Roosevelt
Carey	Ichord, Mo.	Rosenthal
Celler	Inouye	Ryan, Mich.
Chelf	Jennings	Ryan, N.Y.
Coad	Johnson, Calif.	St. Germain
Cohelan	Jones, Ala.	Santangelo
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Corman	Karsten	Sheppard
Daniels	Kastenmeier	Sisk
Delaney	Kelly	Smith, Iowa
Derwinski	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Dingell	King, Calif.	Steed
Donohue	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Dorn	Lesinski	Sullivan
Downing	Libonati	Thomas
Doyle	McFall	Thompson, Tex.
Elliott	Magnuson	Thornberry
Evins	Mahon	Toll
Farbstein	Marshall	Trimble
Fascell	Matthews	Van Pelt
Feighan	Miller, Clem	Walter
Flood	Montoya	Watts
Fountain	Moorhead, Pa.	Whitener
	Moss	Whitten

NAYS—248

Abbitt	Burke, Mass.	Dwyer
Abernethy	Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth
Adair	Cahill	Everett
Alger	Casey	Fallon
Anderson, Ill.	Cederberg	Fenton
Andrews	Chamberlain	Findley
Arends	Chenoweth	Fisher
Ashbrook	Chiperfield	Flynt
Ashmore	Church	Forrester
Auchincloss	Clancy	Frazier
Avery	Clark	Frelinghuysen
Bailey	Collier	Fulton
Baker	Conte	Garland
Baldwin	Cook	Glenn
Barry	Cooley	Goodling
Bates	Corbett	Grant
Battin	Cramer	Green, Oreg.
Becker	Cunningham	Griffin
Beermann	Curtin	Griffiths
Belcher	Curtis, Mo.	Gross
Bell	Daddario	Gubser
Bennett, Fla.	Dague	Hagan, Ga.
Berry	Davis, John W.	Haley
Betts	Davis, Tenn.	Hall
Boggs	Dawson	Halleck
Boland	Dent	Halpern
Bolton	Denton	Hansen
Brademas	Derounian	Harrison, Va.
Bray	Devine	Harrison, Wyo.
Brewster	Dole	Harsha
Broomfield	Dominick	Harvey, Mich.
Brown	Dowdy	Hays
Broyhill	Dulski	Hechler
Bruce	Durno	Hemphill
Burke, Ky.	Herlong	Mathias
Hiestand	May	Schenck
Hoeven	Meader	Scherer
Hoffman, Ill.	Michel	Schneebeli
Holland	Miller, George P.	Schweiker
Hosmer	Miller, N.Y.	Schwengel
Huddleston	Milliken	Scranton
Jarman	Mills	Seely-Brown
Jensen	Minshall	Selden
Joelson	Moeller	Shipley
Johansen	Monagan	Short
Johnson, Wis.	Moore	Shriver
Jonas	Morgan	Sibal
Judd	Morris	Siler
Karth	Morse	Slack
Kearns	Mosher	Smith, Miss.
Kee	Murphy	Springer
Keith	Murray	Stafford
Kilgore	Nedzi	Staggers
King, N.Y.	Nelsen	Stephens
King, Utah	Norblad	Stratton
Kitchin	Nygaard	Taber
Kluczynski	O'Brien, N.Y.	Taylor
Knox	O'Hara, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Kornegay	O'Konski	Teague, Tex.
Kowalski	Osmers	Thomson, Wis.
Kunkel	Ostertag	Tollefson
Kyl	Pelly	Tuck
Laird	Pike	Tupper
Landrum	Poff	Udall, Morris K.
Lane	Pucinski	Ullman
Langen	Quie	Utt
Lankford	Ray	Vanik
Latta	Reece	Van Zandt
Lennon	Reifel	Waggonner
Lindsay	Reuss	Wallhauser
Lipscomb	Rhodes, Ariz.	Weaver
Loser	Roberts, Ala.	Westland
McCulloch	Robison	Wharton
McDowell	Rogers, Colo.	Wickersham
McIntire	Rogers, Fla.	Widnall
McMillan	Rostenkowski	Williams
McVey	Roudebush	Willis
MacGregor	Roush	Wilson, Ind.
Mack	Rousselot	Winstead
Madden	Rutherford	Wright
Mailliard	Saylor	Young
Martin, Nebr.	Schadeberg	Younger
Mason		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—62

Anfuso	Hébert	Rains
Ayres	Hoffman, Mich.	Riley
Bass, N.H.	Hull	Rivers, Alaska
Bennett, Mich.	Johnson, Md.	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Kilburn	Roberts, Tex.
Boykin	McDonough	Rogers, Tex.
Breeding	McSween	St. George
Bromwell	Macdonald	Saund
Buckley	Martin, Mass.	Shelley
Curtis, Mass.	Merrow	Sikes
Davis, James C.	Moorehead, Ohio	Smith, Calif.
Diggs	Morrison	Spence
Dooley	Moulder	Thompson, La.
Edmondson	Norrell	Thompson, N.J.
Finnegan	O'Brien, Ill.	Vinson
Fino	Passman	Weis
Fogarty	Patman	Whalley
Ford	Peterson	Wilson, Calif.
Gavin	Pfost	Yates
Goodell	Pilcher	Zelenko
Harvey, Ind.	Powell	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McDonough for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Johnson of Maryland with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mrs. Riley with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. ALBERT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. BAILEY, DENT, HOLLAND, HARVEY of Michigan, AUCHINCLOSS, BERRY, CHAMBERLAIN, and SLACK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire again to point out that the action of the House today in accepting a Senate amendment which prohibits the use of the franking privilege for "Occupant" mail is not a move for economy. On the contrary, the Post Office Department has testified that the occupant mail handled is a much less costly method than addressed mail carrying the frank.

The legislative appropriation bill approved today contains more than $3,900,000 in payment to the Post Office Department for the use of the franking privilege by Congress. This is the highest figure in history.

An analysis of the claim filed by the Post Office Department shows that the largest single item is for mailing the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Other large mailings charged to Congress include so-called newsletters, questionnaires, farmer bulletin lists, and reprinted speeches.

An analysis of the membership record on use of the frank in these areas shows that there are 32 members who sent out more than 400,000 pieces of franked mail each. It is interesting to note that these heaviest users of the frank sent a combined total greater than all the other 403 Members combined. It is also interesting to note that of these heaviest users of the frank 24 voted against use of "Occupant" mail. Among those supporting the right of the House to use the frank for occupant mail were 95 Members who did not use the franking privilege for any of the above-stated purposes.

In view of this situation, I cannot refrain from advising our taxpaying American people that if their Congressmen now will practice what they preach, our postage bill next year will show a substantial reduction. I hope my beloved colleagues will do just this. Our hearings on next year's appropriation bill may be able to reveal this information.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, once again, before the vote on the Senate amendment outlawing the congressional usage of the frank on mail addressed simply "Occupant" or "Boxholder," I want to register my approval and enthusiasm for the amendment. I was unable to be present during the discussion of it yesterday because I wanted to cast

my vote in the Massachusetts primary. Had I been able to be anywhere near this Chamber, I would have run, not walked, to join in the debate on this amendment. For during that discussion, the high-flung praises of "Occupant" mail were sung as never before. It was claimed that "Occupant" mail had saved lives, that it would be less costly, and that it would put congressional mail on a par with that of the private sector of our Nation.

Some of these claims are based more on fancy than on fact. Let us look at just a few. The statement that "the per piece handling cost of congressional mail, addressed to 'Postal Patron' without street address on city carrier routes and post office boxes, will be less than the same mail fully addressed to each householder," is certainly true. But, it completely misses the point involved here, which is that the increase in volume of such mail will up the cost to offset the savings.

The second statement that "franked mail would not even have parity with private mailers on either rural, star, or city routes or boxes since private mailers can send rural mail addressed simply 'Postal Patron, Local' and city mail without name," is even more inaccurate.

There is a big difference between congressional mail for which the taxpayers foot the bill and other mail paid for by the users themselves. Certainly, private mailers can use the "Occupant" system, but they pay for it themselves. Congressional "Occupant" mail is paid for by the taxpayers in general. There is an enormous difference.

I have, in various debates on this subject, pointed out abuses of the system. I have emphasized that the taxpayers are the ones we should have in mind when voting on this measure. In general, my point has been that it is easier to prevent an abuse than to correct those which might occur. I hope that the House will allow the Senate amendment to stand.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FHA TO MAKE PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 13067, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13067)?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill S. 3529, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3529)?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK, ST. JOHN, V.I.

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business of the House is the question on the passage of the bill S. 2429, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is very clear to anyone familiar with the Virgin Islands that the formation of the park has been a major factor for economic development. Senator Theovald E. Moorhead, meeting with the gentleman from Texas, Congressman RUTHERFORD, and others, on September 7, stated at length what a wonderful thing the Virgin Islands National Park is for the people of St. John and the whole community of the Virgin Islands, and what a fine project Caneel Bay Plantation has been for the economy of St. John. Furthermore, in the original legislation, more than 3,000 acres in two segments of the island where the great majority of the people live were purposely excluded from the boundaries of the national park in order that there might be ample land on the island for private development.

Senator Moorhead has said that his only objection to the bill was the feature of condemnation. Mr. Rockefeller has made his position very clear that he is against condemnation. This has constantly been his position, and it is based on the extreme, adverse reaction to condemnation expressed by the people of the area, plus the fact that Mr. Rockefeller feels condemnation is not essential in this particular case. The gentleman from Texas, Congressman RUTHERFORD, and others, also have made themselves very clear that they are against condemnation, and the gentleman from Texas, Congressman RUTHERFORD, has gone so far as to offer an amendment excluding condemnation from the bill and to work for the passage of the bill only if condemnation is excluded. It is regrettable that confusion continues; hopefully, this bill will be amended to exclude condemnation and will be enacted.

Senator Moorhead, in a letter to the Daily News of the Virgin Islands, which was published on September 15, also commented:

We in St. John are convinced that this bill is to protect the Caneel Bay Plantation interests from further competition and provide a monopoly on the island.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Rockefeller, who had the vision and the willingness to invest in the future of the island of St. John, has constantly expressed his desire that private interests invest in the economy of the island. These interests have not been stymied for lack of land or beaches.

In another section of his letter, Senator Moorhead stated that $500,000 would be available to match Federal appropriations from Mr. Laurance Rockefeller and his associates, and further inquired:

Does this mean the Federal Government, if this legislation is enacted, has decided to invest condemnation authority in Mr. Laurance Rockefeller and his associates?

Senator Moorhead obviously is referring to the possibility of Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., giving matching funds with the Federal Government for land purchases. Jackson Hole Preserve is a nonprofit conservation foundation supported by the Rockefeller family. It donated the land for the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park and has contributed funds for the purchase of lands within the park boundaries by the park service. It owns Caneel Bay Plantation, and any profits from that operation would be used for conservation purposes. It is, of course, ridiculous to suggest that Jackson Hole Preserve might ever have any power of condemnation.

FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill, S. 3475, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill H.R. 12802 was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10129) to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to

the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, WILLIAMS, FRIEDEL, BENNETT of Michigan, and SPRINGER.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the so-called foreign-aid bill—involving what? $3 to $4 billion—will be before the House tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to this unanimous-consent request and any other unanimous-consent request that any committee meet tomorrow during general debate. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PUBLIC RECREATION IN NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREAS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1171) to assure continued fish and wildlife benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas by authorizing their appropriate incidental or secondary use for public recreation to the extent that such use is compatible with the primary purposes of such areas, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "and" and insert "game ranges, and other".

Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "the wildlife populations" and insert "fish and wildlife populations and management operations".

Page 3, line 12, after "areas" insert "in existence or approved by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission as of the date of enactment of this Act".

Page 3, line 18, after "stamps." insert "Lands acquired pursuant to this section shall become a part of the particular conservation area to which they are adjacent."

Page 4, lines 4 and 5, strike out "charges, fees, and" and insert "charges and fees and issue".

Page 4, line 8 strike out "of this Act".

Page 4, line 8, after "Act." insert "The Secretary may issue regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WICKERSHAM BLASTS CED FARM PLAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my opposition to the Committee for Economic Development proposed plan for agriculture, which would drive approximately one-third of the farmers off their land within 5 years.

The Committee for Economic Development farm plan would reduce farm income from $11.5 billion as it was in 1959 to about $7 billion in 1965, a reduction in income of about 40 percent.

Farmers displaced from the fields would be dumped into the already crowded labor market, creating even more unemployment.

Taking one out of every three farmers away from their jobs would kill hundreds of small towns and cities.

The Committee for Economic Development program has been endorsed by big business officials of such firms as Sears, Roebuck & Co. and the Ford Motor Co., and so forth. A farmers revolt against products of firms endorsing the Committee for Economic Development farm plan has been so great that the Ford Motor Co. disassociated itself with the plan and other companies may follow soon.

The backbone of our farm program is the family-size farm. Agriculture cannot be run like big business.

The Committee for Economic Development farm plan is very much like the program of the late 1920's which led to the big depression day of the early 1930's.

AMENDING WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7283) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ENROLLMENT OF ATHLETES BY THE SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from my personal friend and outstanding director of athletics, Mr. Frank Carver, of the University of Pittsburgh. I agree with Mr. Carver that it would be doing this country a great disservice if the academies were not permitted to pay special attention to enrolling fine athletes—as long as these men met the other criteria.

I am inserting the letter at this point:

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 27, 1962.

Hon. FRANK M. CLARK,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I noticed in the Post Gazette this morning that the Army—and the other service academies—are under fire for their football recruiting. May I say that I hope that this is not too serious a problem. We are in competition with all three of these institutions for players and I only wish all colleges and universities conducted this phase of the game as honestly as the service academies.

We know that they contact only the academically qualified students who have strong recommendations from the guidance counsellors in the various high schools, and the students sought are given to understand that they will not have any easier life by virtue of being an athlete.

I think it would be doing this country a great disservice if the academies were not permitted to pay special attention to enrolling fine athletes—as long as these men met the other criteria.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK CARVER,
Director of Athletics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 14, I addressed the House and requested leave to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an excellent speech analyzing the problems involving legislation in the maritime labor field, presented at the recent annual convention of the Federal Bar Association.

It appears that the speech was estimated to exceed, by approximately one-half page, two pages in the RECORD, and that its insertion would cost about $225. Accordingly, my prefatory remarks and the text of the speech were returned to me.

I feel that the speech is of such significance, not only to the maritime industry, but to all of our transportation systems, that notwithstanding the estimated cost, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks and the accompanying speech by Mr. Warner W. Gardner on the subject of "Maritime Labor Legislation," in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

MARITIME LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, during the past year vital elements of our national economy and security have been plagued by a series of crises in labor-management relations. This has been particularly true in the transportation systems, where shipping, railroads, airplanes, and trucking have all been involved. Strikes have threatened to crip-

ple and delay our space program. As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have been particularly disturbed by the deficiencies in collective bargaining processes in the maritime industry.

As I have said on several occasions, an intolerable situation exists. I have urged intensified efforts on the part of cognizant executive departments to find solutions. I have introduced legislation with the hope that its consideration might lead the way to realistic answers.

The problems are complex and I freely confess that I do not know the answer.

Very recently, at the Federal Bar Association's annual convention held at the Statler Hotel on September 6, the maritime and admiralty law committee of the association presented a splendid panel discussion on the subject of "Maritime Labor Legislation." This timely and provocative subject had been selected for discussion by the chairman of that committee, John N. Thurman, who is also vice president of the Pacific American Steamship Association. Thoughtful and objective papers were presented by Mr. Lawrence Jones, General Counsel of the Federal Maritime Administration; Mr. Joseph P. Goldberg, maritime labor expert for the Department of Labor; Edward D. Friedman, counsel of the Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and Mr. Warner Gardner, member of the law firm of Shea & Gardner, Washington, D.C., and an able and distinguished lawyer with broad background in maritime problems.

Mr. Gardner's remarks were particularly comprehensive and searching as he analyzed the background of maritime labor strife, pending legislation, and possible solutions to relationships which have reached a stage which has been characterized as "insoluble."

The issues involved in Mr. Gardner's excellent presentation are not limited to the maritime industry and I strongly commend his remarks for thoughtful consideration by all who are concerned with modernizing and making more effective the necessary machinery for fair collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the text of Mr. Gardner's discussion in the RECORD at this point:

MARITIME LABOR LEGISLATION

(By Warner W. Gardner)

I am not sure that I have a valid claim to speak. Possibly, indeed, none of us has. I at least have never participated in maritime collective bargaining, and without that richly educational experience I rather doubt that any discussion of maritime labor legislation can be more than a theoretical speculation. That, however, is a point which I shall probably be pressing upon Mr. Jones on another occasion, and it would be inappropriate to dwell upon it here.

It is probably unnecessary to state that my discussion today is my own, and may not at all reflect the views of the steamship men for whom I have worked, and certainly not of those for whom I have not.

A. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I don't believe that the recurrent crises in maritime labor relations can be understood without a quick backward glance at their history. The men are different; today's generation of seamen have in the large not known the conditions of 30 years ago, while the ship operators of the first part of the century have long since gone. Nevertheless the traditions of the sea outlive the men and the circumstances which formed them. I should expect that the difficulties of the present labor relations can in part be traced to resentments which have not faded away as rapidly as their causes.

At the turn of the century the seaman's life was close to indescribable. The wage was $20 or $25 a month; the hours were 12–14 a day, 7 days a week, without overtime pay. The quarters were simply bunks in the forecastle, with a table for those who could eat the food. Recruiting was largely accomplished by crimping, by which the boardinghouse keepers controlled the hiring and kept the kickback. The laws of desertion and mutiny insured against protest once the articles were signed.

Working conditions improved rapidly during the shipping prosperity of World War I. But the unions lost a disastrous strike in 1921 and were for most practical purposes eliminated; working conditions returned almost to the prewar level.

But the pendulum swings rapidly in this industry. After the NIRA, the Wagner Act and some bitter and successful organizational strikes, the unions were recognized on all coasts. Their victory was sealed by the prosperity of shipping, and the consequent demand for seamen, in the prewar and postwar period.

Today one need only glance at the conditions of employment to see who is up and who is down. The west coast seaman has a base rate of about $475 a month; overtime, for all hours over 8, and penalty pay will bring this up to about $650; and vacation and other fringe benefits make the total about $750 a month. Two men in an air-conditioned cabin are typical quarters on new vessels. A steward makes their bed and tidies up. Union hiring halls and rotation of employment are invariable. Manning scales exceed those of any other nation, and indeed those of the east coast. The seamen's earnings place them at or near the top of American labor, and at a level 3 to 6 times that of the foreign seamen aboard the competing vessels.

I am not here today to say whether this is on balance good or bad. It is obviously good that seamen be well paid. It is obviously bad if they are so well paid as to drive the American ships from the seas. At the present it seems likely that there would be no American vessels in foreign trade if it were not for the subsidy program and the cargo preference laws. Even with complete protection against foreign competition, the intercoastal and coastwise trades have shrunk close to the vanishing point. So far as I know, however, the inquiry as to whether the unions are pricing themselves out of work has invariably been answered according as the answer comes from the labor or the management side of the table. So it will probably always be.

B. THE BARGAINING ORGANIZATION

My concern today is not with the ultimate results of maritime collective bargaining, but rather with its processes; with what happens when it doesn't work.

There are, unfortunately, a number of built-in reasons why maritime collective bargaining won't work, or at least won't work very well. Probably the most fundamental of these reasons is the disorganized state of the industry, chiefly on the labor side.

The union organization goes something like this: On the east coast and gulf, there are two rival organizations of the unlicensed personnel. One, the National Maritime Union, covers all departments. The other, the Seafarers International Union—Atlantic has three constituent unions: the seamen, the firemen, and the cooks and stewards. The Seafarers International Union—Pacific has formal connection with but complete practical independence of Seafarers International Union—Atlantic. Its three constituents, Sailors Union of the Pacific, the firemen, and the cooks and stewards, negotiate together but through their respective officers rather than with a common voice.

The licensed unions are almost as diverse. The masters, mates, and pilots, and the marine engineers are nationwide organizations, which negotiate separate contracts on the east and on the west coasts. The radio operators have two unions. The American Radio Association operates on both coasts, while on the east coast the Radio Officers Union also operates.

Before a single ship can sail, the operator must have reached an agreement with either four unions or with six. Some operators, owing to different sources of their vessels, have contracts both with the NMU and ISU unions, and with both radio unions; they must agree with eight unions and face also the jurisdictional conflicts which arise when new vessels are added to the fleet.

A diversity of union organization tends, I believe, to magnify the coercive power of the stronger party. If the unions are weak enough, the employers can force upon all the terms agreed by the weakest. If, as in the maritime field, the unions are strong, the employer is almost inevitably caught in the whipsaw. Any demand won by one union becomes a fait accompli in subsequent negotiations with other unions. "Catchup" demands between west and east coast agreements acquire an added momentum when the several unions dispute as to who needs to catch up with whom. The union leader who fails to "catch up" may well fear the next election; the one who jumps the farthest ahead has laid a solid foundation for entrenching his leadership and extending his influence.

This basic problem is not soluble by any form of legislation. Nor do I see any reason to hope that the contending unions will of their own initiative merge into one. It is a problem which will, I expect, be with us for a good many years to come.

C. THE IMMATURITY OF MARITIME BARGAINING

Seven of the nineteen Taft-Hartley injunctions have been in the maritime field; two were required in the past year. The west coast lines have had three strikes within a year, 20 days in June 1961, shared with the east coast, and 12 days in October and 27 days in the spring of 1962 all to themselves. About another 3 months of the year consisted of operations conducted under the incomplete protection of a Taft-Hartley injunction. The lines have had to shoulder not only the loss of revenue and the cost of layup, while their foreign or east coast competitors moved the cargo, but have incurred also a long-term loss of confidence by their shippers. The ship operator, it must be remembered, is in direct day-to-day competition in the same trades with foreign competitors. Subsidy goes part of the way to make competition possible with ships sailing at a quarter of the wage cost. But subsidy will not in any way offset the shipper's reluctance to entrust his cargo to a ship which may not be able to deliver it.

The unions have now developed the practice of refusing to off-load cargo which arrives during a strike This is strike action against the customers, not the operators. They are customers the unions as well as the operators need. Hereafter, the mere threat of a strike is sufficient to dry up all inbound cargo on an American-flag ship, at least if manned with west coast crews. The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit last May managed to displease both the employers and the unions by ruling that a Taft-Hartley injunction would not be extended to protect the discharge of cargo on ships arriving after the 80 days, but that the union

members would have to sign the regular articles placing them under at least a legal obligation, possibly unenforceable, to discharge the cargo. Both sides filed petitions with the Supreme Court which, however, followed the Government's position and declined review.[1] In result, even though the last strike was settled within the 80 days, the ship operators lost several millions of dollars of revenue on their inbound voyages because of the fear that the ships would arrive during a strike.

The lines have been faced with union demands which seem, at least to me, to be increasingly irresponsible. Some recent examples, each a prime cause of one of the recent strikes, are: (a) The Masters, Mates & Pilots in October demanded rotational hiring for mates, and are talking of such a demand for masters; this would mean that the *President Cleveland,* for example, would put to sea with 1,000 passengers and crew under the sole command of the man with a master's license who had been longest on the beach; (b) the west coast SIU unions, under the leadership of the firemen, this spring demanded pay increases very substantially in excess of those bargained out with every other maritime union. That strike, incidentally, had a novel harbinger. Sailing of the *President Wilson,* with a full passenger list, 2 days before the general strike began, was forbidden by the union; (c) all American-flag lines a year ago were struck in part because some, chiefly the tankers, used flag-of-convenience vessels.

These disputes have been settled without new or drastic legislation. The two that produced a Taft-Hartley injunction were settled within the 80 days. But the settlements have been achieved only at enormous costs—in steamship losses, in loss of shipper confidence, and in lost wages. Another year like the last could well solve the west coast labor problem in the most thorough-going fashion, by eliminating the ships.

We talk of automation as solving the high wage costs which make American-flag ships noncompetitive. This, in the present state of labor relations, seems to me dreaming. The west coast operators can't get men off the ships who are now unnecessary; if they are needed, every other freighter in the world is unsafe because of 2–6 men short.

I don't believe that even the labor men would say that there is a mature responsibility on the part of the seagoing unions, nor that the labor-management relations in that industry have the stability which is customary ashore.

Some sort of last-ditch protection seems to me necessary if the American merchant marine, despite its importance and despite the magnitude of the Government's support, is not some day rather soon to be sunk in the turbulence of its labor relations.

D. THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

There has during the present session of Congress been more interest than usual in finding a legislative solution. This has arisen both from the succession of maritime strikes and from the pilot-flight engineer controversy which has kept the airlines in ferment.

The first area in which to look for a solution is, of course, the Railway Labor Act. That act, jointly drafted by railway labor and management, worked rather well from 1926 to the war. It has, however, become increasingly ineffective as to major disputes and its grievance machinery is probably too cumbersome. I believe it has not been even partially satisfactory in the air industry.

Basically, the Railway Labor Act calls for (a) compulsory arbitration of grievances and minor disputes, ultimately before jointly manned adjustment boards, and (b) mediation of major disputes, to be followed if unsuccessful and if arbitration is refused, by a 90-day period during which a Presidential emergency board holds hearings and makes recommendations. Donald Richberg, counsel for the unions, and the chief draftsman of the act, told the Congress that (a) he expected voluntary recourse to arbitration in almost every case, and that (b) it would be extremely difficult for either side to flout public opinion by refusing an emergency board recommendation.[2] In fact, at least postwar, arbitration has been rare and the emergency board recommendations have usually served simply as a floor for further negotiations.

Congressman BONNER, on April 18, introduced H.R. 11450, which was an amendment of the Railway Labor Act to cover common carriers by water on the high seas and Great Lakes. I believe, however, that the Railway Labor Act approach has permanently been buried by the thoughtful comments of the Secretary of Commerce in his June 15, 1962, report to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as to possible solution of the maritime labor problem. He pointed out that the Railway Labor Act (1) was the result of joint agreement, with each side responsible for its success; (2) the railroad labor relations were matured and stable; (3) the splintering of maritime collective bargaining would not be remedied; (4) the grievance procedures of the act were less satisfactory than those voluntarily provided under the maritime contracts; and (5) the National Mediation Board has no maritime experience.

E. THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Secretary of Commerce in his report urged adoption of the course proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. This Committee, composed of leading members of management and of labor, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor and the vice-chairmanship of the Secretary of Commerce, on May 1, 1962, submitted a largely unanimous report recommending in essence free collective bargaining, without enforced solution of any labor dispute. In order to deal with the national-emergency disputes which did not solve themselves, the Committee recommended only (a) convening an Emergency Disputes Board which would, upon authorization of the President, have power to make recommendations for settling the dispute, and (b) a direct order of the President, instead of a court injunction, to forbid strikes during an 80-day period.

Draft bills incorporating these provisions, though forecast by Government officials, have not yet reached the Congress (or else have done so when my back was turned).

I consider myself as much attached as the committee members to American ideals, to the virtues of freedom, and to developing a sturdy and mature bargaining responsibility by all parties.

I don't, however, believe that such an act would provide the solution for the maritime industry. There is not in that field a single, broad-based union, feeling a lively responsibility for the future of the industry. There is instead a diversity of unions, with leaders apparently feeling chiefly a lively need to stay a jump ahead of their colleagues or competitors. I am inclined to doubt that emergency board recommendations would be followed.

If the choice were between this approach and none, this approach seems to me obviously desirable. If the choice were wider, I should think the more effective avenues opened by three other current bills would be preferable.

F. COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT

1. Senator BUTLER on July 6 introduced S. 3511. This bill is directed specifically to the off-shore maritime industry, and is confined moreover to the carriers and their employees who bargain in a group including subsidized lines. It is intended to provide a flexible series of powers by which the Government officials can, if at several successive forks of the road they so choose, force settlement of the otherwise insoluble maritime labor dispute in which the Government has so heavy a stake.

The procedures could be invoked only by a party who has offered and has been refused arbitration of the dispute. The Secretary of Commerce could in his discretion dismiss the matter at the outset. Otherwise, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, he may order the dispute either to factfinding or directly to arbitration. If factfinding is chosen, the Secretary of Labor would appoint an officer of maritime inquiry who would report in 20 days. The proceeding could then either be dismissed at that stage or be referred to a national maritime arbitration board of three disinterested persons appointed by the Secretary of Labor. After hearing, it would enter its award. It is not, however, legally enforcible except by injunction sought under direction of the President. He can, if he chooses, request a normal Taft-Hartley injunction for the life of the arbitration proceedings. Upon separate determination by the President, and separate action by the Court, it can be extended for a year, with the conditions of employment those fixed by the arbitration award.

2. S. 3442, introduced by Senator MORSE on June 19, would apply to all industry. It authorizes the President, in an insoluble dispute affecting the national health, safety or security, to appoint an emergency board. It shall, after hearings, submit its findings to the President and also, if so requested, its recommendations. On its receipt the President can propose to the Congress that he either reconvene the board with authority to issue an order or seize the business concerned for a maximum of 90 days. Either House of Congress can by resolution within 10 days veto the proposal. Strikes in violation of the board's orders can be enjoined.

3. Finally there is S. 3540, introduced by Senator MONRONEY on July 12. It is directed specifically to the air industry, and in essence authorizes jurisdictional disputes to be submitted by the President to a jurisdictional disputes board appointed by him for final settlement. It shall, after hearing, issue a final order, reviewable by a Court of Appeals, and enforceable in court, including an injunction.

These bills have one element in common—a compulsory settlement of the otherwise insoluble labor dispute. The Monroney bill offers no alternative solution; the Morse bill offers two; the Butler bill offers several. But each in the end comes down to providing Government compulsion as a solution of the insoluble labor dispute.

G. THE MERITS OF COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

I want to make three not entirely consistent points about the theory and practice of compulsory arbitration.

1. The semantic obstacle: In the first place I do not believe we should stop analysis at the threshold of the problem by saying that compulsory arbitration contradicts the American way of life, is inconsistent with a free man's rights, or is a threat to the American home and motherhood.

I seem in that respect to speak for the minority. Both the chamber of commerce and the AFL–CIO could readily agree upon both the substance and the wording of a declaration that compulsory arbitration is evil.

I am told, for example, that organized labor will oppose compulsory arbitration even when to its advantage. The underpaid hospital workers in New York are unable, so

[1] *Seafarers International Union* v. *United States,* 304 F. 2d 437 (C.A. 9), cert. den. 370 U.S. 924.

[2] Hearings on H.R. 7180, 69th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 18–19, 103.

strong is the natural force of public opinion, to strike. I understand that they gladly agreed to a proposed law for compulsory arbitration, which has however encountered the vigorous opposition of the general labor movement.

Yet American labor and management are alike thoroughly committed to arbitration of their disputes. A great many contracts call for compulsory arbitration of all disputes arising under or during the life of the contract. A great many major contract disputes are settled by an agreement to put the issues to arbitration. It is then a fairly standard practice to have compulsory arbitration of minor disputes and voluntary arbitration of major disputes. It does not seem too far a leap to have compulsory arbitration of an occasional major dispute.

There is, it is true, a considerable difference between Government enforcement of a contract and Government compulsion not agreed in advance. But that difference does not by any means rise to the point that it is a dividing line between freedom and slave labor.

The Government has in wartime controlled wages. It has, indeed, drafted workers and owners alike to die in battle. The Government tax laws, unemployment benefits, old age plans, manning requirements and safety regulations are in the aggregate about as important an element of the maritime labor contract as those bargained out by the parties. Once the articles are signed the laws of mutiny and desertion require completion of the voyage. The Government can for appropriate purposes seize the workers' home or the employers' ships. I can see nothing in the American tradition which makes abhorrent an occasional and last-ditch arbitration of an insoluble dispute heavily affecting the public interest.

2. Practical experience: It yet remains true that the countries which have experimented with general systems of compulsory arbitration seem to have had a mixed experience. My very superficial examination indicates:

Australia has had a system of compulsory arbitration, with binding awards on wages and conditions, since 1904. While there has been some dissatisfaction with its operation, on the ground that collective bargaining tends to give way to extensive litigation, the fact remains that it has been in operation for over half a century. The New Zealand experience goes back a decade longer; while it is based upon voluntary entry into the system, that entry seems to be the rule rather than the exception.

The European experience, judging by the short life of the experiments which have been made, points in the other direction. For the chief examples: Denmark enacted a compulsory arbitration law in 1936 and repealed it in 1937. Great Britain has used compulsory arbitration during both world wars, with the last experience continuing for 5 years thereafter, but has found both management and labor opposed. Sweden in 1923 abandoned its 1903 requirements that disputes in the railroad industry over the terms of new contracts be arbitrated.

A sound conclusion would require a more careful study, but I at least am persuaded that any general system for compulsory arbitration would be of doubtful value in actual practice.

3. Last-resort compulsion: A fair resolution of these contradictions seems to me to be found in the Butler bill.

(a) We start from the premise that we are dealing with an industry whose survival, and whose continued operation, is of imperative national interest. If, as I believe to be the case, the choice may some day be between the possibility of compulsory arbitration and continuance of the merchant marine, the choice would, I believe, be clear to all who accept the necessity of choice.

(b) The coverage of the Butler bill is very narrow; it includes only the offshore maritime disputes involving subsidized lines and does not push the experiment into fields where relief is not necessary.

(c) There ought not, even in a narrow field, be established a system by which the parties know that failure to agree will result in arbitration of the dispute. Each would prefer to hold out in the hope of a favorable arbitration award rather than to yield his point in negotiation. Compulsory arbitration must be only a possibility, and preferably a rather remote one, if collective bargaining is to have its necessary pressures toward agreement.

(d) Finally, the Butler bill recognizes that subsidy is in itself a course of labor instability. Unions tend to overreach, and the operators either to give in too quickly or, for fear of criticism, to be unduly adamant when the Government pays 75 percent of the wage cost. As subsidy is necessary if there is to be a merchant marine, so it seems right that the Government should prevent a breakdown of bargaining partially caused by that subsidy.

When many unions are competing for leadership of the men who go to sea, and when any one of them has the economic strength to impose its will, there is a premium on overreaching demands. If the shipowners yield successively to one demand and then to another, the country's oceangoing merchant marine may be expected before too long to join, as a colorful chapter of our history, the New England whalers and the Mississippi River packets. It is not good enough—whether for the sailors whose lives have been spent at sea, or for the investors who have committed their fortunes, or for the Government which has invested so heavily—that insoluble labor disputes should be allowed to run a fatal course without provision for their last-resort solution.

TRADE EXPANSION LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, although the Kennedy trade expansion bill has been approved by the House and Senate, two events have taken place which to my mind deserve some comment and consideration.

The first is the difficulty Great Britain has experienced in being accepted as a member of the Common Market. The discussion of reasons for delaying the British application has particular interest for the American farmer, since it is in the realm of agriculture that difficulty arises in finding a common ground of agreement.

The more one reads the press accounts of Common Market negotiations and the objections of the British dominions to England's accession to membership, the more one becomes impressed with the fact that the grand purpose of the Common Market is self-sufficiency—at least as to agricultural products. If England is admitted as a member of the market but the British farm producing Dominions are left out, we can easily imagine the difficulty the American farmer will encounter in trying to penetrate the tariff wall around the European Economic Community. British influence would certainly not permit any concessions to the United States which would hurt Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

On the other hand, if these Commonwealths are allowed to enter with England and be permitted to ship grain into Europe without any tariff restrictions—the United States foreign agricultural market is doomed. Nowhere in the trade bill would there be sufficient negotiating authority to compensate for the millions of tons of farm products these British countries could dump into the Common Market duty free. The American farmer would be caught with no protection and in addition would find himself taxed to pay for the cost of compensation and adjustment for other workers and industries injured by imported products. Since the Treaty of Rome was signed nothing has so clearly demonstrated the protectionist attitude of the six countries who signed it as has the current negotiations in regard to England's membership. As a harbinger of things to come these negotiations should settle once and for all the notion that our workers and farmers and industries have anything to gain under the terms of this so-called trade expansion bill with its provisions for removing protection and compensating the injured.

If the complications connected with the admission of Great Britain leave any doubts about the protectionist policies of the Common Market, then the following article from Paris by Gaston Coblentz should lay them to rest:

FEATHERS FLY AS TARIFF ON BROILERS RISES—AMERICAN CHICKEN EXPORTERS ARE JOLTED BY COMMON MARKET

(By Gaston Coblentz)

PARIS.—The largest single foreign market for American frozen chickens—$35 million annual business with West Germany—is at the mercy of the European Common Market commission at Brussels.

It has become a matter of high-level diplomacy. It was considered important enough for U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk to have discussed it with West German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder at Geneva recently along with such topics as the Berlin crisis.

Rusk's move followed reported pleas to the White House by the Governors of Maryland, Delaware, Georgia, and Mississippi to prevent the Common Market's high tariffs from raising havoc with the annual 63,000 tons of American ready-to-cook broiler sales to West Germany.

The next step in the sequence has been a recommendation by the West German Government to Common Market headquarters to take it easy on the American "poulets" by making use of an escape clause hidden in the Common Market treaty.

This means that the fate of the frozen chickens has passed into the hands of the Common Market's semiautonomous commission at Brussels. Bonn's formal recommendation was said by well-informed quarters to be in the process of being forwarded. Prophesies varied as to what the results will be.

The Common Market's agricultural policy responsible for this situation was agreed upon earlier this year and went into effect this week. It will raise the price of imported poultry in West Germany, thus dealing a blow to American sales.

Feathers are flying as French "poulet" interests and their opposite numbers across the Rhine, the German "Gefluegel" farmers,

angrily are protesting against any Common Market concession to the U.S. broilers.

It all adds up to the fact that we are dedicated to the task of lowering trade barriers at the expense, not only of the American worker and businessman but also the taxpayer, while the Common Market has dignified the term "protection" and goes merrily on its way of raising tariff walls. And now the administration proposes that the American farmer be added to the casualty list. It seems to me we should be working for our farmers, workers, and industries instead of against them. It is plain that the Common Market is definitely protectionist and it is time we come down to earth and develop a course of action predicated on the cold realities of the marketplace.

The second incident which provokes comment is the President's Fourth of July speech on the Atlantic union and interdependence. With that it becomes apparent that the trade expansion bill is one of the vehicles to be used for the purpose of violating sovereignty and promoting interdependence. Going back a few months, one can find ample evidence that the administration trade proposal is not only a trade bill but a political bill.

One of the original purposes recited in H.R. 9900 was to strengthen economic and political relations with the European community and foreign countries. On March 14, 1962, Roswell Gilpatric, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, testified before the Ways and Means Committee that—

> Together, as full partners, we can battle for economic and political progress in a fragmentary world.

On April 25, 1962, at Toledo, Ohio, a representative of the Department of State said:

> Our real aim in aiding the Common Market is to achieve European political unity.

This remark was made at a State Department regional briefing conference on the subject of the Kennedy trade program and the U.S. relationship to the European Common Market.

It is rather amazing that the State Department should be saying that the purpose of the trade bill is to aid the Common Market. I thought we were told it was to aid our own industry and our American workers.

On March 30, 1962, Time magazine reported that the State Department wanted its representative to be the lead-off witness in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. Only after intervention by the White House was this procedure abandoned and the Secretary of Commerce given the honors.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from these episodes is that the course of the proposed trade expansion legislation is being directed by the State Department with the aim not so much of helping our own economy but of "achieving political unity" among the Common Market countries. It also is important to note that the Ways and Means Committee was careful to strike the word "political" from the purpose clause in H.R. 9900, and the Department of Commerce has been designated as the administrative agent in H.R. 11970. But this change of words cannot eliminate the original intentions. Clever cliches like "trade or fade" cannot obscure the plain fact that the historic concept of regulating trade to help American business has given way to the proposition that American business must be used to help the political progress of the Common Market and the underdeveloped countries.

Aside from these two observations, another example of Common Market protectionism is the creation within it of giant industrial mergers, obviously aimed at the self-sufficiency of its economy. The advocates of the trade bill pointed out to the Ways and Means Committee that the European Economic Community is committed to the elimination of cartels. Much is made of article 85 of the Rome Treaty on this score. But a careful reading of this article reveals that while cartels are prohibited in one section, they are permitted by a following section if the cartel improves production or distribution. An article in the Washington Star of June 22 will shatter anyone's illusions that cartels are doomed in the Common Market. Under a Dusseldorf dateline, the article begins as follows:

EUROPEAN FIRMS STUDY MERGERS TO WIN TRADE

(By Norman Lindhurst)

DUESSELDORF.—The real threat posed by the European Common Market may prove to be an even stronger economic weapon than the erection of a common tariff wall. That is the series of mergers, currently being engineered by Common Market companies, to form giant production units aimed at wresting world markets from American and other outside competitors.

Common Market-based production units are now taking shape which eventually will rival in size and financial resources General Motors and United States Steel in America; Mitsui and Mitsubishi, industrial combines in Japan, and the Wallenberg interests in Sweden.

Mergers of Common Market automakers are in the offing—Fiat and Citroen, for example. And chemical colossi, such as Imperial Chemical Industries and Bayer, have focused on fusion as the most promising avenue to the competitive conquest of Du Pont.

But the real shape of things to come is foreshadowed in the current paroxysm of mergers that are recasting Ruhr steel and easing the way for a fusion of Common Market steel producers.

STEEL MERGER PLANNED

The European Coal and Steel Community has authorized three mergers by German Steel companies:

August Thyssen-Suette (ATH) is acquiring control of Handelsunion AG; ATH, in a second merger, is purchasing a 50-percent holding in Stahlund Walzwerke Rasselstein Andernach AG; and Dortmund-Hoerder Huettenunion AG is taking over Establech Gesellschaft fuer Eisen-Stahl-und Blecherzeugnisse MbH.

Even more significant is the new type of Ruhr steel merger requiring no special legal sanction—the "mutual capacity exchange."

The pilot agreement for this form of indirect merger is between Hoesch and Dortmund-Hoerder Huettenunion. These two companies have agreed to make idle plant capacity mutually available, and to coordinate their investment policies.

POOLING OF PRODUCTION

In effect, the agreement represents a pooling of production capacity. Dortmund-Hoerder is using Hoesch's broad strip mill and Hoesch, in turn, gets reciprocal use of Dortmund-Hoerder's blooming mill capacity. Finally, Dortmund-Hoerder gets access to Hoesch's sintering plant for iron ore dressing, and Hoesch will use Dortmund-Hoerder's soaking pits.

Ruhr steel is now engineering linkups with French and Belgian steel producers too. And if Britain enters the Common Market, as is assumed in the Ruhr for planning purposes, Ruhr steel is prepared to negotiate linkups with British producers.

This is not to say that agreements are in the making for a cartel sliceup of the Common Market among a few producers in each field. But the mergers clearly signal a contraction in producers and a magnifying of competition among a few giant firms.

This is illustrated in the automotive field where negotiations are in progress for a fusion of Fiat and Citroen. Mercedes-Benz is talking merger with Peugeot. And Renault and Volkswagen, both largely State-owned, would like to pool production and sales facilities, particularly with the aim of strengthening their penetration of the North American market.

The auto-makers illustrate still another aspect of the competitive struggle taking shape. In some cases, the Common Market mergers are dictated as much by protective as aggressive market considerations.

European auto-makers fear the merger of American General Motors with its subsidiaries in Britain and West Germany. They also fear a similar Ford merger. For such steps would threaten to deliver the Common Market auto industry to the American "Big Two."

The Common Market merger moves are aimed at deflecting the competition of such foreign colossi outside the market.

With each new step and counterstep, the gyrations add up to an economic dance that makes the twist seem decorous as a minuet.

Mr. Speaker, American foreign economic policy should be directed to the strengthening of the position of our Nation's free enterprise system in international trade. Our foreign economic policy should not become confused with uncertain or vague goals of political unity or interdependence that may be labeled as desirable by some State Department planner. America's foreign trade program should promote jobs and opportunities for Americans; we should not shortsightedly sacrifice our economic strength in pursuit of a program that in its conception suggests that our negotiators will not be primarily motivated by seeking to achieve maximum economic benefits for American producers.

Mr. Speaker, are we about to embark on another program threatening injury to American industry through increased imports with little hope of achieving expanded export opportunities for our goods and services? I am afraid the answer is in the affirmative in the light of the comments and press reports I have submitted to the House membership today.

I am convinced the Congress should not delegate sweeping tariff-cutting authority to the Executive for the unprecedented period of 5 years. If a delegation of authority is to be made, it should be for a shorter period in order to assure a more timely congressional review of the exercise of the authority.

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once in a while something is said that bears repeating. I feel that the address of Mr. H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co., delivered in 1945, is such a worthy presentation. I have consistently advocated the thesis that the basic issue of our decade is whether or not the individual will maintain his freedom or surrender it to a paternalistic government.

Mr. Prentis eloquently presented the problem in its proper perspective and I am inserting his address at this point in the RECORD:

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

(By H. W. Prentis, Jr.)

Some years ago I heard a minister in the Deep South deliver a sermon based on a verse found in the first epistle of Peter, the fifth chapter: "The devil is a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." His opening sentences were to the effect that his text would be developed under three heads: "First, who the debil am he? Second, what de debil am he lookin' for? And, third, where de debil am he goin'?" Regardless of its logic, this outline did have the virtue of indicating the speaker's general intentions fairly accurately. Perhaps in talking to you today about the price of freedom I should do likewise. So you will find my text in paragraph XV of the Bill of Rights proclaimed by the Virginia Assembly in June 1776, about 3 weeks before the momentous Declaration from Independence Hall on the 4th of July of that same year. That paragraph reads: "No free government or the blessing of liberty can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles." I have selected it because it states in succinct and lucid fashion what our American forefathers considered the price that any nation must pay for liberty.

What then are those "fundamental principles"? From what sources do they stem? What historic grounds do we have for confidence in their validity? The pragmatic philosophy that has pervaded so much of America's thinking in the past 40 years denies that there are any eternal verities; refuses to concede that there are any principles of truth and morality and social conduct that are permanent and lasting. Everything is relative; nothing is absolute. Our so-called progressive education directly reflects that type of reasoning and now it has invaded the realm of law and justice, where sociological jurisprudence is ascribing new and strange meanings to the plainly written provisions of our Federal Constitution.

LIBERTY MUST BE BOUGHT AND REBOUGHT

However, there are still some old-fashioned people in the world like myself, who believe that certain things will be as true a thousand years from now as they are today. Common honesty will still be common honesty. A truthful balance sheet will still be a truthful balance sheet. A steel girder of a given size and composition will still be safe to carry only a certain maximum load. Oil and water will still refuse to form a chemical mixture. And generations hence, man will still find that he does not live by bread alone, which conviction will lead him to assert again and again his possession of those divine, inalienable rights that distinguish him from brute creation. So while the mechanics of government may and will change, the principles on which men may associate themselves permanently to enjoy the blessings of liberty are firm and immutable. The price of freedom is fixed. And liberty must be bought and rebought at the same price by every generation for itself.

Obviously, in addition to practicing justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, we must also know what those fundamental principles are if we are to recur to them frequently—as the Virginia Bill of Rights says we must. Yet how many American business and professional men have even a casual acquaintance with those principles? How many members of this assembly—far above the level of the average American audience in education and intelligence—could appear this afternoon before their employees or on a radio forum with Earl Browder or Norman Thomas or Henry Wallace and make even a sketchy explanation and defense of the foundations on which the American Republic rests?

And yet is it not obvious that without such knowledge widely dispersed among our people, the preservation of our system of popular self-government is simply impossible? We have all been very smug and complacent. We have taken our freedom for granted. We have washed our hands of so-called dirty politics. We have buried our heads in the sand while a vocal minority in our midst have been steadily undermining the foundations of our freedom for half a century. "The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small" and we have permitted the mills of the collectivists—operated in the majority of cases by kindhearted but shortsighted men and women—to befuddle the thinking, arouse the covetousness, and destroy the faith and self-confidence of great groups of our people who now turn to that mythical being, the Government, to solve their economic difficulties.

Yet I am not without hope. The fact that you are here to listen to a talk of this nature; the fact that more Americans today are examining the foundations of their liberty than at any period since the Civil War; the fact that more books are now being written about the American system than have been for a generation; the fact that so many businessmen are planning now to provide greater stability for our economic system in the post-war years—all indicate that the thinking people of America are coming alive to the seriousness of the situation that confronts us and are again girdling themselves to pay the price of freedom—no matter what that price may be in personal effort and sacrifice, and in persecution and smearing by those who do not hesitate to apply personal vilification to anyone who has the courage to stand for sound American principles.

FREEDOM IS INTELLIGENT BEHAVIOR

The roots of American liberty are sunk deep in philosophic and religious soil. They go down to those far-off days in Palestine 1100 years before Christ when the Prophet Samuel warned the Hebrew people what they would suffer in loss of personal dignity and independence if they insisted on having an earthly king; to those distant generations in ancient Greece when men sought to discover the requirements for living a good life; to that great period when the freemen of ancient Rome explored the possibilities of a self-governing republic under the rule of law; and to those brief years of Christ's ministry in Judea, proclaiming the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The common philosophy on which American freedom rests holds that there is a vital relation between freedom and reason; that freedom, in other words, is intelligent behavior. Thus emphasis is placed on understanding, and on the development of reason and intelligence, and our society has been organized on the basis of a meeting of minds and of mutual respect.

Three great historic currents of thought combined to foster and develop this concept of freedom among the English-speaking peoples: First, the Nominalist philosophy in England in the 14th century; second, the British Reformation 200 years before Luther; and third, the revival of classical learning in England in the 16th century.

Neither the time nor the occasion permits an extended discussion of these three momentous movements. Suffice it to say that the English monk, William of Ockham, the founder of the Nominalistic school of philosophy, postulated the fundamental tenet of English and American liberalism—individualism—about the year 1325 when he taught at Oxford. Applying that concept to government, the English-speaking peoples have said ever since that the reality of the individual and his concrete experience in a real world must be respected.

John Wyclif placed translations of the New Testament in the hands of the common people all over England; set up conventicles where the populace got together for prayer and worship; and taught that the sacraments of the church meant nothing unless the individual who accepts them knows what he is doing and what they signify. As a result, our forefathers came to the shores of the American Continent impregnated with the principles of personal moral responsibility, the right of private judgment, and the right of free assembly which, together, filled them with a fervent passion and unshakable belief in the inward spirituality of the individual soul.

THE TRIPOD OF FREEDOM

With this principle as the foundation, they erected the tripod on which our individual freedom in America rests today. First they maintained that if man did possesss a sacred personality, he had the right to choose who should rule over him. On that thesis they reared the first supporting tower of our edifice of liberty—representative constitutional democracy. Again they argued that since man possessed a sacred personality, he had the right to think, speak, assemble, and worship as he saw fit. On that concept they erected the second tower of the structure of American liberty—civil and religious freedom. And finally they reasoned that any man endowed with a sacred personality had the right to possess for himself such portion of the God-given resources of the earth as he could win by honest toil and effort. Thus they asserted every individual's right to private property and economic activity of his own choice, and on that basic tenet they built the third supporting tower of their temple of liberty—private competitive business. These three towers stand or fall together. Destroy any one of them, and the whole structure of freedom soon collapses.

To our forefathers tyranny was not merely a seven-letter word. They knew what tyranny meant literally in terms of religious, intellectual, economic and political oppression. They dreamed of a land where every man—no matter how humble—could have liberty and the opportunity to pursue happiness in his own personal way, so long as he did not interfere with the rights of others. Hence they resolved to set up a form of government that would prevent tyranny from ever raising its ugly head again. They gave us the best instruments designed to that end that the mind of man has yet devised—our Federal and State constitutions. But these constitutions are worth nothing in preserving our freedom unless they are

backed up by citizens who are willing to pay the continuing price of liberty. The cornerstone of the Republic our forefathers established was the religious concept of which I have spoken: the conviction that every human being is endowed with a soul that is sacred in the eyes of a sovereign God. From this principle, they derived the two basic theses that they employed in setting up our system of popular self-government.

First, they concluded that, since God had created man in His own image with the power to distinguish between right and wrong, every individual ought to listen with respect to the opinions expressed by his fellow citizens, and that whatever judgment was expressed by the majority of such divinely created human beings after full and free discussion, was likely to be closest to God's will for all of them. Vox populi, vox Dei—the voice of the people is the voice of God. This idea is reflected in the assertion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

GOVERNMENT'S OBJECTIVES

Their second thesis was equally logical, namely, that every mortal soul is endowed by its Creator with certain natural inalienable rights that no human agency whatever may justly invade—neither any man called king, nor any group of men representing a temporary majority called government. To guard these natural rights, government, in John Locke's words, should be confined to four objectives—the protection of life, property, peace, and freedom.

The problem of the founders of this Republic, therefore, was how to combine these two opposing principles into a workable, durable government adapted to human nature in its manifold economic, intellectual and spiritual aspects, and to a large population scattered over a big country. They discarded the idea of a pure democracy in which all decisions would be made by the current majority, because they knew historically that such governments had never lasted long. They are too susceptible to demagoguery. As Samuel Adams said: "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide." So they decided on a republic instead, that is, a constitutional representative democracy, so as to make effective the majority will of the people in governing themselves and at the same time not destroy the individual rights that the Creator had conferred upon each person.

To resolve the paradox that thus confronted them, they set up a government of laws—not a government of men. As the first step, they adopted a written Constitution with its Bill of Rights, as a permanent bulwark to safeguard individual and minority rights from hasty and ill-considered attacks by temporary majorities. Hence, they purposely made the process of amending the Constitution long and difficult. That is the reason sociological jurisprudence—stretching the Constitution to meet current demands for legislation—instead of honest forthright amendment of that document after full discussion, is so very dangerous to our freedom. As Thomas Jefferson said: "Our peculiar security is the possession of a written constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction."

In the second place, our forefathers incorporated in their system of government the principle of representative rather than direct action, with different terms of office and different modes of electing Senators and Representatives, to cushion the action of any current majority, and to enable government to function over a large geographical area.

Third, they provided a system of checks and balances by painstaking separation and coordination of the powers of the legislative, executive and judicial branches. I wish I had time to quote the provision on this point in the Constitution of Massachusetts, which was adopted in 1780 and which spells out explicity the fact that in the government of that Commonwealth no one of the three departments may ever exercise any of the powers of either of the others "to the end that it (the government of Massachusetts) may be a government of laws and not of men." As the Federalist Papers pointed out: "The accumulation of all powers—legislative, executive, and judicial—in the same hands * * * may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny." Hence the present blurring of the lines of responsibility between the three departments of the Federal Government—which had gone far even prior to the outbreak of the war—is perhaps the most sinister of all threats to our freedom in the postwar period. The tyranny of administrative law—the bureaucratic despotism from which we suffer today—would be mitigated if the lines of demarcation between the legislative, executive, and judicial functions had been kept sharp and clear.

DANGERS OF CENTRALIZED POWER

As a fourth step, the founders of our Republic divided the responsibilities of government among the Federal Union and the States, counties and towns. They did that, so that each particular segment of government would not get too big for an intelligent citizen to understand its functions and for his elected representatives to legislate intelligently. Today the Federal Government has arrogated to itself so many State and local powers, and has become so extremely huge and complicated that the average Congressman will tell you frankly that it is impossible for him even to read all of the legislation that is proposed or desired by the various Federal departments. In other words, the size of the Central Government puts such a tremendous load on Congress that our representatives are unable to function effectively to protect the rights of the people who elected them.

It is exactly as though a business corporation permitted itself to expand to a point where the directors and officers chosen by the stockholders, found themselves unable to cope with the enormous number of problems that were put up to them for decision. Centralization of power in Washington, moreover, undermines State and local government, and thus destroys the opportunity that local self-government affords for practical experience in citizenship. Unless a man first acquires some training in handling public problems in State, county, city or town, he certainly is not likely to become qualified to deal with the large questions of national scope on which his freedom ultimately depends.

Drawing from the experience of our British ancestors, the fifth step was to keep the control of the public purse in the hands of the House of Representatives—the arm of government closest to the people. Every effort at popular self-government that I have read about in history has eventually been destroyed by some demagog who got his hands on the people's own money. In recent years Congress has delegated more and more latitude in respect to public expenditures to the executive department. Hence another grave threat to our freedom is arising from what might well be termed the privy power of the public purse.

NO FIXED CLASSES

Another basic essential of a republican type of government is that there should be no fixed classes in the social structure; that every man should have the opportunity to advance and improve his economic, intellectual, and social status just as far as his innate ability, industry, and character will permit him to go. So the sixth step was to discourage the development of class feeling by inserting article I, section 9, in the Constitution which specifically prohibits the granting of any title of nobility by the Federal Government. Thus it was hoped that such divisions of political opinion as we had, would be essentially vertical rather than horizontal in character, for our forefathers knew that no form of popular self-government could long endure in the face of acute class cleavage. Hence the appearance of sharp class stratifications in recent years—such as youth groups, farm groups, labor groups, veterans' groups—is naturally a matter of deep concern to every true lover of American liberty—particularly since such class consciousness has frequently been incited for partisan political purposes.

Last but not least, the men who set up the American Republic reserved the largest possible field for local and individual initiative by strictly limiting the powers of the Central Government. In respect to business, only interstate and foreign commerce were made subject to its regulation. The tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution provides specifically that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." As the late Justice Brandeis said: "The makers of the Constitution * * * conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone, the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men." I leave it to you to say to what extent that halcyon situation still exists.

There, in a nutshell, is the mechanism by which our forefathers sought to harmonize the will of the majority with the personal rights of the individual. Jobs, opportunity, and freedom for us and succeeding generations depend on how well we safeguard that mechanism—a mechanism based on meticulous analysis of all previous attempts at self-government in the world's history; a mechanism so ingenious, so carefully organized, so accurately compensated against human vagaries and lust for power, that it led Gladstone to say that the Constitution was "the greatest instrument of government ever struck off at a given time by the hand and brain of man."

If we are willing to pay the price of freedom, we will take the advice of the Virginia Bill of Rights seriously and by frequent recurrence to these seven fundamental principles examine every new proposal of government to see whether it fits soundly into the fabric of our system. Precise definition of the terms we used in our political discussions, clear thinking based on sound understanding, willingness to take a large measure of responsibility for our own physical welfare, self-restraint, courage, along with justice, temperance, moderation, frugality, and virtue—these are the coin in which the price of freedom must be paid yesterday, today, and forever. As Somerset Maugham said: "If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that, too."

THE HISTORICAL CYCLE

Paradoxically enough, the release of initiative and enterprise made possible by popular self-government ultimately generates disintegrating forces from within. Again and again, after freedom has brought opportunity and some degree of plenty, the competent become selfish, luxury loving and complacent; the incompetent and the unfortunate grow envious and covetous; and all three groups turn aside from the hard road of freedom to worship the golden calf of economic security. The historical cycle seems to be: from bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to apathy; from apathy to dependency; and from dependency back to bondage once more.

At the stage between apathy and dependency, men always turn in fear to economic and political panaceas. New conditions, it

is claimed, require new remedies. Usually so-called new remedies are not new at all. Compulsory planned economy, for example, was tried by the Chinese some three millenniums ago, and by the Romans in the early centuries of the Christian era. It was applied in Germany, Italy, and Russia long before the present war broke out. Yet it is being vigorously advocated today as a solution of our economic problems in the United States.

For example, I noticed a few months ago in the New York Times a typical illustration of muddy thinking on this vitally important subject in a public address by Dr. Robert S. Lynd, professor of sociology at Columbia University, in which he calmly asserted: "The choice the engineer faces today and from now on is not between the use of his skills by 'free enterprise' or by the State. * * * The choice * * * is a choice between two versions of State power, two types of State control of science and technology: a monopoly business-dominated State or a democratic State which dominates and uses industry and science for the ends of mass welfare of all the people. Since the engineer is inescapably caught in this choice, up to his chin, the course of realism is for him not to pretend that he is politically neutral and to make up his mind as to which way he will seek to throw his weight."

Certainly the engineer—or any other citizen—cannot afford to take a neutral position but neither alternative that Professor Lynd offers is in accord with the fundamental principles on which the perpetuation of American freedom depends. We desire neither a "monopoly business-dominated state" nor a "democratic state which dominates industry and science." We want no state domination whatever except in the sense of state umpiring and regulation of business to insure fairplay. For state control—compulsory planning of our economic life by the state—means the ultimate destruction of our political freedom and all our hard-won civil and religious liberties. Professor Lynd, like so many other humanitarian thinkers, ignores that point completely; yet the lessons of history all point in exactly that direction.

Under compulsory national economic planning in Germany before the war was there freedom of the press? Ask any newspaperman. Was there freedom of suffrage in Italy? Ask any hardy soul who underwent the castor oil treatment at the hands of fanatical Fascists. Did the farmer preserve his freedom in Russia? Ask the kulaks. What happens to labor unions under planned economy? Ask the former labor leaders of any Axis nation. Is academic freedom permitted? Ask the intellectuals in exile. How about freedom of worship? Ask the clergy of Germany and Russia. Well, then, can we not apply compulsory planning to a part of our economy and leave the rest to private business? Stalin says no, and so does Douglas Miller in his famous book about Hitler. That is the record. "Power over a man's support is power over his will," the Federalist Papers sagely observed. Yet I venture to predict that if we ever do lose our freedom in America it will be because of public ignorance of the perils involved in outright government planning and control of our economic life. All of which again demonstrates that the price of freedom is a deep understanding of the basic principles of self-government and recognition of the fact that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

VOLUNTARY PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Of course, we want all of the voluntary planning for the future that we can possibly have on the part of labor, management, agriculture, and Government. Compulsory planning, however, is a horse of an entirely different color. As Peter Drucker says in his book, "The Future of Industrial Man": "The panacea which is being advertised today under the misleading name of 'Planning' is not a preparation for future events and contingencies. It is the abolition of all limitations on governmental power."

Russia's planned economy is being cited today by many well-intentioned Americans as possessing certain virtues that we might well emulate. For example, in an article in the New York Times last spring, Clair Wilcox, professor of economics at Swarthmore College, says: "Whatever the shortcomings of the Russian system—and there are many—it has one outstanding merit: It can unquestionably provide full employment." Of course, it can—but at what a price: the loss of every civil and religious right that we Americans hold dear—freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of religious worship, of the right to work when and where one pleases, and to choose one's own rulers. To secure so-called full employment at such cost would be the negation of every principle of freedom that the American Republic has stood for since its foundation.

And do not say that the danger of our being subjected to compulsory economic planning in the United States when peace comes, is not real. The National Resources Planning Board, headed by Mr. Roosevelt's uncle, had as one of its chief advisers, Dr. Alvin H. Hansen of Harvard University. Among other things, he is one of the outstanding proponents of the idea that the size of the public debt does not matter "since we owe it to ourselves."

In an interview some months ago, he said that under his proposed program, "Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax, keeping to itself the right only to establish broad limits within which the administration may move. Congress will appropriate huge sums; will surrender the power of directing how and when they will be spent. Other extraordinary powers such as, for instance, to effect wholesale social reforms will be delegated to the administration, which will retain most, if not all, of its present extraordinary wartime controls." Mr. Herbert Agar, one of the more vocal New Dealers, in his book, "A Time for Greatness," advocates making "the responsibilities of the Executive absolute and public. A government must have unlimited power to act and at times act fast, or it cannot survive the emergencies of our unquiet world." Yet, as Woodrow Wilson said: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

A year or so ago Congress abolished the National Resources Planning Board but a checkup will show that many of its planners are still in the service of the Government in divers capacities. Their power and influence in molding governmental policies is still potent, and there is no reason to believe they are not still working for the inauguration of compulsory economic planning in the postwar period which, as I have said, will spell the end of liberty as we have known it heretofore in America.

GUARANTEEING THE "RIGHT" TO A JOB

Take the so-called Full Employment Act of 1945 recently introduced in the Senate by Senator Murray.

Despite the lipservice this suggested legislation pays to private enterprise, the fact remains that it would result in overall governmental planning and control of the national economy. The bill proposes that the Government guarantee the "right" of every able-bodied American to a "useful and remunerative job." A national production and employment budget would be set up based on a Government estimate of the number of jobs required to assure so-called full employment in the ensuing fiscal year; the estimated dollar volume of gross national product at the expected level of prices required to produce such number of jobs; the estimated volume of investment and other expenditure by private business and Government to assure such a gross national product in the year ahead; an estimate of the actual prospective volume of such investment, with the Federal Government making up any deficiency in the required level of investment by expenditures from public funds.

The mere knowledge that the Government had any such plan in mind would tend to create the very unemployment that this job budget plan seeks to eliminate. This proposal and others of similar tenor have strong support in certain labor and social reformer circles. It would lead inevitably to some form of the very collectivism we are fighting to destroy in Germany and Italy today.

It is significant to note that with little publicity in this country, the British House of Commons and later the House of Lords recently approved a program entitled "Planned Economy of Great Britain." That's the exact title of the act and it, apparently, means exactly what it says. Debate in Parliament developed that the British program was almost identical with the New Deal program in the United States. The British plan is described in detail in a white paper entitled "Employment Policy" which has been reprinted by the Macmillan Co. of New York.

You should read it in order to get a clearer picture of the probable "shape of things to come" over here if the advocates of economic planning have their way.

The long history of man's struggle for freedom indicates that a part of the price he must pay for it is the willingness to assume a large measure of responsibility for his own physical well-being. Whenever men have endeavored to transfer their economic responsibilities to the shoulders of other fallible men calling themselves government, they have eventually reared a Frankenstein monster that has turned and devoured their political, intellectual and spiritual liberty. Plutarch's sage observation that "the real destroyer of the liberty of any people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and largesses," still holds good, along with Plato's prediction that "democracy contains no long-range force which will check the constant tendency to put more and more on the public payroll."

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY BRINGS POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

Significantly enough, freedom for the common man has seldom, if ever, resulted from the efforts of either the aristocrat or the wage earner. The entrenched privileges of aristocracy and the leveling-down demands for equality under the rule of the proletariat, have proven to be equally destructive of personal liberty. Hence such freedom as the ordinary man has enjoyed for brief periods since the dawn of history, has always emerged as a corollary of the development of a middle class composed of business and professional men and farmers. A recent lecturer at Princeton University affirms that "political democracy came to the United States as a result of economic democracy." History shows that businessmen were principally responsible for such freedom as Athens enjoyed before the age of Pericles; as Rome had before the time of Marius and Sulla; as the Republic of Florence had under the early Medici.

The merchant class, moreover, created the free cities of the Hanseatic League. And certainly in modern times, freedom for the common man has been the outstanding characteristic of the business civilization of the Netherlands, Switzerland, France, Great Britain, and the United States. The reason

for all this is obvious. A complex and expanding commercial and industrial society requires political stability of a high order to ensure the sanctity of contracts, the protection of property, and the right to labor at a vocation of one's own choice; and such stability can be secured only by having the foundations of government laid sound and deep in the hearts and minds of the people where it is presumably safe from the arbitrary whims of tyranny and dictatorship.

Hence as a part of the price of freedom, businessmen must faithfully recognize their historic mission as preservers of the precious values of human liberty. To that end they should be shining examples of civic virtue, using that word "virtue" in the exact sense in which it is employed in my text this afternoon. They must eliminate unethical practices in their own enterprises so that business can always come into the court of public opinion with clean hands; they must be keenly conscious of the social significance of their day-by-day decisions; they must be good stewards of the responsibilities with which individual freedom has entrusted them; they must constantly endeavor to create better conditions of employment by the elimination of health and accident hazards; they must steadily seek ways and means of regularizing employment and cushioning the effect of advancing technology on the lives and fortunes of their workers; they must raise the standard of living by passing along the benefits of improved technique and quantity production through lower prices and higher wages; they must take an active part in public affairs; they must seek to be industrial statesmen rather than mere businessmen.

SOCIAL STEWARDSHIP

The voluntary assumption of social stewardship is, in a very literal sense, the price of freedom. As Justice Brandeis said: "Democracy is a serious undertaking which substitutes self-restraint for external restraint." In other words, if men do not conduct themselves of their own volition with due regard for the rights of others, they invite public coercion. We saw that process at work in the years before the war in the well-nigh endless multiplication of governmental controls designed allegedly to bring about social justice. Many of these measures were justified, but few would have been enacted if we had had the moral competency to conduct ourselves in accordance with the basic tenets of the parable of the Good Samaritan, the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule.

Henri Bergson, addressing the French Academy in 1914, said: "Science * * * equipped man in less than 50 years with more tools than he had made during the thousands of years he had lived upon earth. Each new machine being for man a new organ, an artificial organ, his body became suddenly and prodigiously increased in size, without his soul being at the same time able to dilate to the dimensions of his new body." That was 30 years ago, and we still have the same problem confronting us. It cannot be solved by the spawning of more laws and regulations—if we are to keep our freedom. Its only solution lies in the development of adequate moral competency—a task in which there can be no evasion of individual responsibility on the part of any citizen who truly loves his country. In his last published article, "The Road Away from Revolution," written practically on his deathbed, Woodrow Wilson said: "The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

SECRET OF LIBERTY IS COURAGE

Pericles observed 2,400 years ago that "The secret of liberty is courage"; not food, not comfort, not money, but just plain old-fashioned fortitude of body, mind and soul. In thinking about the four freedoms that we hear so much of these days, I have often wondered what the reaction of the Pilgrim Fathers would have been the day they landed on the rocky, barren coast at Plymouth if Governor Carver had said: "Those of you who seek primarily freedom from want, come ashore." Not a man would have stirred. Again suppose he had said: "Those of you who seek primarily freedom from fear in this wilderness full of savages, come ashore." Not a man would have left the ship. But, thank God, impending privation and fear did not daunt those sturdy pioneers. They had known at firsthand what political, intellectual and spiritual tyranny meant and they were willing to pay the price for the blessings of such liberty in the New World, no matter what physical suffering was involved. They landed in midwinter. Before many months had passed, half of their number had died. Yet when the *Mayflower* sailed home in April, as an old historian says: "Not one of the colonists went in her. So sweet was the taste of freedom even under the shadow of death." Millions of our soldiers and sailors are under that same shadow today. May it not be written of us civilians in the fateful years ahead, that we lacked that courage of body, mind, and soul, which, when all is said, is the real price of freedom.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a series of events affecting the administration of justice in the United States.

As a former prosecutor, I have always been impressed with the importance of protecting the defendants' constitutional rights "to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and District where the crime shall have been committed."

At the outset, I wish to set the record straight. I shall not argue the merits of the Hoffa case. I am not bound to believe Hoffa right in order to argue that he shall have the same right as any other citizen to a "fair and speedy trial." I do not know whether he is right or wrong in either of the indictments now pending against him. But I do know this—I know that the humblest and the meanest man who lives, I know that the idlest and the silliest man who lives, should have his day in court. And I know that the Constitution is a delusion and a snare if the weak or the unpopular in the land do not have the same right to a fair and impartial trial as the greatest and strongest in the land.

There is a practical reason for this belief. Over a quarter of a century ago, Clarence Darrow stated the basis for this conviction, in pleading the cause for unpopular men, who were despised and maligned by prosecutors. Darrow's warning rings with eloquence to this day. He stated:

> You can only protect your liberties in this world by protecting the other man's freedom. You can only be free if I am free.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy condemned Teamster lawyers for even undertaking the defense of Teamsters like Jimmy Hoffa. Attorney General Kennedy condemned Teamster lawyers as "legal prostitutes."

The American Weekly of July 17, 1960, quoted Robert Kennedy as stating:

> I think the 200 lawyers who take their money from the Teamsters are legal prostitutes.

On August 19, 1960, in a letter addressed to the editor of the American Weekly, Robert F. Kennedy attempted to explain the statement attributed to him:

> I have never made such a statement. I said to your reporter, as I have said on other occasions, that investigations revealed that the Teamsters have about the largest array of legal talent in the country. Many of them are not labor lawyers but criminal attorneys. They are financed through the use of huge amounts of union members' dues money and often their only job is to insure that Mr. Hoffa and his cronies remain in their positions of power within the Teamsters Union. These men are the legal prostitutes. I differentiated these lawyers to your writer, as I have always done, from those lawyers within the Teamsters who do labor management work and advise the Teamsters on labor negotiations, etc.
>
> In fairness to those Teamster attorneys whose work is untainted by any wrongdoing, I would greatly appreciate your printing this letter.

Robert Kennedy's statement regarding lawyers representing Teamsters, even in its revision as given by him, falls far short of the high ethical, fair, and objective standards that are called for in the position of Attorney General of the United States.

In the light of this, I feel compelled to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, TOM CURTIS, who stated on the floor of the House on August 31, 1960:

> It is difficult enough to keep impressed upon the American public the importance to our personal liberties of the principle that good lawyers should represent people and groups accused even of the most reprehensible of crimes without members of the bar undermining this important public concept by ill-considered public statements. It is a basic part of our concept of justice that every person and every organization whatever they may be accused of should be ably represented by counsel.
>
> Where would this concept be if lawyers felt that they were going to be judged by the clients they represent rather than by their own conduct in representing, whomever might be their clients, ethically and to the best of their abilities? Such a statement as that attributed to Robert Kennedy is more than ill conceived. It is both libelous and unethical.

Since taking office the Attorney General has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars toward the prosecution of James Hoffa, and has even established a special Hoffa unit. He has empaneled 32 grand juries for the purpose of getting Hoffa. I have no objections to these actions if his motive is to obtain evidence to determine whether indictment should be brought and later to prosecute the indictment properly. If this great energy on the part of the Attorney General is for other reasons, however, it is not in accord with the high responsibility of his office.

There recently has been added another chapter to the many volumes of

legal actions that the Government has taken against James Hoffa. On December 7, 1960, an indictment was returned against Hoffa in a Federal district court in Florida. The original indictment was dismissed on July 12, 1961, and a second indictment was returned on October 11, 1961. Many motions have been made before that court. A pretrial conference was held and the case scheduled for trial on October 15, 1962. Attorneys on each side of the case have examined many, many thousands of exhibits. The officials of the Justice Department and of the Post Office Department have been very active in the investigation of this case.

Another indictment was returned against Hoffa and Commercial Carriers, Inc., in the Federal district court in Nashville, Tenn., on May 18, 1962. A hearing was held before a Federal district judge of this court on August 1, 1962, and at that time the Government insisted on an early trial of this case in October on the grounds that the case in Florida would be removed from the docket. I understand that the defense attorneys had no knowledge that this case was to be removed from the docket in Florida and apparently neither did the Federal judge before the case was set for trial.

Apparently the district attorney had information which the others did not have, for on August 6, 1962, Chief Justice Simpson in the southern district of Florida removed all cases from the docket in that district which were scheduled to be tried before October 2 but which would not be completed before October 28. One of the reasons given for removing this case from the docket was that a new district had been created in Florida.

Title 18, section 3240 of the United States Code Annotated, reads as follows:

> Whenever any new district or division is established, or any county or territory is transferred from one district or division to another district or division, prosecution for offenses committed within such district, division, county, or territory, prior to such transfer, shall be commenced and be proceeded with the same as if such new district or division had not been created, or such county or territory had not been transferred unless the court, upon application of the defendant, shall order the case to be moved to the new district or division for trial.

There have been arguments raised that this second indictment in Tennessee should not have been returned in that State, but I have no comment to make on that, for I assume that this matter will be adequately disposed of. But I do want to point out that the Government in its prosecution of James Hoffa should proceed with the same fairness that it proceeds against anyone else.

It is easy to demand fairness and justice for a person who is popular. It is not so easy to go against public opinion and defend the rights of the unpopular. We are often remiss and I fear that in this case the Government is remiss in resorting to unfairness against a person who is not popular. I am not commenting on the reasons for the present unpopularity of James Hoffa. I do know that there has been the strongest concerted attempt made to convict this man that in my opinion has ever been made to convict anyone in this country.

It is also an interesting fact that whenever leaders in a government desire to take over power which they should not have, especially in the matter of prosecution, they first proceed against a person who is unpopular. I fear that this is what is happening today. But we must keep ever before us the fact that if our Government proceeds with unfair practices to indict and convict James Hoffa, they can use this same unfair practice to attack any of the rest of us.

If our Government is to remain the sacred depository of our freedoms, we must protect the rights of those we do not like with the same zeal that we protect the rights of those whom we love.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Certainly it is basic to Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence that every man when accused of a crime has the right to adequate representation properly prepared by well-trained lawyers; and he is entitled further, as the gentleman from Indiana so well points out, to be tried under established rules of procedure and evidence. It is important that these rules, these procedures, and these laws be applied equally to all men.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this basic matter to our attention this afternoon.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentlemen and yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with what the gentleman from Indiana has said as to the basic principles which he has so clearly set forth.

There certainly seems to be something patently unfair about charging an individual, causing him to expend large sums of money in preparation for trial on a day certain, as I understand it, a day certain was set at least a year ago—and then delaying such trial in order to permit a second indictment to take precedence.

I would ask the gentleman if I am not correct in my understanding that the case in Tampa, Fla., where the person involved was originally indicted is ready at the present time, and the defense is ready, and that there is no request on the part of the defense for any postponement.

Mr. BRAY. There has been no request for postponement; in fact there has been insistence that the trial be carried through.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Does it not mean that the defendant in this instance is in the position of finding himself forced by the Government to have spent thousands of hours and many thousands of dollars in examining hundreds of thousands of exhibits and doing research work, interviewing witnesses, pretrial conferences, and so forth, all of which have taken place and now must be held in abeyance until the case in Nashville is completed; is that correct?

Mr. BRAY. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I agree again with the gentleman, we are not trying to decide the merits of either indictment, but it seems to me that in this case in the zeal of trying to proceed against the defendant, as the gentleman said, who is in certain quarters unpopular, and maybe deservedly so, perhaps an injustice is being done him.

If these facts are true, then certainly the Government is in the position of following a course of conduct which places an individual's liberty in jeopardy under our laws. May I ask the gentleman, it would come pretty close to being actually harassment in this instance?

Mr. BRAY. It apparently is.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then I will say to the gentleman I must agree with him. I have taken the unpopular side of many cases, as the gentleman well knows. I will be glad, of course, to consider any evidence on the part of the Government which would justify pressing so hard at this time and ignoring the Tampa indictment to proceed with the other matters which the gentleman has brought out. I have not been able to find, and again I will ask the gentleman whether he knows, of any instance which would justify the Government's action in this case?

Mr. BRAY. I know of none. I heard about this matter a short time ago, and while I have not done any research in the matter, it did seem unusual, after I understand thousands of exhibits have been examined, and pretrial conferences held, with both sides working and both sides ready, to take the action that has been taken is not justifiable. It is very easy for a prosecuting attorney and the Attorney General to become very ambitious, but that ambition must be purged, because if you have in the courts tried one man unfairly, that can spread to someone else.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is it not true that in the case that is being made in Nashville it is based upon facts which were studied by a committee of the House some 10 years ago and subsequently by a committee of the other body, and following those investigations previous Attorneys General have refused to proceed in the basic matters which are here involved?

Mr. BRAY. I did not mention this, but it was brought about from investigations of 10 years or more ago. Whether it was brought to the attention of the prosecuting attorneys of the District, I do not know. I assume it was, but all of these years have elapsed, and again the matter is being brought up.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I hope the Attorney General will find out and review the discussion here this afternoon.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting quietly in this Chamber listening to the colloquy between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Indiana.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, speaking personally, that here is a case where I am called upon to fulfill my sworn duty to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY]—with reference to

double standards of law enforcement—have impelled me to stand up and remind myself and my colleagues of this House that this week the Congress and the American people are observing Constitution Week. I remind myself that it is the Constitution which guarantees each citizen, including such unpopular citizens as Jimmy Hoffa, equal justice under the law. The issue raised here is that presently, under the policy of the Attorney General of the United States, there is a violation of the Constitution which guarantees equal protection under the law. As I understand the charge leveled here today, it is that the policy of the Department of Justice is such that a double standard is being followed.

Mr. Speaker, if this be true, none of us is secure in our liberties. The target of the politically ambitious prosecutor may be—and I take it from what is said, is—one Jimmy Hoffa. Tomorrow that target could be a member of an unpopular minority, or, indeed, the target could be a member of an opposite political party.

Mr. Speaker, under this administration there has been pressure and it is generally known that Members of the Congress have been threatened with reprisals if they failed to get in line.

Under this administration and under this Attorney General, we know that newspaper reporters have been awakened by a knock at the door at 3 o'clock in the morning on orders from the Attorney General.

What I fear is that a teamster law-enforcement policy of today, even though Mr. Hoffa is the subject of such prejudice and discrimination, might well be supplemented by a special brand of law enforcement tomorrow, leveled at another group, or individual, in our society.

This approach, as I see it, by the Attorney General in the Hoffa case employs in an arbitrary fashion the unlimited power of Government in violation of the constitutional guarantees of the rights of the individual—the very essence of totalitarianism. Such a hounding by the police and prosecutor has all the earmarks of a police state. Is this America?

Mr. Speaker, as for me, I must say that I feel compelled to agree with Clarence Darrow, that great defender of individual rights, who once said:

> You can only protect your liberties in this world by protecting the other man's freedom. You can only be free if I am free.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge an investigation by the House Committee on the Judiciary of the charges against the Attorney General—that he is following a double standard of law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to join my other colleagues in commending the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], for taking this time to call attention to not just the Members of the House but to others throughout the country the serious implications involved in the Hoffa case. It is indeed true that the test of liberty is often one that involves someone who is unpopular and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] said, possibly deservedly so. When prejudice is rampant and, I might add, when fear has been built up, liberty is in danger. I think it is quite appropriate that this special order should have come today after we had on the floor of the House two other procedural matters in the name of national security, and this Congress refused to look beneath the label in one of the bills to determine whether we were protecting security to the extent that we well might and at the same time preserving basic personal liberties.

I took the floor of the House, as the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out, I believe it was last year or possibly the year before, when this news magazine quoted, whether rightly or wrongly, the Attorney General as referring to the lawyers of the Teamsters Union as legal prostitutes. At the time the American Bar Association was meeting here. I called upon the labor section of the American Bar Association to whom a protest had been presented, and rightly so by the Teamsters Union, of unethical conduct on the part of the man who later became Attorney General, to urge that they should move forward in this matter. I am happy that the Attorney General denied he made these remarks. I was careful in the way I made my statement. I said "a statement as that attributed to Robert Kennedy," but I note in his denial of having made the statement he compounds and commits the unethical and libelous conduct on his part. He said he was not talking about the labor lawyers of the Teamsters Union, but the criminal attorneys, and went on to say that they were the legal prostitutes. My remarks at the time were to the effect that it is difficult enough to keep impressed upon the American people the importance to our personal liberty, of the principle that good lawyers should represent people and groups accused even of the most reprehensible crimes, without members of the bar undermining this important concept by ill-considered public statements.

This is only an illustration of the manner in which, apparently, the Attorney General of the United States is determined to prosecute an individual and a group—and indeed the word persecute could be used here. And this is no brief, I might say, for Jimmie Hoffa. I do not know the man. Politically, Harold Gibbons, the No. 2 man in the Teamsters Union is in my district; and there is no group in my district that has been more active to defeat me the first time I ran for office and every time I have run since. So I would be the last person to take the floor, if it were from the standpoint of wishing well to my political opponents. But these issues are deep.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to article III, section 2 of the Constitution, which provides that criminal trials shall be held in the State where the said crime shall have been committed; a safeguard which is reinforced by the command of the sixth amendment, that the criminal trial shall be before an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.

Construing these provisions the Supreme Court has said in the case of *Travis* v. *United States* (364 U.S. 631):

> The venue provisions in Acts of Congress should not be so freely construed as to give the Government the choice of a "tribunal favorable to it."

From the points that the gentleman has been making and the points that I have observed of the switching around of jurisdictions, I am led to only one conclusion, that the Government, the Attorney General, has been engaging in both "forum shopping" and "forum juggling" and the defendant is being denied an opportunity of a speedy and impartial trial.

I think we well might ask ourselves, and I hope there will be this investigation by the Judiciary Committee, as to why the Government has decided that they want to push the matter in Nashville, Tenn. I might state that this has been brought to my attention, I have not verified it, but it is something the Judiciary Committee should look into, that Nashville, Tenn., is dominated by a newspaper, the publisher of which is a former aid of the Attorney General. This newspaper, it has been alleged, has saturated the Nashville area with anti-Hoffa and anti-Teamster bias. Nashville, Tenn., is one of the major right-to-work centers of a right-to-work State, which is their right, of course. But also it indicates that there is the likelihood of not finding there a jury free of antilabor bias, let alone anti-Hoffa bias, under these circumstances.

It is these questions that among others I think need to be gone into.

The basis of venue in Nashville, Tenn., as nearly as I have been able to determine is on points of extreme technicality. I think the Judiciary Committee should look into the question, of whether there has been both "forum shopping" and "forum juggling" and whether perhaps we need to amend the laws to make it very clear that this kind of operation is contrary to our laws, so that the Attorney General, whoever he may be, does not engage in this kind of procedure which is prone to lead to miscarriage of justice.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a newspaperman who covered the courts for many years, I developed great pride in the fierceness with which our system of jurisprudence protects the rights of the defendant.

It seems to me that in the present instance, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has just said, the Government is engaged in both "forum shopping" and "forum juggling," and the defendant is being denied an opportunity of a speedy and impartial trial.

When I voted to create a new judicial district in Florida, I thought I was cast-

ing my vote to expedite, not to delay, cases pending in the Southern District of Florida.

On August 20 last, the Tampa newspaper headline read as follows: "Government Wins Delay in Hoffa Case." This delay resulted from the Government's opposition to the defendant's petition demanding to be tried on October 1 in Tampa.

Even more interesting is the fact that the Government apparently sought this delay because it preferred to proceed with the case in Nashville even though the Tampa indictment was returned a year before the Nashville indictment.

Obviously the Government feels it has a better chance of sending Hoffa to jail in the Nashville case.

I have been greatly concerned with the Government's policy of "forum shopping" in this or any other case. The Government has transported thousands of documents into Nashville and then proceeds to seek to justify jurisdiction of the Nashville court on this basis.

It would appear that in the interest of fairness the records should have remained where the business is located, where the defendant resides, where almost all the witnesses reside, and where most of the alleged overt acts occurred.

The Government has been able to produce only three highly technical acts to justify trying the case in Nashville. According to the indictment, the only acts that took place in the middle district of Tennessee were: filing of the charter in 1959; amendment to the charter in 1953; filing of an excise tax return.

These acts, which are purely legalistic and are performed not only all over the country for corporations which are incorporated in States other than those in which they do business, that is, Delaware, et cetera, but all over the world, have never been considered as anything more than purely formal legal jurisdictional matters.

On the other hand, we find that all of the substantive acts occurred or exist in Detroit, Mich.

As far back as the Magna Carta, Anglo-Saxon justice required that the defendant must be tried in the vicinity where the alleged offense was committed. This was a basic protection against the despot dragging the defendant for trial from the scene of an alleged crime, where he could be judged by members of the community, to a hostile or unfriendly jurisdiction.

Our forebears fought the American Revolution against such tactics by the British crown. For this reason, we have article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which was quoted by the gentleman from Missouri, which provides that criminal trials "shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed," a safeguard reinforced by the command of the sixth amendment, which states that the criminal trial shall be before an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.

I cannot but wonder whether Hoffa's constitutional rights are not being disregarded. I wonder if the Government is not playing fast and loose with basic principles of fairness and equity thoroughly engraved in our system of jurisprudence since the days of Magna Carta.

Why is it "overreaching" and juggling the schedules of cases—an exclusive function of the courts under our system of separation of powers—in order to try the case in Nashville now?

Regardless of the merits of the case, it is not proper for the prosecutor to shop around for a court in which the chances of a fair trial are minimal. In fact, the courts have suggested that a defendant may not be tried where the hostility of the community has been engendered by the Government's acts.

The prosecutor has a responsibility, in the interest of a fair and impartial trial, to lean over backward in securing the defendant's rights.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for the statement he has made today and also my colleagues who have expressed themselves on the situation the gentleman has brought before the House. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I certainly am well aware of the situation that is involved in the cases in Florida and Tennessee. I assure the Members who participate in this colloquy this afternoon, that in voting to create a new judicial district in Florida it was the farthest thing from our minds in committee that we would put in the hands of the Attorney General a weapon he could use to trample on the individual liberties of any party in any particular case.

We talk about the fact that this is a case where the Department of Justice has been shopping around for a forum. Under section 3240, title 18, of the United States Code, a case such as this that has been initiated in one district cannot be transferred to a newly created district unless the defendant himself consents. Obviously the intent and purpose of this long-existent statute is to safeguard the rights of a defendant in a situation similar to that which has been called to our attention today.

Mr. Speaker, the example which has been cited by those who have joined in this discussion is but one instance, and I am sure there are many other instances that could be documented; yet, it is sufficiently disturbing, I believe, to warrant the inquiry of the Committee on the Judiciary. If public prosecutors, regardless who they might be, can ensnare citizens into spending small fortunes on defending indictments only to make the indictment disappear without formal action being taken, it is even more reprehensible for the Federal courts to be willing to lend assistance to this type of pettifogging; then there is little hope for individual liberty.

The misuse of power by the public prosecutor is as old as civilization and as new as the morning newspaper. In this country of ours, however, we have always gone about our daily business under the secure belief that such misuse could not occur or be long tolerated. Whether the cause be attractive or objectionable, we have always stood ready to assure and demand fair and equal justice for everyone. Today, however, there appears to be developing an unwholesome tendency to wink at the procedural safeguards which have been long established in our society. Albeit these aberrant tactics may be employed in the sincere effort to stamp out syndicated crime—a cause for which we all extend our total support—that is no excuse for riding roughshod over the rights of individual citizens. In fact, the greater the war on crime, the more exacting the law-enforcement arm of the Government must be to protect the innocent and to treat fairly those suspected of guilt. This is not mollycoddling, this is justice according to law.

Yet in spite of this time-honored tradition of ours, there has come to my attention in the past few years a number of instances where the judicial system was being used more as a weapon than as an equally balanced scale.

In particular, I have in mind a series of indictments which have been served in the States of Florida and Tennessee during the past 2 years against the same defendant. As the drama unfolded, an indictment was issued in a Federal district court in Florida in December 1960. For reasons not now relevant, the indictment was dismissed. Shortly thereafter, in October 1961, a second indictment was again issued and in the same district of Florida. After initial legal fencing was dispensed with, a definite trial date was set for October 1962. In the meantime, however, another indictment, based upon a different set of circumstances, was obtained against the same defendant in a Federal court in Tennessee.

From this point on, the plot thickens, but the basis for action grows hazy. What appears to have occurred is that the outcome of the trial in Florida began to cause worries within the Department of Justice, while that in Tennessee radiated greater hope. Perhaps it was even believed that an adverse decision in Florida could have undermined the hoped for victory in Tennessee. For one reason or another, therefore, the decision was obviously made within the Department, as will be seen below, to remove from the docket the Florida case and pursue alone the Tennessee indictment.

At this point, it may be asked, what this all has to do with justice, equity, and fair play. The answer is that forum shopping may be an accepted practice of a prosecutor prior to the institution of legal proceedings. But, to promulgate on-again-off-again tactics is reprehensible. As a defendant, you would have to expend time and money preparing for a case in one jurisdiction only to discover that that was only a feint and that the actual prosecution actually will transpire in another district. For all one knows, this could be carried on indefinitely.

Without going into great detail in my present example the defendant contended with numerous motions before the Florida court, he participated in a detailed pretrial conference. Attorneys for the defendant devoted large periods

of time in preparing for the trial. This involved not only gathering material but examining exhibits and interviewing witnesses. Needless to say, thousands and thousands of dollars were spent by the defendant in this endeavor to justify innocence. No one knows how many additional thousands were paid out by the Government prosecutor.

Yet, in one fell swoop, this was all cast aside. How can this be, one may ask. Of course, there is no question that the public prosecutor can move to dismiss an indictment. It is regularly done and for good cause. But it must be recognized that good cause must be part and parcel of such a motion. The Federal judge hearing such a motion may well demand reasons for granting the motion and is well justified in turning it down if he believes the proceedings are too far advanced or if he suspects that the prosecutor has ulterior motives for making the motion.

It was undoubtedly with this in mind, then, that the Department of Justice engineered a most ingenious coup under our present example—the effect of which was to have the Florida case dismissed without the trial judge's concurrence and thereby inducing the Tennessee court to move more hastily. What apparently occurred was that the Department learned that Congress intended to create a new judicial district in Florida. In turn, this new district would be created out of certain counties theretofore attached to the southern district where our defendant was facing trial.

Under existing law, however—section 3240 of title 18, United States Code—a case that has been initiated in one district cannot be transferred to a newly created district unless the defendant consents. Obviously the intent and purpose of this long existent statute was to safeguard the rights of a defendant in a situation similar to our example. Once litigation has begun, a defendant was not to be shunted around like a freight car in a railroad yard. A speedy trial, the orderly administration of justice, and fairness were the basis for the statute and these have been rigidly enforced through subsequent court decisions.

But, here is where the Department turned in some fancy legerdemain—pulling the rabbit out of the hat, so to speak. It was undoubtedly recognized by the astute lawyers at the Department of Justice that although the bill creating the new Florida district was passed on July 20, 1962, and that the President would undoubtedly sign it a short time thereafter, as he did on July 30, nevertheless the act itself would not become effective until 90 days after the enactment. Therefore, in piecing the mystery together, the Department attorneys undoubtedly put their heads together sometime between July 20 and July 30 and concluded that this 90-day delay in effectuating the act was a miraculous legislative gift which would get them off the hook in Florida without disturbing their Tennessee proceedings.

Without it, they would have faced the need to explain to the Federal judge the reasons for seeking to dismiss the indictment before him. Since the legal proceedings had gone so far and the defendant had been so inconvenienced, the judge may have denied such a motion. Even if he had not denied it, bad publicity could have resulted. But if he did deny, bad publicity could have been assured along with the possibility of a Government defeat at trial. Finally, a dramatized false step in Florida could have generated repercussions in Tennessee. Thus, without this fateful creation of the new Florida district, justice as administered by the Department of Justice could have faltered embarrassingly.

Here is how the new act was well used. Following the presumed conferences between July 20 and July 30, a special assistant to the Attorney General appeared in the Tennessee court on August 1, 1962. In this appearance, the Justice Department lawyer urged the Federal court in Tennessee to set an early trial date in October since the case in Florida would be removed from the docket. Keep in mind that this August 1 appearance was but 1 day after the President had signed the bill creating the new Florida district, and preceded any knowledge of such action by the defendants since the Florida court had taken no action to raise such notice. Yet, on August 6, just 5 days later, the chief judge in the southern district of Florida entered an order removing all cases from the docket that were scheduled to be tried after October 2, but not to be completed prior to October 28. Conveniently, but not surprisingly, this happened to include the case of our present defendant whose trial was scheduled to begin on October 15.

The conclusion from all this is inescapable. The Department maneuvered a beautiful end run through an arrangement between the Department and the chief judge of the circuit. The district judge in Florida was bypassed, a case whose conclusion could have been embarrassing was chloroformed, the action in Tennessee was given a green light. And, yet, no motions were made to dismiss, no refusals to dismiss were promulgated, no cases were lost and no newspaper headlines were forthcoming. Harry Houdini could not have performed better in his heyday. The fact that no administrative necessity has been shown for the chief judge's action; the fact that existing law directs that cases pending in a district be continued when a new district is created; and the fact that justice, equity, and fairness compel the continuation of our defendant's case in Florida appear to carry little weight with the administration of justice today.

This example which I have cited is but one, I'm sure, of many that could be documented from recent experience. Yet, it is a sufficiently disturbing example to warrant the query as to where we are headed in this country. If public prosecutors can ensnare citizens into spending small fortunes in defending indictments only to make the indictment disappear without formal action being taken and if Federal courts will lend assistance to this type of petti-fogging, then there is little hope that individual liberty and justice under law will survive as we have long understood those terms.

I again congratulate the gentleman from Indiana for bringing the matter to our attention. It is in the best American tradition.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks made by Mr. MOORE.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I am concerned that the Department of Justice has used a new act of the Congress to gain a tactical advantage over a defendant in a manner apparently contrary to law. When the Congress this summer created a new judicial district, the middle district of Florida, a criminal action was pending in that State. A second criminal action was pending in Tennessee involving the same defendant. The Florida action was scheduled to be tried first.

The applicable law seemed to be clear; title 18, United Stats Code, section 3240 provides:

> Wherever any new district or division is established * * * prosecutions for offenses committed within such district * * * shall be commenced and proceeded with the same as if such new district or division had not been created * * * unless the court upon the application of the defendant shall order the case to be removed to the new district or division for trial.

The defendant named above has made no such application, but I understand the Department of Justice has now so juggled matters that the Tennessee action will be reached for trial before that pending in Florida. The Attorney General has taken advantage of our creation of a new district to reverse the orderly course of justice. He owes the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Congress an explanation.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks made by Mr. MACGREGOR.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I compliment the gentleman from Indiana who is leading the discussion that involves basic principles of law.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of impartial laws to apply equally and fairly to every citizen of the United States is the sole ultimate purpose of the Congress of the United States.

Whenever we legislate on matters that deal with the courts or in any way to knowingly pass laws that can or will influence the outcome of a trial we are ourselves violating the basic principle and the accepted principle of law that has become almost sacred.

Mr. Speaker, because I have privately and publicly on previous occasions spoken about the inadequacies and poor judgment and apparent lack of understanding of both good public policy and the responsibility of his job that prevails in the Attorney General's office, I should extend for the record some additional information that gives proof to the be-

lief that many have regarding our present Attorney General and that is, he is not the best qualified man in the United States for the most responsible law enforcement office in the world. For it was this same Attorney General who has recommended that we pass some wiretapping laws and based upon his testimony these laws, if passed, would go far beyond any legitimate need and in my opinion would be in violation of the natural private rights and personal invasion of the sanctity of the home, the like of which we have never seen before in America. It evidences a trend in this administration and in his Office that is undesirable and inconsistent with America's established and proven traditions on personal rights.

This is also the Attorney General who on April 13 shocked America when at his executive order had some people from his Department in the early morning hours in Philadelphia knocking at the doors of American citizens. It turns out that these knockers were Federal police acting without the knowledge of their immediate superior, without writs or warrants, with no claim of wrongdoing against the citizens, investigators with no questions to ask that could not have been better asked in the morning and with no right constitutionally or otherwise. It turns out that apparently they had a personal mandate from the Nation's highest enforcement officer—the Attorney General of the United States, a servant and not the master of the sleeper and frightened citizen and one who took an oath to support and not violate the laws of the United States. We are told that in New York a similar event took place.

Mr. Speaker, the implication of this type of occurrence is a frightening thing to happen in America and we need to be alerted to its consequences.

There are other things that need to be noted in this Office that involve the basic and accepted procedures of law and the conduct of this enforcement officer and about which much has already been said, but time and space does not permit.

I cannot resist, however, from jocularly and seriously calling attention to another bit of evidence of poor judgment. The mistreatment of a dog by the name of Brumas. Judging from newspaper reports the Attorney General imagines that this friendly dog enjoys being brought down to the office in violation of law and there while important business of state goes on being led around the halls by beautiful girls. Now, of course, there are people who would enjoy this but we from Iowa know that dogs would much rather be out in the open country where they can enjoy the fresh air and be away from the dangers of heavy traffic and enclosures which would be for a dog an unhealthy atmosphere. And if one's own children are not available there are always children in the neighborhood who would enjoy being asked to play with a friendly dog like this dog must be.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing to the attention of the House these very important facts with reference to the liberties of certain people in this country.

THIS NATION IN STATE OF DIRE DISTRESS AND EXTREME DANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to solemnly warn the President of the United States, the Members of this Congress, and our 186 million citizens, that this Nation is in a state of dire distress and extreme danger.

The Soviet-Communist forces are pounding this Nation with a succession of political and military power blows around the world.

Our national and international policies are tragically inept, inadequate, and ineffective to stem or to even slow down the Soviet-Communist drive to destroy us.

The magnitude of the present and potential dangers posed by the Soviet-Cuban military and nuclear buildup cannot be hidden by the devious excuses of the State Department or by artful sophistry from the administration.

In order to intelligently and effectively contend with the threat of Cuba, we must recognize that Cuba is only the spearhead of the Soviet-Communist drive to take over every Central and South American country. We must further recognize that the Soviet campaign for Latin America is only one phase of the Soviet-Communist total world civil war.

Cuba cannot be viewed or treated merely as an isolated source of danger. Cuba is not a Cuban problem. It is a Soviet problem we are dealing with.

The strategic, economic, and political decisions directing Cuba's actions are made by Khrushchev in Moscow, and not by Castro in Havana.

Cuba constitutes a Khrushchev jugular attack upon the United States. Today, Cuba is a formidable Soviet military outpost.

The Soviet has, under its command, in Cuba, as of now: first, two nuclear rocket and missile launching sites; second, five naval bases; third, hundreds of Soviet fighter planes; fourth, thoustands of Czech and Soviet artillery pieces; fifth, thousands of Soviet tanks and motorized weapon carriers; and sixth, 350,000 Soviet trained and equipped troops.

This arsenal is only the nucleus of the Soviet military plans for Cuba. Unless this military buildup is arrested, now, Cuba will become a triple nuclear threat to this Nation's survival.

Within 6 months to a year, the Soviet will be using Cuba's naval bases for hiding its nuclear launching submarines. These Russian submarines are capable of destroying just about every coastal city in the United States.

Cuba's airfields, inevitably, will be utilized for Soviet aircraft, carrying nuclear bombs. These bombers could drop nuclear bombs anywhere in the United States.

Cuba's missile launching sites can be intended only for the installation of Soviet nuclear missiles zeroed in on the United States.

This nuclear weapons complex, based in Cuba, will have the capability of destroying this Nation and its people. We are cravenly delivering, to Khrushchev in Moscow, another alternative weapon for blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, let us recall that Castro did not take over Cuba. Khrushchev did not take over Castro and Cuba.

Pro-Castro segments of our press, and the television networks, can take the discredit for misguiding public opinion and pressuring the State Department into the chain of events which created today's Cuban crisis.

Members of Congress, our Central Intelligence Agency, our State Department, other governmental agencies, all contributed to the Castro-Communist takeover.

In essence, it was failure of our foreign policy, the malfunctioning of our foreign-policy-making machinery, and the incompetence of our officials, under the Eisenhower administration, that delivered Cuba to Castro.

All of this Nation's foreign policy blunderings, under the Eisenhower administration, have been repeated and compounded under the Kennedy administration.

In all the world's history there has never been a more ill-conceived, misplanned, and pitifully executed military abortion than our Cuban invasion of April 17, 1961. One thousand two hundred innocent youngsters were sacrificed in this Bay of Pigs debacle.

This was a military operation for the attainment of a political objective. It was turned over for execution to a disjointed, uncoordinated combination of State Department, CIA, and White House dilettantes.

Our tragic policies, aimed to soothe the Soviet, involved Khrushchev's takeover of both Castro and Cuba. This Government's failure to act practically assured Khrushchev of our noninterference.

At this late date Congress is about to consider two resolutions relating to the Cuban crisis.

Now, I have the highest respect for every Member of this House. The sponsors of these resolutions are sincerely seeking a means to neutralize Soviet aggressions.

But I respectfully submit that these resolutions do not realistically discharge our constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense of this Nation.

The first resolution would authorize the President to call up 150,000 reservists.

Under the previous authorization of August 1961, 150,000 reservists were recalled to active duty.

This last callup did not prevent the surrender of Laos to a Communist coalition government. It did not end the Communist guerrilla war in South Vietnam. It did not slow up the Soviet-Communist successes anywhere in the world.

No American can seriously accept the conclusion that a new callup will in any way disrupt or delay the completion of the Soviet nuclear arsenal in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, the second proposal would authorize the President, in his sole discretion, to prevent the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes and to prevent in Cuba, the creation of an externally supported offensive military base capable of endangering the United States.

I would like to emphasize that the Soviet nuclear base in Cuba is not being constructed to export aggressive purposes.

It is not being constructed as a base from which to launch conventional military attacks against other Latin American nations.

It is directed wholly and solely toward squeezing this Nation into a choice between thermonuclear destruction, or a blackmail surrender.

The language of this resolution is vague and indecisive.

It fails to support the Monroe Doctrine. In fact, it legitimatizes a foreign Soviet base in Cuba.

It fails to clearly define for Khrushchev and Castro the limits of Soviet military power that this Nation will tolerate in Cuba.

It fails to unmistakably state this Nation's determination to prevent the completion of any and all types of nuclear missile bases in Cuba.

The weakness of this resolution and the defensive pronouncements of President Kennedy do not truly reflect the strength and the determination of the American people.

This resolution actually invites Khrushchev to speed up his missile bases in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is now in its most critical and dangerous phase of the Soviet-Communist total war.

A Soviet-controlled nuclear arsenal, based only 90 miles away in Cuba, and aimed at the United States, demands that our people make a "now or never" decision for their survival.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon this House to adopt a resolution expressing the sense of Congress in support of the following proposals:

First. A Presidential proclamation stating this Nation's unqualified determination to prevent the completion of any and all Soviet nuclear missile bases in Cuba.

Second. A Presidential demand that the Cuban Government take immediate steps to expel all foreign military troops.

Third. Congressional authorization to the President for a complete naval blockade of Cuba against the entry of all military supplies and equipment, a Presidential directive to the Department of Defense calling for a worldwide alert of our forces and ordering specific preparation to carry out whatever acts may be required to completely secure this Nation against any Soviet military threat out of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, Cuba is not a single, isolated crisis that confronts us. It is only one skirmish in the Soviet-Communist total war of disintegration and destruction. Cuba is another loss in a 30-year series of disastrous defeats resulting from our tragic misconceptions and misjudgments of the Soviet-Communist purposes and strategies. Latvia, Poland, Red China, East Germany, North Vietnam, Cuba, and Laos are chronological examples of our foreign policy failures. They extend over the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for talking on this very important subject. Frankly, I feel, as does the gentleman from New York, that this is the most important and most dangerous thing facing us in the world today.

Mr. PILLION. There is no question about it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The tragedy of it is, and the laughing stock that we must be all over the world, is this fact: I do not know if the gentleman from New York is aware of it or not, but just a few days ago a Yugoslavian ship came into the port of Cuba, loaded with Soviet, Czechoslovak, and Communist arms. They unloaded that cargo of arms from the Communist countries in Cuba.

That same ship is now on the way to Houston, Tex., where, under Public Law 480, it is going to pick up grain which we gave to Yugoslavia as a gift. We are paying the cost of the transportation for it. In other words, the United States of America is actually paying for the transportation of Communist arms from Czechoslovakia and Russia to Cuba and then picking up grain under Public Law 480, wherein we foot the bill. In other words, we are actually in a position where we are financing our own destruction on the Cuban island.

Mr. PILLION. I agree with the gentleman completely. It is evidence of the stupidity of our outlook so far as the Communist war is concerned. You are right. We are paying for our own destruction. We give foreign aid to these Communist satellite countries who are united with the Soviets in a campaign to destroy us, not to rule us, but to destroy us first. They do not want to rule us until they first destroy our society.

The comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] are very appropriate. The gentleman is completely right. That is the type of thinking and conception that we have in the State Department that I am trying to awaken the people of this country to, so we can bring about a reshaping of those policies that are bringing about our downfall, and with accelerated speed. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and wish to compliment the gentleman on his discussion this afternoon of the seriousness of the Cuban situation and the mishandling of that situation. I shall go further than that and say that our "no win" policy in my estimation began when we failed to cross the Elbe River into Germany and permitted the division of Germany in Berlin. This was followed up when we failed to cross the Yalu River and destroy the Russian and Chinese armaments in that area. It occurred again when we failed to support the Cuban invasion, and was followed up when we failed to destroy the wall in Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that at that time we had the power to destroy that wall. We had the power to remove Castro. We further had the power in 1948 by armed force to open Berlin, rather than to put on a world show through a stupendous airlift which cost millions of dollars, and which did not settle anything.

There were those in the military who wanted to move into Berlin and enforce our rights there by a chain of tanks. That would have stopped the encroachment of communism. But we have come to a point where we are afraid to make any move for fear it will create a countermove, which would create another countermove. That is now being described by the Pentagon and the State Department as escalation. In other words, we start with a fist fight, we go into an armaments fight, then we go to the fear of a holocaust by nuclear weapons. It is that fear that has destroyed us in the eyes of the world, when we should have respect rather than popularity.

It is time, as I say, to take a stand. If we are going to be destroyed, let us be destroyed as honorable men rather than to be put in the chains of slavery; whether those chains are made of gold or of steel, they are still onerous and they are not what I want for my grandchildren.

Following up what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] said, it has come to our attention that within the last week or two great Russian airplanes have been flying into Cuba by way of Gander, with the tacit consent of the administration and with the aid of the Canadian Government, that furnished Russian-speaking crews to go over to Scotland and train the Russian pilots on the approach mechanism to Gander and the exit from Gander. Those planes have been flying armaments and military personnel and other types of technicians into Cuba. If we do not take a stand now, if we just try to contain communism in Cuba, we shall fail because that is the springboard, as the gentleman has said, for Latin America and all of South America. We cannot afford to try to brush this under the rug. To me it is an issue. When they say this is a bipartisan matter, I say that it cannot be a bipartisan matter. If it is bipartisan, I have got to put my stamp of approval on the Cuban situation; I have got to put my stamp of approval on the Laos situation; I have got to put my stamp of approval on the Berlin wall. That I will not do. And I would be remiss in my duty as a Representative of my district if I did not call the attention of my people to the dangers which they are facing in this decade.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for his appropriate remarks. They are so relevant to the one great issue that is facing this country, and that is our survival. I agree with the views expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] completely. I agree with him that our foreign policies have failed to stem the tide, have failed even when we had complete military superiority up to the time of about 1953 or 1954, because we failed to use that military superiority to attain the political objective we should have attained in order to secure the future of this country. Instead, we permitted the Soviet to extend her political control to a point where today the matter of survival of this country is in very, very precarious balance. I wish publicly to acknowledge the fine efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] in this great fight that we must make if we are to survive.

The steady increase of Soviet-Communist world power and the corresponding decrease of the power of the free world can be accounted for only because of policies that have lacked a comprehension of the nature, the totality, the strategies, and the tactics of Lenin's new form of complete warfare.

Our foreign policies have failed to meet the realities of world politics. Our basic foreign policy concepts have remained unchanged for 30 years.

They have been defensive, self-deceptive, and self-defeating.

The NATO alliance, the United Nations, international loans, foreign aid, disarmament, summit meetings, have been major features of our foreign policy. They have all proven themselves to be figments of our own gullibility.

Our negotiations, our appeasements, our vacillations, have led us only down the road of retreat and surrender, bit by bit.

Mr. Speaker, I have been saddened and frightened by the confused, evasive, and capitulating pronouncements emanating from our Government.

I do not, for 1 minute, expect this administration to reverse our disastrous foreign policies.

Nor can we hope, that this Congress will take appropriate action to reverse this country's march to national suicide.

Unless this country is able to reevaluate, reshape, and reformulate its foreign policies, the cause of freedom is lost.

Mr. Speaker, our policies with respect to the Communist cancer cannot be redesigned by the existing foreign policy apparatus. They are too deeply imbedded in the fabric of our National Government.

Only a national surge of political demands on the part of the people can bring about the needed reforms.

The impulse for a transformation from weak and vacillating policies to strong, firm, effective policies can only come from the electorate, the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have both expressed their opinion that foreign policy is not a proper topic for debate in this year's political campaign.

Mr. Khrushchev has expressed the same desire.

I respectfully disagree with General Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

We should contemptuously reject Khrushchev's devious effort to prevent the American people from forcing a reversal of this country's foreign policies that serve him so well.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, there is only one issue that is of vital importance to our people.

That is the issue of freedom, survival, and peace.

I make only one qualification. These national aspirations and the foreign policies necessary to retain them, should not be made partisan political issues.

I respectfully suggest that every member of this Congress present to his or her constituency the following questions of:

First. Whether or not this Nation is losing the global war to the Soviet-Communist forces.

Second. Whether or not our present foreign policies are adequate for dealing with the Soviet-Communist forces.

Third. Whether or not the citizens of this Nation are willing to make all necessary sacrifices to build up an invincible military superiority over the Soviet.

Fourth. Whether or not they favor a strong, coordinated, political, and military program that will reverse the course of this war.

Mr. Speaker, on June 12 of last year, I introduced House Joint Resolution 447.

This resolution called for a recognition by this Congress of the total war being waged against us by the Soviet-Communist conspiracy.

It called for action by the United States to counter the Soviet-Communist war with a nonmilitary, political, ideological, and economic offensive.

In March of this year, 6 months ago, I sent 150,000 questionnaires to my constituency. The following three questions were based upon the concepts contained in House Joint Resolution 447.

I submit to you the tabulated answers to these questions.

The first question was: "Do you believe that the Soviet-Communist forces are steadily winning their goals of weakening and destroying the free world?"

The tabulation of the answers was: "Yes," 5,401; "No," 1,179.

The second question was: "Do you believe that the first step in reversing Communist gains is to recognize the Communist organization, its purposes, strategies, tactics, and weapons?"

The answers were: "Yes," 5,213; "No," 1,245.

The third question was: "Would you support a united free world effort to neutralize and destroy the international Communist conspiracy by nonmilitary political means?"

The answers were: "Yes," 5,426; "No," 386.

Gentlemen, the future of this Nation is in your hands.

CUBAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are gravely concerned over the situation existing today in Cuba. The concern felt by our people over the Communist buildup is shared by freedom-loving people everywhere.

The President has wisely stated that the United States will not permit a Communist-dominated Cuba to become a serious threat to the security of this country.

It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress should let the President know that it supports his efforts to preserve the peace and political integrity of this hemisphere.

I have introduced a resolution, therefore, which declares that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take all necessary steps to implement the Monroe Doctrine with respect to the current situation in Cuba.

The Monroe Doctrine is as applicable today to the troubled situation in the Caribbean as it was when it was promulgated by President James Monroe on December 2, 1823. Within the framework of that historic declaration the President has ample precedent to deal with communism in this hemisphere.

It is my feeling that the Congress and the President should take a strong stand and that the United States should make it abundantly clear that we have no intention of permitting a Communist threat to our security to exist in our backyard.

I hope that the President will take immediate and positive action to implement the Monroe Doctrine.

INCOME TAX LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, again I call the attention of this House to legislation I have introduced to provide an exemption from income taxation of the first $3,000 received by an individual as an annuity, pension, or other retirement benefit.

On August 29, I explained to this House in detail the purpose of this legislation. At that time I called for the support of the measure by my colleagues and urged that the Ways and Means Committee give the bill its fullest attention with the view of acting on it before the current session adjourns.

I rise again today to reiterate this appeal. My bill, H.R. 6504, is a sensible and reasonable approach to a serious problem. It corrects an existing inequity in the tax law which currently exempts some retirement programs, partially exempts others, and applies full taxation to still other annuities.

When an individual retires he usually must adjust to a substantially reduced income. With living costs what they are today, and the gradual decline in the valuation of the dollar, the average person has considerable difficulty in building up even a small nest egg to provide reserve funds during his later years of life. Thus, faced with reduced income and

larger outlays, an individual can ill afford a further reduction in his income by having to pay taxes on a small pension. As a result many workers who approach the retirement age cannot see their way clear to retire. They often work beyond the normal retirement age and thus are deprived of a few years free of the rigors and anxieties of a full-time job. That is why I do not think it is fair that retired individuals be required to pay income tax on a small, modest retirement income.

This bill is not establishing any new principles. Actually, all it does is ask that all retirees be given a reasonable exemption as currently accorded social security and railroad retirement annuitants. Its enactment would fulfill a cardinal principle of a fair tax system—that similarly situated individuals should be taxed similarly. How can anyone argue against this type of justice? That is why equity demands that we take favorable action on H.R. 6504, the bill to allow an exemption of $3,000 on annuities, pensions, and other retirement benefits.

I fervently trust that my colleagues in this House will join in urging early committee action on this bill so that full opportunity can be given to the House to vote on it before the adjournment of the 87th Congress.

HIESTAND DEMANDS TAFT-HARTLEY BE INVOKED

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I think we should demand that President Kennedy invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent the closing down of five great Aero-Space factories by the impending strike. The strike is scheduled to begin Saturday, September 22. Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley law to provide for just such emergencies as this. A national industry vitally important to the security of our Nation is threatened.

The law clearly directs the President to appoint a board of inquiry to determine whether a national emergency exists. This must be done immediately in order to prevent the strike. If this board decides that a national emergency does exist, the President must ask the courts for an injunction outlawing the strike and declaring an 80-day moratorium during which time the employees and employers shall continue to negotiate. At the end of the 80-day period, the employees shall take a vote by secret ballot upon the employers' last and final offer.

This is the legal and duly authorized method of settling national emergency strikes. The informal and extra-legal factfinding committee of George W. Taylor, of course, can advise the President but they cannot replace the law. It appears that this committee was constituted for the purpose of evading the Taft-Hartley procedure. The families of the workers who will be deprived of their income deserve more consideration. The defense of our country deserves better, also.

Whether the President will invoke the Taft-Hartley provisions is clearly up to him, but it appears that a devastating strike which could throw many thousands of people out of work and seriously delay our defense and space effort is the alternative. I think the proper course is crystal clear and I hope the President takes it.

DIALOG

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance of Czechoslovak Exiles in Chicago, a group of dedicated citizens who give their special attention to reminding us of the critical situation of the peoples in their homeland and all the other nations behind the Iron Curtain, featured in their monthly bulletin of September 1962 an article describing the socialistic philosophy of the special assistant to the President, Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. They point out the danger that this type of thinking may present to the United States.

The article is entitled "Dialog," and is a penetrating analysis of Mr. Schlesinger's controversial and extreme views, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

MARGINAL NOTES TO OUR DIALOGS

(Dealing with the Schlesinger manifesto)

To complete the picture of today's "Dialogs" it is necessary to make known that Mr. Henry J. Taylor, Scripps-Howard columnist, sent this year to Mr. Schlesinger a letter, asking whether the professor still believed what he wrote in 1947. Taylor knew that many men, who, in their youth, were bearers of various ideas, often acquired wisdom through the ages. It turned out that Mr. Schlesinger was not one of them. His answer read as follows: "I neither withdraw nor apologize."

If Mr. Schlesinger were a mere Harvard University professor, conclusions to his ideas would not be perhaps necessary. However, the fact that Mr. Schlesinger is at present the special assistant to the President, and as such, one of his principal advisers, can hardly be overlooked.

By his ideas, Mr. Schlesinger is openly manifesting that he has dedicated himself to the task of promoting socialism in the United States of America. It is needless to deny that his deductions have been presented in a very attractive form and that he has endeavored to emphasize parliamentary procedure and to preserve liberties as well. However, speaking "en passant," there is in the Soviet Union, as well as in the United States of America, a formal parliamentary procedure; nevertheless, they do not enjoy liberties known to the Christian world. But even so, many will find Mr. Schlesinger's manifesto in theory quite attractive.

It is by no means necessary to amply discuss the pros and cons of socialism. Generally speaking, its good points exist in theory only, whereas the practice clearly reveals the shortcomings. Existing results of the buildup of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could hardly establish a bright example to be followed. It makes no difference if a Socialist buildup is achieved by brutality and guns or by deceit and guile. Professor Schlesinger does not differ with Marx and Lenin in aim, but in procedure and tactics solely. To prevent the arrival of a sudden and tough Marxism, he is recommending the acceptance of a gentle and gradual one.

For that purpose, and in order to achieve the subjugation of the American Nation's mind, he and his ideological associates will have to use every adroit verbal acrobacy, dialectical subtleties, humanitarian and melodramatic appeals and theoretical and semi-truths—if you want to catch a bird, you have to lure it. He knows very well that to influence people you do not ask them to think, but rather, you plant thoughts in their minds.

Preserving liberties under a Socialist buildup is nothing but mere utopia. This fact has been indirectly admitted by the professor himself through his diction; liberties "could be," instead of "would be," preserved. Of course, if what the professor means by liberty exists at present in the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries, then his deduction is absolutely correct. Do not "liberties" also exist there, and, do they not enjoy "the new and real expression of democracy"?

In spite of all theoretical assurances, we do not share the opinion of easily persuading anyone that socialism (i.e., the ownership by the State of all significant means of production) would not bring a tremendous increase of power to a centralized government. Thus, President Woodrow Wilson said in 1912 in New York: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power. When we resist the concentration of power, we are resisting the powers of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

In the eastern part of the world we are witnessing today the existence of a monolithic state organization, which by its natural character makes an individual become a manipulatory unit, suppresses his initiative and personal responsibilities, and governs by merciless oligarchy and by awkward bureaucracy.

The basic problem facing the United States of America today is to find the means to protect individual freedom, action, and responsibility without slowing down those processes and techniques which a modern industrial society must employ if it is to develop. Taking into consideration the experience and outcome of socialism up to date, it can be fairly said that Schlesinger's "Alice in Wonderland" barely constitutes an answer.

Certain intellectual circles in the United States of America have strong leftist leanings. It makes no difference if it is an accident of history or a carefully laid plan. It remains a reality that this course has important backing in very high and influential places. A group of these intellectuals decided that in order to definitely save America from the inevitable adoption of either fascism or communism, there had to be some changes made. These changes then should unequivocally be based on certain selected aspects of Marxism, which, in their opinion, would enrich and stabilize American democracy.

While the American Nation is guarding the front door of its national home against communism, the back door remains open. Its new and cunning enemy is shrewdly avoiding the odious name of communism and slips into favor through a "sheep's garment" of different nomenclature. One time it is called "welfarism," "New Dealism,"

"State monopoly capitalism," "centralized government," or "democratic socialism." The common denominator with Marxism remains the same. The aim is identical, whereas the methods are different. It is of little or no significance if the planned subjugation would be performed through the "iron chains of communism" or by the "silken threads of socialism."

To bring their "new religion" to victory, Socialists have to endeavor to create a general state of mind, in which belief in God should be considered to be an abnormality and a symptom of social disease. It is matter of no coincidence that Professor Schlesinger blames the worker for his belief in religion.

In conclusion, it is to be stated that contemporary society certainly cannot live by a law of the wilderness wherein only the stronger can survive. It does not mean, however, that the desired social justice should be brought by a reactionary and, in practice, failing system, which is the best method to enslave mankind. There are, in spite of that, still many enthusiastic prophets of socialism. With them, disagreeing is honestly possible. It seems, however, that in contradistinction we could also find those individuals and groups driven solely by "gloriae et potestatis sacra fames"—"the cursed desire for glory and power." They know better than anyone else that their plans would be served best by a Socialist oligarchy.

REPORT TO MY CONSTITUENTS ON THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress is drawing to a close, once again I am submitting a report to my constituents of the 22d District of Ohio covering a résumé of major legislation and my activities as their Representative in Washington. This has been a session of greater than average length, but less than average accomplishment. Congress continued to support the President in the field of defense and international relations but despite the fact that the President's own party controls the Senate by a 2 to 1 margin and the House by a 3 to 2 majority, his domestic program has not met with any display of enthusiastic support which is necessary to move the legislation efficiently through the Congress. While it is impossible to list all legislation considered by the Congress, here are some of the major issues and a summary comment on them:

MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

This has been a major issue for several years. The House did not have an opportunity to consider this subject in the 87th Congress as no bill was reported by the Ways and Means Committee. However, the Senate considered and defeated the proposal embodied in the King-Anderson bills for medical care financed through social security. As a longtime advocate of better health care for all individuals, I am very cognizant of the need for an adequate health insurance protection plan for senior citizens. This matter will be taken up again and it is my hope that we will have an opportunity to consider alternatives to the King-Anderson proposals. There have been so many claims and counterclaims concerning what this plan would or would not do that many people are understandably confused. Many believe that the administration's proposal, embodied in the King-Anderson bill, would cover all elderly people.

The truth is that it would provide no protection to some 4.5 million of the most needy who are not under social security or railroad retirement. In my opinion any health care program for senior citizens should provide protection for all. Furthermore, the King-Anderson bill is not a true medical care program in that it would not cover the costs of a doctor's services, whether at home, in an office, or in a hospital. It would not cover surgical or dental fees. It would not pay for medicines used outside a hospital or nursing home. In short, it would be necessary for a patient to be admitted to a hospital or nursing home before receiving any benefits under the administration's King-Anderson plan. Even then, the proposed program would not cover all hospital costs, and the patient would be required to pay $10 for each of the first 9 days of hospitalization, plus the first $20 of costs for diagnosis, or a total of $110.

In spite of the limited benefits offered, the King-Anderson plan would be extremely costly—estimated to be $1 billion the first year and up to $5 billion per year within 20 years. To saddle all this cost onto those workers and employers paying social security taxes could lead to the collapse of the whole social security retirement system. Without medicare, the social security tax will be 10 percent by 1969, with employer and worker each paying 5 percent. One can imagine what the tax will have to be if medicare is attached to social security. And this tax hits hardest in the brackets least able to pay. Its overwhelming burden falls on the lowest levels of the income ladder.

To provide adequate coverage and at the same time avoid getting into the realm of compulsory socialized medicine, it seems to me a medical care plan for the aged should meet the following tests: First, it should cover all those in need; second, it should be voluntary both as to participation and the choice of doctors and hospitals; third, it should provide adequate care—such as doctor services and medicines; fourth, since health care of our senior citizens is a national problem the costs should be met through general revenues, keeping the social security system funds fiscally sound to continue the retirement program, as was intended from its beginning.

The Kerr-Mills Act passed in the 86th Congress has operated successfully in some areas. However, it does not deal with the problem of the millions who are in the lower middle income bracket, not indigent but yet not able to underwrite the cost of a catastrophic illness. On the other hand, my Ohio colleague, Hon. FRANK BOW, has introduced a bill (H.R. 10981) which I believe will meet the tests outlined above. He proposes a very simple plan, easily understood, which avoids the setting up of an additional Federal bureaucracy and getting into an endless amount of Government redtape. Under the Bow plan, all persons over 65 paying Federal income tax would be permitted to deduct $125 per year from their actual income tax for the purpose of purchasing a noncancelable health insurance policy. Those who do not have to pay any tax would still be able to obtain from the Government a $125 certificate—$250 for a couple—to be used to pay the annual premium on a health insurance policy. The policy would be issued by private companies, licensed by the States, but it must contain those benefits prescribed in the proposed law. These benefits include among other things hospital, surgical fees, nursing services and medicines. While the sponsors of the Bow bill readily admit that it may need some work on it and perfecting amendments—that it is not the final answer in present form—let us hope this proposal will be given the committee consideration it deserves. Our senior citizens need an adequate health care program—not just a continuing political issue.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The first budget prepared entirely under President Kennedy's direction called for expenditures totaling $92.5 billion, a sum greater than the amount spent in three of the four World War II years; $11 billion more than last year's budget, and $16 billion more than the first Eisenhower budget. At the time it was presented, the administration predicted there would be a surplus of $500 million at the end of the fiscal year but it now appears that the anticipated surplus has vanished and there will be a deficit of at least $4 billion.

COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES ACT

As passed by the House, assistance would be provided institutions of higher learning to build classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related academic and service facilities. I favored the bill passed by the House to provide funds for construction purposes only. Subsequently the Senate passed a much broader bill which would include $1 billion for student scholarships. As a result, the legislation bogged down for most of the session in a Senate-House conference, but the conferees finally agreed to allow funds to colleges and universities for construction and a limited amount for aid to needy students. As of this writing, the conference report must still be passed by the House and Senate. This was the only major bill dealing with education considered by the House. The general Federal aid to education bill did not come out of committee.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

This came to the House in the form of a reorganization plan submitted by the administration to set up a new Cabinet post. It was overwhelmingly rejected by a vote of 264 to 150. I voted with the majority against this proposal. Those who opposed the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs did so for the following reasons: First, the plan would

provide the mechanism with which the Federal Government could involve itself in every imaginable local activity. If the cities were to take their troubles only to Washington the union of autonomous States which is the United States of America would soon cease to be. Second, the plan would not solve one single urban problem. It merely provided the trappings of another vast Federal agency for the making of more superfluous studies. Third, the cost and size of this proposed new Department staggers one's thinking. A vast majority of those who replied to my opinion poll agreed that the proposed new Department was not a wise move—61.4 percent did not favor it, 29.9 percent favored it, and 8.7 percent had no opinion.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

This was one of the few major pieces of legislation to run the legislative course early in the session. I voted for this legislation which was largely an outgrowth of Operation Employment, a project undertaken by about 60 House Republicans. The 3-year program, first major national manpower retraining program yet proposed, will help the unemployed or unskilled worker, or one suddenly deprived of a job because of technological advances in his industry. Costs of retraining will be paid by the Government and the trainee is to be paid a weekly subsistence allowance in his State ranging from about $20 to $45. This program should go far in providing the Nation with a method of determining employment objectives and encouraging displaced workers to retrain for important job opportunities in our expanding free enterprise system. On my opinion poll 45.5 percent stated they favored a federally financed job retraining program; 45 percent said "No," and 9.1 percent had no opinion.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S TAX BILL

Passed the House by a record vote of 219 to 196. Prior to passage, a Republican motion to recommit the bill to eliminate the 7-percent investment tax credit for new business equipment—estimated to cost more than $1 billion in tax revenue in fiscal year 1963—and to eliminate the provision for withholding 20 percent of dividends and interest was defeated by a vote of 190 to 225. I voted for the motion to recommit and against final pasage of the bill. More mail was received in opposition to the provision for withholding on dividends and interest than on any other single subject this year. My opinion poll also indicated that a vast majority did not favor this provision—56.6 percent said "No"; 33.9 percent "Yes"; and 9.5 percent no opinion. When the bill reached the Senate the withholding provision was eliminated by the Finance Committee and their action was upheld by the Senate. I am pleased that this action was taken as the withholding provision would have hit low-income groups, such as retired persons, the hardest. It would have deprived many persons whose incomes are below taxable level of the use of their limited funds from savings and investments over a period of time before they received refund checks.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT

Once again Congress was called upon to pass legislation extending the present corporate tax rate of 52 percent and certain existing excise taxes on such items as passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and distilled spirits. The corporation tax would otherwise revert to 47 percent. Many of these taxes have been in effect since the Korean war, but with Government spending at an alltime high and our national debt reaching $300 billion, Congress was given little choice but to extend the corporate and wartime excise taxes. There was one redeeming feature of the bill and that was a provision whereby the 10-percent tax with respect to transportation of persons by railroad and bus will be discontinued December 31, 1962, and the tax on airline tickets will be reduced from 10 percent to 5 percent. For years I have advocated repeal of the transportation tax which was imposed during World War II to discourage travel as well as raise revenue. The repeal of a portion of this tax should be of some help in restoring passenger business to our hard-pressed railroads.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

The Congress was called upon by the administration to raise the debt limit from $300 billion to $308 billion. This was the third time within a year that we were called upon to raise the ceiling. I opposed this, but it was passed 211 to 192. Unless the administration spending is curtailed we will have further deficits and still more debt. As the debt goes up, so must the interest payments. Our interest payments already amount to more than 10 percent of our yearly budget—$9.4 billion interest for fiscal 1963—and with this latest increase the interest will be more than $10 billion next year. This is more than $1 million an hour—money which otherwise could be used for other Government programs or left in the hands of taxpayers for them to spend or save as they see fit.

THE FARM BILL

The hairline vote of 215–205 by which the House recommitted the President's farm bill was one of the great dramas of the session. Forty eight Members of the President's own party voted with Republican Members to recommit the legislation. While we must continue to search for solutions to the farm problem and what to do about huge surpluses, and high prices to consumers, the answer does not lie in legislation that would give the Secretary of Agriculture virtually unlimited authority to put stringent controls on American farmers. Just as the problems of our urban areas cannot be solved by transferring them to Washington, the farm problem will not be solved by making a "czar"—or commissar—of the Secretary of Agriculture.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

More than half of the total Federal budget—$47.8 billion—was included in the defense appropriation bill. Because of the continuous Communist threat to the United States and the entire free world we must accept this burden and demonstrate to the Soviets and the Communist bloc of nations that there is no U.S. "defense gap" of any type. At the same time the Defense Department can and must improve its operations to provide a better defense program for less tax dollars. The money voted this year will provide an active duty establishment of 2,676,000 and a Ready Reserve military force of 1,003,500.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Under this act the President is empowered to reduce tariffs by 50 percent over a 5-year period in return for mutual concessions from countries with whom we trade; moreover, the President is granted authority to repeal outright, duties on items exported between the Common Market and the United States of America. Finally, the President is authorized to negotiate for mutual tariff reductions on broad categories of goods rather than on the usual item-to-item basis. My opinion poll indicated that a vast majority of my constituents favored a liberalized trade policy—68 percent said "Yes"; 15 percent "No," with 17 percent no opinion.

The adjustment assistance provision was the most controversial feature of the bill. It permits financial aid to firms and workers dislocated by foreign competition. Few proponents of this provision realize that such assistance would be inoperative and contrary to the laws of Ohio as well as many other States. The Ohio law prohibits benefits to any individual who "has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under unemployment compensation laws of any other State or the United States of America. However, a motion which I favored to recommit the bill to eliminate this provision failed, and I supported the basic legislation on final passage.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

For the better part of 2 months my Committee on Foreign Affairs worked on the Foreign Assistance Act in an effort to reduce expenditures without jeopardizing the national security. The final bill which I supported authorized funds of $4.6 billion in military and economic assistance to Allies and friendly nations—a cut of $810 million from the President's request. The main categories of assistance are as follows: $1.5 billion, development loans; $300 million, development grants and technical cooperation; $600 million, Alliance for Progress; $148.9 million, international organizations; $1.7 billion, military assistance. Two important amendments were adopted by the House. The first concerns the expropriation of American property and requires the President to terminate assistance to nations that seize our property unless appropriate steps are taken within 6 months to make reasonable and adequate compensation. Secondly, the President is prohibited from granting assistance to Communist countries unless he decided such aid meets three conditions: it is vital to American security, the recipient country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement, and aid would promote the possibility of independence. The Congress must still vote to appropriate the funds authorized and as of this writing no action has been

taken, although the House Appropriations Committee has recommended a reduction of $1.1 billion.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATIONS

A bill was passed authorizing appropriations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 to continue the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway system, as well as the Interstate System. This legislation which received my support is traditionally acted on several years in advance by the Congress in order to give State legislatures a sufficient opportunity to provide the necessary State matching funds. Under the allocation formula, Ohio will receive $37,200,000 for primary, secondary, and urban roads in 1964 to be matched on a 50–50 basis, and $176,952,000 for the Interstate System, 90 percent of which is paid by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the States. In 1965 Ohio will receive $38,179,000 for primary, secondary, and urban roads and $183,758,000 for the Interstate System.

CLEVELAND HARBOR APPROPRIATION

Again this year I joined my congressional colleagues and city and business interests from Cleveland in urgently requesting the House Appropriations Committee to favorably consider providing the funds recommended in the budget to continue our Cleveland Harbor improvement program. The committee approved and the Congress voted an appropriation of $1,553,000 to continue the improvement program of bridge replacement, cutting back of banks, dredging, and bulkheading. Also included was an appropriation of $75,000 to continue the Army Corps of Engineers technical study of the feasibility of constructing Tinkers Creek Dam to prevent flooding of the Cuyahoga River.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE BILL

By a vote of 354 to 9 the House passed this bill to create a private rather than a Government corporation to develop our communications satellite program. When the bill reached the Senate it was filibustered for days by a group of Senators who call themselves "liberals." They favored Government rather than private development. Although this was an administration "must" bill, those who opposed it in the Senate were all members of the President's own party. After all their talk, no convincing reasons were put forth that the program should be Government rather than privately owned. Certainly the success of Telstar, which was perfected and built by private enterprise, was a source of pride to all of us, and it pointed the way to what can be accomplished through private enterprise, cooperating with Government efforts.

UNITED NATIONS BOND BILL

Authorizes appropriation of $100 million for loan to U.N. through purchase of U.N. bonds. My Committee on Foreign Affairs held 11 open hearings on this measure and met 5 times in executive session to consider amendments. We finally decided to report the bill but added an amendment to provide that the total amount loaned by the United States to the United Nations must be matched at all times, dollar for dollar, by the total loaned by other countries.

Refusal of the United States to finance a substantial portion of the current United Nations deficit would not force a reform in United Nations organization and procedure nor would it put the United Nations out of business. Instead, it would mean the withdrawal of the United Nations from the Congo, and either the termination or drastic curtailment of United Nations operations in the Middle East. As a result, the United Nations would be limited to serving as an international forum for debate and the dissemination of propaganda. This is just what the Soviet Union is trying to bring about.

MY OWN BILLS

Among the bills I have sponsored in the 87th Congress have been the following: H.R. 315, to amend the Social Security Act to permit an individual to earn an unlimited amount without losing any social security benefits; H.R. 5146, to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; H.R. 10531, to permit a child to continue receiving social security benefits after age 18—up to age 21—so long as he remains in school—this bill is designed to help prevent so many school dropouts—H.R. 913, to make educational benefits available to peacetime veterans; H.R. 4062, to repeal the telephone excise tax; H.R. 3640, to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts; and H.R. 8135, to permit male nurses to receive Regular—rather than just Reserve—commissions in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

CONCLUSION

This, of course, is little more than an outline of the work of the 87th Congress. Many, many hours were spent in committees, in conferences, and otherwise in tedious "behind the scenes" work on all phases of legislation and other business of the Congress and the Federal Government.

It is a very great privilege to serve the 22d Ohio District in the many areas of national life that grow increasingly important to each individual American, and I would like to thank each of my constituents for the support given me throughout my service in the Congress.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, speaking at the commencement exercises at Yale University in June, called for a national "dialog" on the problems besetting the American economy. Still more recently, in August, the President reported to the American people over nationwide television on the state of America's economy, and why he will not propose a tax cut at this time.

I agree that a national debate on the subject of our lagging economy would be most fruitful. Therefore, I would like to address myself to one major thesis of the President's speech. Mr. Kennedy states that he "needs the help" of the Congress in pushing to enactment those measures which he thinks would speed up the economy.

The President's legislative proposals include farm controls, aid to depressed areas, medicare, youth employment, manpower retraining, and discretionary Presidential power to increase public works spending.

However, if one examines the proposals thus far, it is apparent that they have nothing to do with economic growth. Whatever else may be said for the farm bill that failed, its purpose was to regiment the farmer into producing less, not to stimulate more production. And also, whatever the pros and cons of medicare on other grounds, not even its proponents could very well claim it was a growth additive.

Aid to depressed areas, unemployed youth, manpower retraining, public works—all of these are by definition tranquilizers, designed at most to soothe sore spots. They can no more be expected to stimulate economic growth than did similar programs in the thirties, when all the considerable efforts of Government, year after year, were unable to significantly alleviate mass unemployment, much less lift the whole economy out of the mire of depression.

Thus, it would appear that the help the President seeks from the Congress would in reality at best mitigate the effects of our economic slowdown, rather than cure it. Then, if this be the case, what is the answer?

Certainly not budget deficits, which appear to be a key part of the administration's growth policy. Spending has gone up many billions, and not alone in the areas of defense and space. An imposing deficit of $7 billion was piled up in the last fiscal year, and another deficit of $10 billion is in store for this year. And yet the economy is still staggering. This still does not answer the question, "what can be done to get the American economy rolling again?"

The answer, in my opinion, lies in a forthright statement by Mr. Kennedy that he is going to reduce nonessential spending and restore fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government. If he would then convert these words into deeds, I believe this would do more to stimulate confidence in the American economy both in this country and around the world, than any other single act.

Secondly, Mr. Kennedy should present a comprehensive tax reform bill to the Congress along the lines of the Herlong-Baker bill which provides for tax reduction on a graduated basis—over a 5-year period—and covers both corporate and personal income taxes. This would release the additional money needed for more rapid plant expansion, retooling, and increased research. It would further put additional money in the consumer's hands for increasing the purchasing power of the American public. The stimulus from this increased economic activity would create more jobs

and make up for lost revenues by increased taxable incomes.

Finally, I would suggest to President Kennedy that he fire his battery of pseudo economists and allow them to return to the "ivory towers" at Harvard, and so forth. Among these I include America's leading advocate of democratic socialism, Arthur Schlesinger; also Walter Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, whose advice the West German Government rejected in 1951, and by doing so, went on to create the healthiest economy in Europe.

This I respectfully submit to the President of the United States is my contribution at this time, to this suggestion for a "national dialog" on what ails the American economy.

SLUMS BREED CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, slums breed crime, and slums breed criminals. This basic and well understood fact is as true in the Nation's Capital as it is true in any other city in the United States and in nations overseas.

Slums are breeding crime and criminals on Capitol Hill.

There are 1,100 blighted slum houses on Capitol Hill, and the crime results are showing up continually on the front pages of our newspapers. Just a few weeks ago, a woman employee of our Republican colleague from New York [Mr. BECKER] was stabbed several times while at prayer in a Catholic church 1 block from the House of Representatives Office Building and only 2 blocks from the U.S. Capitol Building itself.

The Washington, D.C., Post this morning and the Washington, D.C., Evening Star this noon reports that a member of the staff of our Democratic colleague from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] "suffered a broken nose last night when she was beaten by a man in the 300 block of First Street SE., police reported."

Inspector William T. Murphy identified the victim as Martha Sue Huitt, of 110 D Street SE., these newspaper report. She was admitted to Casualty Hospital, where doctors said she had suffered two cracked teeth and bruises in addition to the broken nose.

Miss Huitt told police she was walking on First Street about 9:45 p.m. when a man came up behind her, put his arm around her neck, and told her to be quiet. When the man released the pressure on her neck, Miss Huitt said, she screamed. Her assailant punched her in the face and fled.

I am concerned, naturally, because this could happen to those members of my own staff who live on Capitol Hill within a block of the places where these attacks have taken place.

They could be attacked, and the employees and families of Members of Congress could also be attacked in this area, because crime is no respecter of persons. The criminal strikes, and the victim may be rich or poor; the criminal is not concerned with the religion, politics, and often the sex of his victim.

I think it is time to act.

The police force on Capitol Hill should be increased to provide afterdark foot patrols with full use of trained men, dogs, and other means in the Capitol Hill area. A special plainclothes detail should also be trained and added to the night patrols of the Capitol Hill area.

We must not only take every step humanly possible to apprehend these criminals, we must also take positive steps to end the slum conditions which are breeding these criminals because slums breed crime and slums breed criminals.

The slum conditions on Capitol Hill have been fostered by certain special interests which do not want these slum conditions ended because they know it is easier to persuade people to build highways, expressways, and inner loop freeways through slum areas and blighted areas than through well-kept residential areas.

They say, get rid of your slums, your slum and blight, and your slum-bred criminals by building highways, expressways, and inner loop freeways, and do it the easy way with the Federal Government putting up 90 percent of the cost.

Anybody can get rid of slums and slum-bred criminals this way because it is an easy way to get rid of people, but it only does this by creating new slums in other parts of a city.

It was recognition of these basic facts which led me to seek the help of Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, in developing a legislative plan for ending the slums and the slum conditions on Capitol Hill.

I have added this to a legislative proposal clarifying the responsibility of the Joint Committee on the Library with respect to historical exhibits and objects, and other antiquities located in the U.S. Capitol Building, in which the Architect of the Capitol has also expressed the deepest interest and support.

Capitol Architect J. George Stewart has assured me that the adoption of this House Joint Resolution 852, which is the result of our joint efforts, with its section 8 providing for a master plan, and a means of carrying it out quickly and expenditiously, will make a major fundamental contribution to the early ending of the crime and criminal-breeding slum conditions which make it unsafe to live on Capitol Hill.

I am especially happy to say that my proposal has the support not only of the Capitol Architect but is also cosponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

I urge the House leadership on both sides of the aisle to pass this legislation in this session of the Congress to assure the early end of the crime-breeding slum conditions on Capitol Hill.

Capitol Architect J. George Stewart told me that he had a record of 1,100 slum houses on Capitol Hill. These slum conditions must be ended immediately in order that our employees, as well as the citizens of the Nations' Capital who live on Capitol Hill, will be safe in their lives and persons, and will not live in dread of physical assaults, rape, and murder.

Too often, it seems to me, we are in the situation of the farmer who locks the door of his barn after his horse has been stolen.

We apprehend the criminal eventually by dint of splendid police work, and the police force in the Nation's Capital is second to none in this Nation.

But police can only go to work after the crime has been committed.

It is up to the Congress to move quickly to make possible the ending of the slum conditions on Capitol Hill which are making it unsafe for people to live on Capitol Hill in the Nation's Capital.

I include for the information of my colleagues the text of my House Joint Resolution 852 and the text of House Joint Resolution 875 introduced by our friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and I invite particular attention to section 8 of these two measures.

Your support for the passage of these two vital measures before this Congress adjourns will go a long way to make it safe for people to live in the Capitol Hill area of the Nation's Capital. It is obviously not safe to live there now, and this is proved by the continuing criminal assaults on innocent and law-abiding citizens.

H.J. RES. 852

(In the House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d session, August 14, 1962, Mr. McDOWELL introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration)

Joint resolution clarifying the responsibility of the Joint Committee on the Library with respect to historical exhibits and objects, and other antiquities located in the United States Capitol Building, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Joint Committee on the Library, with the assistance of the curator provided for in section 7 of this joint resolution, is hereby authorized and directed to supervise, hold, place, and protect all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits within the United States Capitol, and in its judgment to accept any works of art, historical objects, or exhibits, which may hereafter be given, offered, or devised to the Congress, for placement and exhibition in the United States Capitol: *Provided,* That the placement and exhibition of such items in the House side of the United States Capitol shall be subject to the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and in the Senate side of the United States Capitol shall be subject to the approval of the majority leader of the Senate.

(b) The Joint Committee on the Library shall prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary for the care, protection, and placement of such works of art, historical objects, and exhibits in the United States Capitol, and for their acceptance on behalf of the Congress. Appropriations for the care, maintenance, and protection of such works of art, historical objects, and exhibits shall be provided under the appropriation "Capitol Buildings" under the Architect of the Capitol.

(c) The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, with the advice of the Architect of the Capitol, shall have the supervision, protection, and placement of all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits,

which are the property of the United States, which may be lodged with the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library in the Senate Office Buildings, and the House Office Building Commission, with the advice of the Architect of the Capitol, shall have the supervision, protection, and placement of all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits, which are the property of the United States, which may be lodged with the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library in the House Office Buildings: *Provided,* That all such works of art, historical objects, and exhibits shall have first been accepted by the Congress or in the name of the Congress by the Joint Committee on the Library or acknowledged as United States property by inventory of the joint committee: *Provided further,* That no work of art, historical object, or exhibit, shall be displayed for sale or gain, or offered for sale or gain, in any of the rooms, spaces, corridors, or other areas of the United States Capitol, Senate Office Buildings, or House Office Buildings.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on the Library is authorized and directed to relocate within the United States Capitol any of the statues already received and placed in the National Statuary Hall collection, and to provide for the reception and location in the United States Capitol of the statues which hereafter may be received from the States pursuant to section 187, title 40, United States Code, and is authorized to consult with the Commission of Fine Arts with respect to such relocation and location: *Provided,* That such relocation and location in the House side of the Capitol shall be subject to the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and in the Senate side of the Capitol to the approval of the majority leader of the Senate.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for anyone to remove, relocate, or change any work of art, historical object, or exhibit, which is the property of the United States in the United States Capitol, except with the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the House side of the United States Capitol and the approval of the majority leader of the Senate with respect to the Senate side of the United States Capitol, and whoever removes without such authority, defaces, injures, or in any way damages any said work of art, historical object, or exhibit, or violates any of the provisions of the regulations adopted by the Commission for their care and protection shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned not more than sixty days, or both, and prosecution for such offense is to be had in the municipal court of the District of Columbia, upon information by the United States attorney or any of his assistants: *Provided,* That in any case where the commission of an offense against said works of art, historical objects, or exhibits results in damage in an amount exceeding $100, the amount of the fine for the offense may not be more than $5,000, and the period of imprisonment for the offense may not be more than five years, and the prosecution shall be had in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by indictment, or if the defendant, after he has been advised of the nature of the charge and his rights, waives in open court prosecution by indictment, by information by the United States attorney or any of his assistants.

SEC. 4. Such regulations as the Joint Committee on the Library may issue pursuant to this joint resolution and those regulations authorized by the provisions of section 1820 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 193) to be issued by the Sergeants at Arms of the Senate and the House of Representatives for the protection of the United States Capitol Building, and such regulations as are issued, pursuant to law, by the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate, the House Administration Committee of the House of Representatives, the House Office Building Commission, and the Architect of the Capitol for the care, preservation, and protection of the United States Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings, and the Sam Rayburn, Joseph Cannon, and Nicholas Longworth House Office Buildings shall be consistent.

SEC. 5. The Joint Committee on the Library shall, from time to time, but at periods no less than once every ten years, publish as a House document a list of all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits currently within the United States Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings, together with their description, location, and with such notes as may be pertinent to their history, and the expenses of such publications shall be borne from appropriations available for printing and binding for the Congress.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to prohibit the standing committees of the House and the Senate from accepting, as gifts for such committees, portraits of chairmen or former chairmen of such committees, which portraits shall be under the jurisdiction of such committees.

SEC. 7. The Architect of the Capitol, subject to the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the United States Senate, is authorized to employ a Curator of Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, who shall be an employee of the Office of the Architect at a gross salary not to exceed $15,000 per annum and shall be paid from the appropriation "Salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol", shall perform such duties as the Architect may direct, and shall be removed from office only with the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the United States Senate.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to provide for beautifying and embellishing the surroundings of the United States Capitol and other present and future Federal buildings in its vicinity, to preserve adequate sites and additions to sites for future Federal buildings, including suitable grounds, parking, and approaches for such buildings, and to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for upgrading, preserving, and developing the Capitol Hill area, no plan for the development of the Capitol Hill area, including any plan for the construction of roads or highways, shall be prepared or carried out, or lands acquired in connection therewith, by the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, the National Capital Planning Commission, the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, the Administrator of General Services, the Department of the Interior, or any other department or agency of the Federal Government or the District of Columbia government without prior consultation with the Architect of the Capitol. The National Capital Planning Commission shall, jointly with the Architect of the Capitol, prepare a comprehensive plan for upgrading, preserving, and developing the Capitol Hill area which gives special consideration to preserving the residential character of such area. Such plan shall be revised from time to time to keep it abreast of changes in and growth of the Capitol Hill area. For the purposes of this section the Capitol Hill area includes that part of the District of Columbia which is bounded on the north by the middle of G Street (Northeast and Northwest), on the east and south by the Anacostia River, and on the west by a line running down the middle of Third Street (Northwest and Southeast), from G Street to Canal Street, down the middle of Canal Street to First Street Southwest, and down the middle of First Street to the Anacostia River.

SEC. 9. (a) Section 1831 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 188) is repealed.

(b) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this joint resolution are hereby repealed or amended to the extent of such inconsistency.

H.J. RES. 875

(In the House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d session, September 6, 1962, Mr. WIDNALL introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration)

Joint resolution clarifying the responsibility of the Joint Committee on the Library with respect to historical exhibits and objects, and other antiquities located in the United States Capitol Building, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Joint Committee on the Library, with the assistance of the curator provided for in section 7 of this joint resolution, is hereby authorized and directed to supervise, hold, place, and protect all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits within the United States Capitol, and in its judgment to accept any works of art, historical objects, or exhibits, which may hereafter be given, offered, or devised to the Congress, for placement and exhibition in the United States Capitol: *Provided,* That the placement and exhibition of such items in the House side of the United States Capitol shall be subject to the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and in the Senate side of the United States Capitol shall be subject to the approval of the majority leader of the Senate.

(b) The Joint Committee on the Library shall prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary for the care, protection, and placement of such works of art, historical objects, and exhibits in the United States Capitol, and for their acceptance on behalf of the Congress. Appropriations for the care, maintenance, and protection of such works of art, historical objects, and exhibits shall be provided under the appropriation "Capitol Buildings" under the Architect of the Capitol.

(c) The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, with the advice of the Architect of the Capitol, shall have the supervision, protection, and placement of all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits, which are the property of the United States, which may be lodged with the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library in the Senate Office Buildings, and the House Office Building Commission, with the advice of the Architect of the Capitol, shall have the supervision, protection, and placement of all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits, which are the property of the United States, which may be lodged with the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library in the House Office Buildings: *Provided,* That all such works of art, historical objects, and exhibits shall have first been accepted by the Congress or in the name of the Congress by the Joint Committee on the Library or acknowledged as United States property by inventory of the joint committee: *Provided further,* That no work of art, historical object, or exhibit, shall be displayed for sale or gain, or offered for sale or gain, in any of the rooms, spaces, corridors, or other areas of the United States Capitol, Senate Office Buildings, or House Office Buildings.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on the Library is authorized and directed to relocate within the United States Capitol any of the statutes already received and placed in the National Statuary Hall collection, and to provide for the reception and location in the United States Capitol of the statues which hereafter may be received from the States pursuant to section 187, title 40. United States Code,

and is authorized to consult with the Commission of Fine Arts with respect to such relocation and location: *Provided*, That such relocation and location in the House side of the Capitol shall be subject to the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and in the Senate side of the Capitol to the approval of the majority leader of the Senate.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for anyone to remove, relocate, or change any work of art, historical object, or exhibit, which is the property of the United States in the United States Capitol, except with the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the House side of the United States Capitol and the approval of the majority leader of the Senate with respect to the Senate side of the United States Capitol, and whoever removes without such authority, defaces, injures, or in any way damages any said work of art, historical object, or exhibit, or violates any of the provisions of the regulations adopted by the Commission for their care and protection shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned not more than sixty days, or both, and prosecution for such offense is to be had in the municipal court of the District of Columbia, upon information by the United Attorney or any of his assistants: *Provided*, That in any case where the commission of an offense against said works of art, historical objects, or exhibits results in damage in an amount exceeding $100, the amount of the fine for the offense may not be more than $5,000, and the period of imprisonment for the offense may not be more than five years, and the prosecution shall be had in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by indictment, or if the defendant, after he has been advised of the nature of the charge and his rights, waives in open court prosecution by indictment, by information by the United States attorney or any of his assistants.

SEC. 4. Such regulations as the Joint Committee on the Library may issue pursuant to this joint resolution and those regulations authorized by the provisions of section 1820 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 193) to be issued by the Sergeants at Arms of the Senate and the House of Representatives for the protection of the United States Capitol Building, and such regulations as are issued, pursuant to law, by the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate, the House Administration Committee of the House of Representatives, the House Office Building Commission, and the Architect of the Capitol for the care, preservation, and protection of the United States Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings, and the Sam Rayburn, Joseph Cannon, and Nicholas Longworth House Office Buildings shall be consistent.

SEC. 5. The Joint Committee on the Library shall, from time to time, but at periods no less than once every ten years, publish as a House document a list of all works of art, historical objects, and exhibits currently within the United States Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings, together with their description, location, and with such notes as may be pertinent to their history, and the expenses of such publications shall be borne from appropriations available for printing and binding for the Congress.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to prohibit the standing committees of the House and the Senate from accepting, as gifts for such committees, portraits of chairmen or former chairmen of such committees, which portraits shall be under the jurisdiction of such committees.

SEC. 7. The Architect of the Capitol, subject to the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the United States Senate, is authorized to employ a Curator of Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, who shall be an employee of the Office of the Architect at a gross salary not to exceed $15,000 per annum and shall be paid from the appropriation "Salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol", shall perform such duties as the Architect may direct, and shall be removed from office only with the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the United States Senate.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to provide for beautifying and embellishing the surroundings of the United States Capitol and other present and future Federal buildings in its vicinity, to preserve adequate sites and additions to sites for future Federal buildings, including suitable grounds, parking, and approaches for such buildings, and to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for upgrading, preserving, and developing the Capitol Hill area, no plan for the development of the Capital Hill area, including any plan for the construction of roads or highways, shall be prepared or carried out, or lands acquired in connection therewith, by the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, the National Capital Planning Commission, the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, the Administrator of General Services, the Department of the Interior, or any other department or agency of the Federal Government or the District of Columbia government without prior consultation with the Architect of the Capitol. The National Capital Planning Commission shall, jointly with the Architect of the Capitol, prepare and present to the Congress for appropriate action a comprehensive plan for upgrading, preserving, and developing the Capitol Hill area which gives special consideration to preserving the residential character of such area. Such plan shall be revised from time to time to keep it abreast of changes in and growth of the Capitol Hill area. For the purposes of this section the Capitol Hill area includes that part of the District of Columbia which is bounded on the north by the middle of G Street (Northeast and Northwest), on the east and south by the Anacostia River, and on the west by a line running down the middle of Third Street (Northwest and Southwest), from G Street to Canal Street, down the middle of Canal Street to First Street Southwest, and down the middle of First Street to the Anacostia River.

SEC. 9. (a) Section 1831 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 188) is repealed.

(b) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this joint resolution are hereby repealed or amended to the extent of such inconsistency

---

KENNEDY REQUEST FOR 150,000 RESERVE CALLUP APPLAUDED

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's bid for congressional authority to call up for 1 year 150,000 reservists and to extend certain enlistments, if needed while Congress is not in session, is a restrained and timely preparedness move.

While this measure will get overwhelming support in the House as it did in the Senate, the public should be informed as to the significance of this preparedness move.

Speedy action on the emergency callup authority first, demonstrates for the world this Government's unity in determination to respond to any Communist-created crisis whether it be Cuba, Berlin, or southeast Asia; second, strengthens the President's hand in diplomatic negotiations while Congress is away from Washington; third, provides replacements, if needed, for regular military forces which might be directed to oversea areas; and, fourth, demonstrates a new bipartisan support of the President in a vital and sensitive area of U.S. foreign policy.

The United States now has approximately 2.8 million Americans under arms, and the Executive has authority to call up an additional 1 million when and if a national emergency is found to exist. So, obviously, the request for authority to call up 150,000 reservists is, in reality, only a phase of preparedness which the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe adequate to meet the current situation.

The reservists callup is an intermediate step which a prudent and alert Government deems necessary to take. I hope that when the measure comes before the House next week it will be discussed for the enlightenment of the country at large, but that Members will refrain from adopting amendments which could delay and complicate the situation.

AMERICANS WANT FOREIGN AID ECONOMY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, even Congressmen who supported the $4.75 billion foreign aid authorization last July should now seek to reduce by amendment, aid funds allocated to "doubtful area" in the mutual assistance bill due for debate in the House tomorrow.

I am told that the Appropriations Committee has already sharply reduced the multi-billion-dollar measure, but I understand there are still aid classifications subject to further economies. Economy in foreign aid—especially in areas where it is not likely to advance free world aims nor retard communism's spread—is what the American taxpayer wants today.

Outright opponents of foreign aid appropriations have never mustered more than 132 votes in the House, and while there's no expectation of eliminating foreign aid, I think the goals of the program can be achieved more economically than in the past. Every economy would strengthen our foreign trade position, and would harden the dollar in the international market.

Among the doubtful areas of foreign aid are countries where communism dominates government; nations whose elected governments are toppled by mil-

itary juntas and dictators; those with no plans or programs for effective utilization of U.S. aid, and countries which have resisted private capital and discouraged private investment by expropriation. Less American foreign aid might well pressure our prosperous allies to share a more proportionate burden of assistance to emerging and undeveloped countries still outside the iron and bamboo curtains. Foreign aid and loans under the Marshall Plan have restored Western Europe to economic and military potency, and there has been a commendable trend away from outright aid grants and toward long-term loans in oversea assistance programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to give full weight to foreign aid reductions reportedly made by the House Appropriations Committee after 2 months of detailed study of the $4.75 billion measure.

DISMISSAL POLICY OF NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, two important bills before the House today deal with security administration. One, H.R. 12082 would give the Secretary of Defense power to discharge any employee of the National Security Agency with no hearing whenever the Secretary deems it "in the interest of the United States." The other, H.R. 11363 would establish an industrial security program. Though it would provide for hearing procedures, nevertheless, confrontation and cross-examination procedures could be eliminated "for reasons determined by the Secretary to be good and sufficient."

Though I have many doubts about the wisdom of H.R. 12082, I have voted for this legislation in the belief that the National Security Agency is what might be termed a "hypersensitive" Government agency. Its subject matter is extremely delicate and men who work in the NSA take on special obligations. I feel it is fair to provide procedures comparable to the CIA and AEC in this Agency, although it could be argued that in all of these agencies some reforms might be in order. Since no one is obliged to take work in this specialized Agency, and since it is best to err on the side of caution in this area of national security, I believe the bill should be supported.

However, H.R. 11363 is another matter. This bill does not affect Government agencies. It is not concerned with a specialized group of security experts. Rather it deals with the daily work of 5 million private employees. It would permit the Secretary of Defense to effectively wipe out due process rights of all the employees in industry and education who come under this program.

If this bill were passed, access to information could be denied to millions of men because of an informer's testimony. They would have no way to prove they are above suspicion. The stigma of not being allowed to use information is very great. In many cases it determines whether a man work or not. No man should be put into a position where another may wreck his career or cost him his job without allowing him the right of cross-examination.

I realize that this bill is brought before us in order to protect secret informers. However, the committee report on this bill indicates that in 800 plant-security cases since 1960, it has only been necessary to conceal the informer 11 times. In my opinion the right of the individual to a fair procedure is more important that the loss of anonymity of a few informers whose names would be made public if the right to cross examination is clear in any future case. I cannot see that we lose anything of importance in terms of national security, but we preserve much that is important to our free way of life in sharp distinction to practices in police states which this legislation would, in this respect, seek to emulate.

I believe that measures which deny the individual the rights that are his guarantee to freedom should be opposed. To approve legislation which bends over backward to preserve the secrecy of a few informers at the expense of the job security and freedom of millions of workers is to move away from the traditions of American democracy which have distinguished us from Communist states and, indeed, all totalitarian societies.

REPLY TO KHRUSHCHEV ON CUBA—A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in all the comments made about Cuba today it is strange, indeed, that few characterize it for what it has been for some time—a captive nation. In both the 1961 and 1962 Captive Nations Week observances the captive status of Cuba was emphasized, and many in this country thought this was a gross exaggeration. Americans of Cuban background participated in these observances in Chicago, New York, Washington, and elsewhere, and many could not understand the meaning of their presence. Last year and this, calls for specific and positive action toward Cuba were sounded during these observances—calls for a complete blockade, recognition of a government-in-exile, and the formation of a free Cuban liberation army—but logic and foresight have had to await the pressures of reality and the gradual takeover of Cuba by imperialist Moscow.

A SOLID REPLY TO KHRUSHCHEV

Cuba is indeed a captive nation. This we are witnessing daily now. The resources of other captive nations in Eastern Europe and Asia are being steadily employed to buttress Cuba's captivity and, as so often in the past, to consolidate a base for Moscow's expansion in the rest of Latin America. Moscow has succeeded in bringing the reality of a captive nation to our very doorstep. Cuba, situated close to the bastion of the free world, has become an integral part of the captive world—a truth that many Americans are just now beginning to recognize.

Mr. Speaker, there is one solid reply that this Chamber can make to Khrushchev's threats about Cuba, and that is to create now and quickly a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Moscow would want us to continue to think in piecemeal fashion, to fail to understand Cuba as a member of the growing family of captive nations, and to overlook the enormous cold war possibilities suggested by a truthful linking of Cuba with the captive nations in Europe and Asia. We can circumvent this Soviet Russian objective by establishing this special committee.

Since Congress legislated the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959, there has been a mushroom growth of evidence that clearly proves how sensitive and fearful Moscow is to any free-world concentration on the captive nations. We do not need to counter-threaten Moscow; all that is required at this stage is to launch a serious full-scale investigation into all of the captive nations under Moscow's direct or indirect domination. This alone would mirror the predominant weakness of Moscow's empire. This alone would be capable of demonstrating to the world Moscow's profound weakness and insecurity.

THE 1962 WEEK AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The 1962 Captive Nations Week observance highlighted the necessity for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Many of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, have introduced into the RECORD much data about this highly successful event. I wish to augment this evidence by inserting the proclamation issued by Governor Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, the proclamation of the commissioners of the county of Allegheny, Pa., the Pittsburgh program of Captive Nations Week, the fine resolutions passed by the Pittsburgh assembly, and the report in the July 16 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on "U.S.S.R. Called a Giant With Feet of Clay."

With fitting tribute paid to Commissioner John E. McGrady and Mr. Michael Komichak, respective chairman and secretary of the Captive Nations Committee of Allegheny County, whose leadership and work made the Pittsburgh observance one of the best in the country, I request that this material be printed in the RECORD.

In addition, for those who think we cannot place Moscow under heavy cold war pressure, I need just cite one example for the RECORD, that of the cruel and prolonged imprisonment of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy of the genocided Ukrainian Catholic Church in the U.S.S.R. I request that the sermon delivered by Richard Cardinal Cushing on "A Prelate Under Red Coexistence," as

published in the June 7 issue of America and the Pastoral Letter of the Ukrainian Catholic Hierarchy of the free world also be printed in the RECORD in support of my remarks:

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATION'S WEEK—JULY 15 THROUGH 21, 1962

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America has, by resolution, requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the week of July 15 through 21, 1962, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas the President of the United States has, by such proclamation, invited the people of the United States to observe such week with the appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are fully aware and grieve of the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of Russian communism; and

Whereas it is deemed appropriate to call for a public observance of this occasion so that our knowledge and sympathies may be declared: Now, therefore,

I, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1962, as Captive Nations Week. I invite all Pennsylvanians to observe this occasion with appropriate activity so that all may be made aware of the unfortunate status of those enslaved behind the Iron Curtain and to reaffirm our determination to keep our Nation free to help others obtain equal freedom.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State, at the city of Harrisburg, this 9th day of July 1962, and of the Commonwealth the 187th.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
Governor.

By the Governor.

E. JAMES TRUMARCHI, Jr.,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PROCLAMATION

"Whereas by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States the third week of July has been designated as 'Captive Nations Week'; and

"Whereas the people of the county of Allegheny are linked to the captive nations through bonds of family, religion and the belief in democratic principles; and

"Whereas these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive and heartless policies of Soviet Russia, which have deprived them of their national independence and individual liberties; and

"Whereas it is in the American tradition to advocate the dignity of man, his freedom from tyranny and his right to self-determination of the form of government he prefers,

"Now, therefore, we, the commissioners of the county of Allegheny, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1962, as 'Captive Nations Week.'

"We urge the people of Allegheny County to join with the Captive Nations Committee of Allegheny County in observing the plight of the Communist-dominated nations and in the support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

"We especially encourage everyone to manifest his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at the civic observance of the Captive Nations Week to be held at Kennywood Park on Sunday afternoon, July 15, 1962, at 5 p.m., eastern daylight saving time."

I, Murray W. Snyder, chief clerk for the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Allegheny, Pa., do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of a certain proclamation duly adopted by said board at a special meeting thereof duly held on the 11th day of July, 1962, as the same appears in the minutes of said meeting duly recorded in said board's minute book volume 43.

Witness my hand and the seal of said county of Allegheny hereto affixed this 11th day of July 1962.

MURRAY W. SNYDER,
Chief Clerk.

CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

CAPTIVE NATIONS' OBSERVANCE, KENNYWOOD PARK, SUNDAY, JULY 15, 1962, 5 P.M.

Parade, park to stage, 4:50 p.m.: U.S. Marine Corps; color guard and captive nations flags.

"Star-Spangled Banner": Robert Spikula; accompanist, Michael E. Darkoch.

Pledge of Allegiance: Laszlo Pastor, former Hungarian freedom fighter.

Invocation: Bishop John J. Wright.

Introduction of Michael Komichak: Master of ceremonies, Commissioner John E. McGrady.

Reading of proclamations: Judge Ruggero J. Aldisert.

Address: Gov. David L. Lawrence.

Introduction of honored guests.

Main address: Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky.

Reading of resolutions: Judge John G. Brosky.

Remarks: State Senator Leonard C. Staisey.

Benediction: Rev. Basil Gregory.

Folk songs and dances.

STATEMENTS

Yugoslavs: State Senator Leonard C. Staisey.

Hungarians: Attorney Bill Karlowitz, Mrs. Louis Smith.

Lithuanians: Attorney Stanley Simon.

Polish: Wence Dolegowski.

Slovaks: Paul C. Kazimer.

Ukrainians: Dr. Peter Stercho, St. Vincent's College.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—RESOLUTION I

Whereas the 1 billion captives in the Eurasian empire of Moscow and Peiping are suffering from undernourishment, and in some instances starvation, because of the inability of the so-called Communist economies to feed adequately the captive peoples; and

Whereas the food capability of the U.S. economy exceeds that of all "Communist economies" combined: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, therefore, That the U.S. Government offer food to any of the captive peoples, both within and outside the U.S.S.R. and China, provided it is stamped "Food for Freedom" and is distributed by the International Red Cross.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—RESOLUTION II

Whereas the Allied nations, through their representatives, adopted the Atlantic Charter in which they proclaimed that they "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;" and

Whereas the signatory nations to the Atlantic Charter "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;" and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter guaranteed the four freedoms to all populations of the world; and

Whereas Russia was one of the nations accepting the Atlantic Charter, but has since repudiated her commitments and enslaved over a score of nations against the wishes of their peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the representatives of the captive nations here assembled, That the principles of the Atlantic Charter be reaffirmed, and that the Government of the United States be respectfully requested to repronounce its adherence to the Atlantic Charter and thus give hope and confidence to the peoples of the captive nations for their peaceful liberation from Communist tyranny.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—RESOLUTION III

Whereas the captive nations, including those once independent nations in the so-called U.S.S.R., were suppressed by fraud, violence, and brute military force of Soviet Russian imperialism and are being denied their freedom and independence, and

Whereas since 1920 Soviet Russia has extended its control over 18 countries, while since 1945 over 40 nations have won their independence from Western colonial control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United Nations General Assembly debate the issue of Soviet Russian colonialism which, through such deceiving entities as "constituent republics" and "peoples' democracies", is waging a policy of ruthless colonialism; be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations insist on the withdrawal of Soviet Russian troops from all occupied territories to within the ethnographic boundaries of Russia proper and that free and unfettered elections be held in all the captive nations.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—RESOLUTION IV

Whereas the greatest fear held by the leaders of international communism is that the people of the free world will awaken to the true nature of the vast empire which they have established by subversion, terror, and armed aggression; and

Whereas it is imperative that the African and Latin American countries be made aware of the traditional imperialism and colonialism of Moscow; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations be established in the House of Representatives to study the plight of the captive nations and thus bring to the attention of the uncommitted nations, and those on the verge of committing themselves in favor of communism, the consequences of Communist alinement.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, July 16, 1962]

U.S.S.R. CALLED A GIANT WITH FEET OF CLAY—CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE LEADER, HERE FOR FREEDOM RALLY, HITS RED MYTH

The U.S.S.R. is a giant with feet of clay that will crumble through truth, an expert on communism and the Soviet Union said here yesterday.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of National Captive Nations Committee and originator of the Captive Nations Week resolution passed by Congress, gave his views in an interview before speaking at a freedom rally in Kennywood Park.

Dr. Dobriansky said that one of the chief deceits about Russia is "the myth of Soviet unity." Within the U.S.S.R., he said, are 15 non-Russian "captive" nations with a population of 114 million.

NINETY-SIX MILLION POPULATION

Russia itself, according to Dr. Dobriansky has a population of only 96 million.

These captive nations are not the ones Americans usually think of as being captive—Yugoslavia, Hungary or Bulgaria.

Instead they bear the exotic and relatively unknown names of Kazakh (9.3 million), Idel-Ural (15 million) or Uzbek (8.1 million).

One of Dr. Dobriansky's purposes is to make these and the other names household words.

MUST EXPLODE MYTH

"We must build up the image of the United States and explode the myth of Soviet unity," he said.

One way he attempted to do this was through the formation of the National Captive Nations Committee.

"This and the Captive Nations Week resolution are the structural apparatus," he said. The next step, he believes will come with the establishment of a Freedom Committee in Congress.

The Freedom Committee, which is now being studied by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, could be the forerunner of a Freedom Academy.

SIMILAR TO WAR COLLEGE

The Academy, Dr. Dobriansky said, would be similar to the War College, where men from different levels and fields would train for a year in psychopolitical warfare.

Dr. Dobriansky also remarked that the Captive Nations Week being observed in this country this week is having a counterpart observance in Formosa and the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

Dr. Dobriansky spoke on Quemoy Island last January in answer to an invitation by Chiang Kai-shek. In addition to his work with captive nations, Dr. Dobriansky is an associate professor of economics at Georgetown University and a staff member of Georgetown's Institute of Ethnic Studies.

LAWRENCE SPEAKS

Governor Lawrence also spoke at the Kennywood rally, which was sponsored by the Captive Nations Committee of Allegheny County.

Lawrence, in speaking of countries who are not free, said:

"It is to these people that we turn our hearts and our hands today; it is to them that we offer our hope; it is for them that we offer our prayers and our pledge to our own country."

[From America, June 7, 1962]

A PRELATE UNDER RED COEXISTENCE

(Sermon delivered by Richard Cardinal Cushing at a Solemn Pontifical Mass of the Byzantine Rite in the Basilica of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Mission Church, Roxbury, Mass., on May 6, in honor of the 70th birthday of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy.)

The native land of the Ukrainians is located in southeastern Europe. Centuries ago it was a powerful state, rich in history and traditions with a population of about 50 million. Constant wars of aggression by foreign enemies weakened the nation but never killed the spirit of patriotism that inspired its people.

Before the year 1000 Christianity under the Byzantine rite was embraced by the Ukrainians. The schism of the 11th century that divided the East from the West separated the church from the Holy See. Five hundred years later, in the year 1595, some of the Ukrainian bishops and priests and a large group of the laity were reunited with the Holy See. Retaining their liturgy and religious customs they became a stronghold of the faith of their forefathers and one of the most precious jewels of the universal church.

The faith of the people prospered. The nation eventually became independent but lost its freedom 2 years later, in the year 1920. Within 20 years the church of this great nation suffered religious persecution at the bloody hands of the Soviet power. By the year 1945 all the bishops and priests were arrested, moved to Moscow and subjected to persecution until some 7 million Ukrainian Catholics were forced into the Russian Orthodox Church to be used as tools for the conquests of communism. But doomed to death—the Ukrainian Church was fated not to die.

Even today amid the shadow of the Iron Curtain priests secretly serve their people who amidst constant threats of persecution and death cherish and practice to the best of their ability, the faith of their fathers. Priests are being ordained and bishops consecrated. Thus the Ukrainian Church still lives although it is a "church in silence" awaiting the day when the Iron Curtain will be lifted and freedom of speech, assembly, and religion will once again be possible. When that day dawns, and sooner or later it will dawn, for injustice and slavery, persecution and treachery can last for awhile and only awhile—in the end truth, justice—God will prevail—then the hundreds of thousands of Catholics of Ukrainian origin now worshipping in almost 200 parishes, in 3 dioceses, with about 300 priests will extend their aid to their persecuted brethren and the Catholic Church of Ukraine shall arise from the tomb and enjoy a triumphant resurrection.

Symbolic of the passiontide and crucifixion of the church in his country is the living martyr of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, whose 70th birthday we are commemorating this afternoon.

What manner of churchman is this man of God? He is a scholar of great renown. He is one of the great confessors of the faith in modern times. Born of comparatively wealthy parents, he distinguished himself as a seminarian and a priest for scholarship and piety. Linguist, theologian, editor, rector of a seminary, lecturer, authority on art and literature, he became the pride and joy of his people. It was no surprise, therefore, that, when Metropolitan Sheptitsky, as he advanced in years and ill health, requested the Holy See to appoint Father Slipy as his coadjutor bishop with the right to succeed him. On November 25, 1939, he became an archbishop and later succeeded his metropolitan. Before long his long "way of the cross" began. In the war between Germany and Russia he suffered a foretaste of what was to come.

He was marked for death which he awaited with patience after suffering one humiliation after another. But his choice of suffering was to be filled with greater and more severe persecution. In 1944, on All Saints Day, Metropolitan Andrew Sheptitsky died and his faithful coadjutor archbishop succeeded him. A few months of peace followed and then the Bolshevik forces began the liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. They first assailed in booklet form the character of the former metropolitan. But the late Pope Pius XII put the lie on that document when in later years he wrote: "The memory of Metropolitan Sheptitsky is forever a blessing for the Catholic Church. It will safeguard the memory of his fervent zeal for souls and of his constant courage in the defense of his country."

In 1945 shortly after the blasphemous attack on the former metropolitan, the Soviets arrested Archbishop Slipy and many other Ukrainian bishops. That was the beginning of a cruel passiontide in his life which has continued to the present day. Hard labor was assigned to him in a Siberian prison and sentence after sentence was pronounced against him on false charges save one—he refused again and again to break relations with the Holy See and to subject the Ukrainian Catholics to the allegiance to the Soviet State.

In 1957 while still a helpless, emaciated prisoner he commemorated his 40th anniversary in the holy priesthood. The event was observed throughout the world from the Pope to the humblest member of his flock. His anniversary, however, was celebrated without external manifestation lest the aging archbishop would be subjected to greater suffering. Seventeen of those 40 years in the priesthood have been spent in prison.

In the long history of the church there are few if any confessors and martyrs of the faith who can surpass that record. In the early church Christians were thrown to the lions, tortured, starved, crucified and burned at the stake. But these tortures were of brief duration, in comparison to the prolonged imprisonment with its accompanying tortures of mind and body to which Archbishop Slipy has been subjected, for almost one-half of his entire priesthood of 40 years.

In our day we can recall Cardinal Stepinac of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindzenty of Hungary with other priests, prelates and lay Catholics who suffered from the cruel torture of communism. But few, if any, survived the long imprisonment of Archbishop Slipy.

Stepinac was released from prison shortly before his death and died a free man. Mindzenty is now in protective custody of the American consulate in Budapest. But the great archbishop of the Ukrainians still survives as prisoner of the Communist regime that since 1945 has reduced the Ukrainian Catholic Church to the sorrowful plight of the "Church of the Catacombs." More than 2,000 diocesan priests and religious have been arrested and deported to slave labor camps because they refused to acknowledge the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their supreme head in place of the vicar of Christ, the bishop of Rome, the sovereign pontiff of the universal church. The once-flourishing dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church have been liquidated. Almost 5,000 churches and chapels and 200 religious houses have been desecrated. The bishops that once inspired, instructed and guided the Catholic people have been exiled or imprisoned. Only one remains as a living symbol of the Ukrainian unit of the mystical body of Christ, that was doomed to death by communism, but fated not to die.

Behold the Man of God. Another Christ, still erect, still persevering in his divine vocation, still carrying on although worn and wasted at the age of 70, more than 17 years in prison, subsisting on little nourishment, suffering all kinds of indignities, praying and uniting his agony with that of Christ Himself—and all because he would not deny the faith of his fathers, of his priests, and people and their fidelity to the Apostolic See.

Saddened though we are by the pitiable state to which this spiritual giant has been reduced, we are forced out of our complacency and apathy by his extraordinary example to cry out to all those who follow the communistic line or who think we can coexist with an atheistic plot to dominate the world: Behold the Ukrainians of whom Archbishop Slipy is a symbol, behold Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, China, Russia itself and learn at last that we cannot trust a regime rooted in atheism, propagating a false economic, social, and political order bent on the conquest of the world. Unless and until the Ukrainian people and their shepherd, Archbishop Slipy, are permitted their God-given right to worship God in truth and in charity and unless all people behind the curtains of communism can regain the freedom to do likewise, then communism remains what it has always been—an intrinsic evil that by prayer, sacrifice, and dedication to the supernatural order must be wiped from the face of this earth. Meanwhile, we pray today for Archbishop Slipy, one of the greatest confessors of faith since the dawn of Christianity, and for all others, crushed by the tyranny of communism, of whom he is the symbol.

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY OF THE FREE WORLD, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 70TH BIRTHDAY OF HIS EXCELLENCY, THE MOST REVEREND JOSEPH SLIPY, METROPOLITAN OF HALYCH AND ARCHBISHOP OF LVIW

(Maxime Hermaniuk, CSSR, D.D., archbishop of Winnipeg and metropolitan of Ukrainian Catholics in Canada; Ambrose

Senyshyn, OSBM, D.D., archbishop of Philadelphia and metropolitan of Ukrainian Catholics in the United States; John Buczko, D.D., archbishop of Leucadia and apostolic visitator for Ukrainians of Western Europe; Neil Savaryn, OSBM, D.D., bishop of Edmonton, Canada; Isidore Borecky, D.D., bishop of Toronto, Canada; Andrew Roborecki, D.D., bishop of Saskatoon, Canada; Joseph M. Schmondiuk, D.D., bishop of Stamford, United States; Jaroslav Gabro, D.D., bishop of Chicago, United States; John Prashko, D.D., apostolic exarch for Ukrainian Catholics in Australia; Platon Kornyljak, D.D., apostolic exarch for Ukrainian Catholics in Germany; Volodimir Malanchuk, CSSR, D.D., apostolic exarch for Ukrainian Catholics in France; Joseph Martinets, OSBM, D.D., auxiliary for Ukrainian Catholics in Brazil; Andrew Sapelak, SDB, D.D., apostolic visitator for Ukrainian Catholics in Argentina; Augustine Hornyak, OSBM, D.D., auxiliary for Ukrainian Catholics in England.)

To the very reverend and reverend clergy, the venerable members of the religious communities, and the faithful, peace in the Lord and episcopal blessings. "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep"—John 10: 11.

Very reverend and reverend fathers, religious, and dear brethren in Christ who reside in the free world, a very significant anniversary in the history of our church is the occasion for this jointly issued pastoral letter to you, dearly beloved in Christ. On the 17th day of February of this year, 1962, occurs the 70th birthday of our metropolitan and head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine—the Most Reverend Joseph Slipy. The anniversary cannot be observed by him in his own Cathedral of Saint George in Lviw. It will not be noted in liberty, but rather in exile in a cold Siberian dungeon. Our hearts are pained when we dwell upon the great tragedy which our Ukrainian nation suffers with our church in Europe and with its highest ecclesiastic, Metropolitan Joseph Slipy. The soul of every Ukrainian cannot help but be profoundly moved by the personal misfortune of Metropolitan Slipy as an individual deprived unjustly by a godless government of his ecclesiastical dignity, of personal freedom, of the rights fundamental to each human being, and as an individual who in no way has committed an act contrary to the discipline of the law. Metropolitan Joseph Slipy suffers simply because he has remained steadfast to his God, to his church, and to its Supreme Pontiff, the successor to Saint Peter, the Holy Father, Pope of Rome; and because of his immeasurable love for his people. This very loyalty to the most high, to the Apostolic See, to church and country, and this sacrifice on his part become for us a sacred trust and a source of great pride, pride in the fact that our church is headed by such a godly man who has not surrendered to the power of evil, but who has remained faithful with the help of divine grace to the holy ideals for which he dedicated himself in his youth, and for which he offers himself to Christ every day he lives. Verily can Metropolitan Slipy repeat the words of Saint Paul in his epistle to the Galatians: "With Christ I am nailed to the cross. And I live, now not I: but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh: I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and delivered himself for me" (Galatians 2: 19–20).

METROPOLITAN JOSEPH SLIPY—PREPARATION FOR AND DEDICATION TO GOD, CHURCH, AND PEOPLE

As early as in his youth, Joseph Slipy, the son of wealthy parents of the Podilya region (Western Ukraine), distinguished himself with his outstanding abilities, industry and piety. Though he had the opportunity to study any secular profession, after completing his gymnasium studies at Ternopil in 1911 with honors, the youth enrolled in theological courses at the seminary in Lviw in order that he might serve the Lord. Perceiving the very desirable characteristics of spirit and intellect in the young student, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptitsky sent him for advanced studies to Innsbruck, from which in 1918 he received a doctorate in theology. In the same university, he wrote in German in 1923 a thesis on "The Teachings of the Byzantine Patriarch Photius on the Holy Trinity." Besides theological studies, the Reverend Slipy broadened his studies in philosophy, philology and art on the university level. From 1920 and on he matriculated at these universities: Gregorianum, Angelicum, Oriental Institute in Rome. After completing a dissertation in Latin about the Holy Trinity, he received from Gregorianum the degree of "magister agregatus." During the course of his education he perfected his knowledge of the classical languages and learned German, French, Italian, Russian and English. All these subjects were attended to with diligence and proved to be a suitable preparation for his labors in Christ's vineyard, particularly in those departments in which the Church had most need—in the training of as many as possible highly educated candidates for the priesthood and the development of theological studies, especially in those branches which were important for better mutual understanding between East and West.

METROPOLITAN SLIPY—THEOLOGIAN, ORGANIZER, AND AUTHOR

After this thorough preparation, the young scholar returned to his archdiocese where he was assigned in 1922 by Metropolitan Sheptitsky to be professor of dogmatics at the theological branch of the Seminary of Lviw. In the following year he became one of the organizers of the Scientific Theological Society, founded the theological quarterly "Bohosloviya" (theology), and became its chief editor—an office he kept until the publication was liquidated by the Bolsheviks. The society and publication as well as his teaching became his principal occupations; and in great measure these contributed to the progress of the theological studies of our priesthood, as well as to the Catholic Church in general.

In 1926 Metropolitan Sheptitsky appointed the eminent theologian and outstanding organizer, Father Slipy, to be the rector of the seminary; and the Scientific Theological Society chose him to be their presiding officer. In both positions he proved to be truly a man of great learning as well as an indefatigable laborer for the welfare of his church and people. For his distinguished services in education, the oldest Ukrainian intellectual organization, the Shevchenko Scientific Society, selected him in 1930 to become a member. Meanwhile in 1928 he was assigned by Metropolitan Sheptitsky the task of organizing a theological academy along the lines of the universities of Western Europe; and he was appointed by the Metropolitan to be its first rector, an office which still more manifested his tremendous pedagogical and organizational skills. Both prior to this new post and during it he also undertook frequent journeys to Western European countries where he visited Catholic educational institutions, observed their procedures and systems, and then introduced their strongest points into the theological academy. His last such trip was to England in 1935.

In addition, from 1929 and on, he was the coeditor of Niva (the Soil), a monthly organ for clergy. Besides that he was cowriter of the Velehrad Acts plus other domestic and foreign publications which dealt with theology and unity problems.

Church unity was always a subject that interested him and his predecessor, Metropolitan Sheptitsky. Father Rector Slipy continually participated in unity meetings such as those held at Velehrad, Prague, and Pinsk. There he delivered his lectures. In addition he organized and presided over a similar gathering held at Lviw. Following the example of Metropolitan Sheptitsky he maintained friendly relations with our orthodox brethren who in a similar manner were interested in the return to unity and who studied the causes of church disharmony.

Another interest that Father Slipy had was that of looking for and collecting old specimens of liturgical art, decoration, and print. Frequently such precious articles were to be found in the churches and homes of Halychyna (western Ukraine). He acquired many such treasures and presented them for permanence and safekeeping to the museum at the seminary of Lviw. The museum was established and supervised by him.

In the midst of his energetic labors, widespread interests, and great plans for the expansion of the theological academy into a full Catholic university came World War II.

METROPOLITAN SLIPY AS CONFESSOR

In 1939 during the Bolshevik occupation, Metropolitan Sheptitsky, poor in health and advanced in years, requested that the Holy See grant him an auxiliary bishop with coadjutor rights. For this office he suggested Rev. Rector Slipy to be the best candidate, for Metropolitan Sheptitsky highly regarded his close coworker for his deep piety, arduous labors, organizational ability, and broad erudition. On November 25, 1939, the apostolic see nominated Father Rector Slipy archbishop with the right to succession of the archdiocese and metropolitan see of Halych.

The archepiscopal consecration was observed secretly in the metropolitan's private chapel on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary (according to the Julian Calendar), December 22, 1939. The consecrators were their excellencies, Metropolitan Sheptitsky, Bishop Nicethas Budka, and Bishop Nicholas Charnetsky. The circumstances of this event were indicative of the great cross divine providence was placing upon the shoulders of Archbishop Slipy. Of this he was fully aware. The road to Calvary began for him with the very first occupation of Halychyna and almost ended with the retreat of the Bolsheviks during the German-Russian battles. Miraculously he was rescued from being shot. "The NKVD's tore off my cassock. We made an act of contrition and awaited death," wrote the archbishop.

The Lord, however, had prepared for him a full chalice which was not to be drained then and which brims over to the present day. After the death of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptitsky on November 1, 1944, Archbishop Joseph Slipy assumed his duties in the Metropolitan See of Halych with the consent of the Apostolic See. For a few months it was a time of waiting; but quickly the godless forces began their attacks upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church. They were set off with a disgraceful brochure which maligned the late Metropolitan Sheptitsky whose memory was highly regarded and about whom Pope Pius XII said in 1952: "His memory will become forever a blessing in Christ's Church, which will safeguard the memory of his fervent zeal for the salvation of souls and of his constant courage in the defense of this nation." (A.A.S. v. XLIV 1952, p. 877.)

Shortly after the appearance of this printed slander (April 6, 1945), the Soviets arrested Metropolitan Slipy on April 11, 1945, together with all the other bishops of the Province of Halych: Bishop Gregory Khromyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevsky, Bishop Nicholas Charnetsky, C.S.S.R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. Later on Bishop Josaphat Kocylowsky, O.S.B.M. and Bishop Gregory Lakota were also imprisoned. Of these incidents the supreme pontiff, Pope Pius XII

wrote in his encyclical, "Orientales Ecclesias" of December 15, 1952: "We sadly turn our thoughts and affection to another people, truly dear to us; namely, to the people of Ukraine, among whom are not a few of the faithful, who look toward Rome with immense desire and earnest love, and venerate this Apostolic See as the center of Christianity, and as the infallible teacher of Christian truth by reason of the mandate of Jesus Christ. This people, nevertheless, as we have learned with overwhelming grief, are oppressed in no smaller degree with persecution and find themselves already for some time in a situation no less grave than the other peoples. In a special way we would recall the memory of those bishops of the oriental rite,[1] who were among the first in the defense of their religion to endure hardship, affliction and outrage; who, transported to the city of Kiev, were there tried and condemned to various punishments—in the city of Kiev, we say, whence once shone forth throughout all those regions the light of Christian doctrine, and whence Christian worship was propagated. Some of these have already met a glorious death, and so, as one may hope, from the abode of heavenly blessedness, which they enjoy, lovingly look down upon their sons and their companions in their unarmed struggled, and implore for them the all-powerful protection of God." In March 1946 at Kiev Metropolitan Slipy was sentenced for a term of 8 years to a prison in the Siberian wastelands.

GOLGOTHA OF METROPOLITAN SLIPY

We do not know in detail what trials and terrors Metropolitan Slipy has had to endure. For many years nothing was heard of or from him. About 10 years ago there was a rumor—most likely one released by the Soviet regime itself—that he had died. But later this was learned to be false; and information came that he was alive, had been sent to hard labor, yet maintained a spirit of fortitude and even uplifted those suffering with him. It was hoped that after serving his 8-year sentence he would be released from prison in 1954. But this did not come to pass. News came of his being tried again, in Moscow, then later in Kiev where he was tried and sentenced anew for so-called crimes against the Muscovite government. The government demanded that he make a public break from the Holy See of Rome and transfer his allegiance to Soviet Orthodoxy. In fact he was diabolically tempted—as was Jesus Christ tempted by diabolical cunning—with various high positions, on condition that he merely reject his Catholic Church. Neither tortures, a triple sentence, nor imprisonment have forced him to deny his faith—an act which would very much please the Soviet regime. As did Saint Paul and the early martyrs and confessors, so does he bear all: "In all things we suffer tribulation, but are not distressed. We are straightened: but are not destitute. We suffer persecution: but are not forsaken. We are cast down: but we perish not. For we who live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake: that the life also of Jesus may be manifest in our mortal flesh" (2 Corinthians 4: 8–9, 11).

During the next 7-year term in imprisonment in Siberia, specifically in 1957, the 40th anniversary of Metropolitan Slipy's priesthood occurred. The Ukrainian Catholic faithful in the free world decided to keep from public notice their feelings lest any demonstration or statement increase the trials he had to bear in slavery. The event was observed in quiet prayer for his intention. However, the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, desired to express his paternal solicitude and regard for the metropolitan-martyr.

On Christmas of 1957 His Holiness released an apostolic statement with greetings, good wishes, and blessing to "venerable brother, Joseph Slipy, metropolitan of Halych, archbishop of Lviw, bishop of Kamyanets from Pope Pius XII, venerable brother, greetings and apostolic blessings.

"The 40th anniversary of your priesthood which recently occurred gives us the opportunity to express to you our love and respect and our concern to comfort you in exile in the midst of your suffering. We know that upon the completion of 18 years of the priesthood you accepted and zealously fulfilled your pastoral service in the Lviw Eparchy, first as auxiliary coadjutor with rights of succession with the consent of the archbishop ordinary. Because of your fidelity to this Apostolic See you were sentenced to imprisonment and thus forced to leave your faithful flock. Then you were imprisoned in various prisons and finally carried off to Siberia where you now are in a faraway place, Maklakovo, laboring as a servant and guard at a home for the handicapped. Therefore, we express our heartfelt gratitude to you, venerable brother, for the zealous fulfillment of your priestly and pastoral office at the cost of freedom; and because you chose 'to carry disgrace for the name of Jesus,' we arduously implore the Divine Infant Jesus to graciously comfort and strengthen your soul in the midst of many discomforts and unpleasantness. Meanwhile as a sign of certain heavenly protection and our particular affection we bestow upon you, venerable brother, with our wholeheart our apostolic benediction.

"Given in Rome at Saint Peter's, on the 25th day of the month of December on the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year 1957, during the 19th year of our reign as supreme pontiff.

POPE PIUS XII."

(Uryadoviy Veesnyk A. V. 1959, Nos. 1–3, pp. 38–40.)

We regret that we do not have any answer from the most eminent addressee about receiving this papal letter although we can guess that he received it, and that it was a great joy to him in his sad state.

METROPOLITAN SLIPY AS THE GOOD SHEPHERD

Great are the courage and the constancy in holy faith of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, who as the "Good Shepherd gives His life for His flock" (John 10:11). He did not surrender before the godless government, did not deny his Catholic Church and did not betray his sheep. He was not afraid of suffering and with repugnance discharged the sly and treacherous promises of the atheistic government. He is aware that the eyes of his unfortunate faithful in the Ukraine, who are also persecuted because of their faith, are turned to him. Not only are they gazing upon him as their suffering bishop, but also those whom he would want to win for Christ and for church unity. For this reason, he carries the burdensome chains of imprisonment, and these chains, according to the words of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, will surely speak louder to the faithful and the unfaithful than the living word (Pro Ecc.).

Although he is physically weak, he is always spiritually strong. He looks to the crucified Christ and is enraptured with the limitless love that God has for us; and from this he obtains new strength for endurance and immunity for all discomforts, and physical and moral suffering. Patiently, resigning himself to the will of God, he endures everything. It is appropriate, therefore, to quote St. Paul's letter to the Corinthians: "In all things we suffer tribulation, but are not distressed; we are sore pressed, but are not destitute; we suffer persecution, but are not forsaken; we are cast down, but we perish not. For we who live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake; that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our mortal flesh" (2 Corinthians 4:8).

And Christ, our Divine High Priest, certainly assists generously His faithful servant in order that he would emerge from this difficult battle crying out the words of St. Paul in his second epistle to Timothy: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord the Just Judge will render to me" (4: 7–8).

And all of us, dearly beloved, having greeted our most venerable jubilarian on his 70th anniversary with best wishes, let us unite with him in those heartfelt feelings and let us thank the merciful God that He gave us such an illustrious archbishop. Let us give thanks for all those graces which were granted to him by our Lord throughout his life until now and let us ask Him so that He would keep him for us and present him with the richest love for many years to come, until the triumph of Christ's kingdom in our native Ukraine and in the whole world.

On this day on which we commemorate the birth of our suffering archbishop, let us increase our humble petitions, so that these lofty Christ-like ideals for which he suffers and offers himself as a supreme sacrifice, would bloom sooner. Let his fervent wish to see the Ukrainian nation united in one, holy Catholic and apostolic church, under the infallible guidance of the highest supreme pastor, come true.

Exalting the heroic efforts of our metropolitan confessor before God and before the world, let us repeat, dearly beloved, our ardent prayer crusade, so that God may grant a better future for our holy church and for our Ukrainian nation. Let us bring to the attention of other nations the injustice which is perpetrated in our native land and let us ask their participation in our prayer crusade for God-given and human rights for our church and our nation. Let our voice also be heard by the mighty nations of this world that often talk so much about the rights of man and liberty of nations and hardly any of them have the courage to stand up and defend these rights for our nation. Let our voice also be heard by those that have put the chains of bondage on our people, so that they realize and do penance for their evils. We turn to them together with our bishop-jubilarian with the words of Isaias the prophet: "Mighty ones humble yourselves, because God is with us" (8: 9).

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God and the Father, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all"—II Corinthians 13: 13.

Given in Winnipeg, Philadelphia, Rome, Edmonton, Toronto, Saskatoon, Stamford, Chicago, Melbourne, Munich, Paris, Curitibi, Buenos Aires, London, on the 17th day of February in the year of our Lord 1962.

Maxime, Metropolitan-Archbishop; John, Archbishop; Isidore, Bishop; Joseph, Bishop; John, Bishop; Volodimir, Bishop; Andrew, Bishop; Ambrose, Metropolitan-Archbishop; Neil, Bishop; Andrew, Bishop; Jaroslav, Bishop; Platon, Bishop; Joseph, Bishop; Augustine, Bishop.

(It is requested that all the Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers offer the Divine Liturgy on the birthday of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy for the intention of His Excellency, and that the faithful be exhorted to do works of penance, offer prayers, and receive the Holy Sacraments for the intention of our church and for its Prime Hierarch, the Most Revend Joseph Slipy).

[1] Regarding additional bishops: in 1947 the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza of Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine; in 1950 Bishops Paul Gojdich, O.S.B.M. and Basil Hopko of Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. In 1951 Bishop Gojdich was condemned to forced labor for life; Bishop Hopko is in a concentration camp.

SOVIET BID TO DOMINATE THE SEAS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members attention to the following review of the growing threat of the Soviet merchant marine fleet:

Much has been said in recent days about the degree of Russia's accomplishments in outer space. But, little notice has been taken of the Kremlin's accelerated program to overtake us on the high seas.

While we are bogged down in quibbling over whether or not a partial maritime subsidy is proper, the Soviets, with a 100-percent subsidized effort will in the not too distant future have many more merchant vessels on the oceans than we do. These, of course, are for trade, economic, political, and propaganda purposes. Likewise, the Soviet Navy, with reportedly 400 submarines now in operation, is not being neglected.

All of this adds up to a "Soviet Bid To Dominate the Seas," the title of an excellent review, of recent date, by the distinguished journalist and writer, Fletcher Knebel, which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

SOVIET BID TO DOMINATE THE SEAS

(By Fletcher Knebel)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Red flag streams from masts over the seven seas as Soviet Russia bids to become one of the world's great maritime powers.

Landlocked for centuries, Russia has burst out to sea and now raises a menacing challenge to the naval and merchant fleets of the free world.

GIANT STRIDES

In the last decade, largely unnoticed except by intelligence and marine technicians in the West, Russia has made giant strides in all phases of ocean commerce with these results:

Soviet trawlers are now actually outfishing American fishermen in Atlantic and Pacific waters off the U.S. coasts which, until 1955, saw only an occasional Soviet commercial fishing boat. As many as 400 Red trawlers appeared this year, about half on Georges Bank off Cape Cod and about half in the Bering Sea near Alaska.

The Soviet Navy, now manned by 750,000 officers and men, has grown swiftly and numbers more than 400 submarines, 25 cruisers, 165 destroyers, 275 frigates, and hundreds of smaller fighting craft and auxiliaries.

The Soviet merchant marine is swelling rapidly at the same time that the U.S. merchant fleet is contracting. In 6 years, Russia has almost doubled her merchant marine, now has almost 1,000 freighters and tankers with a total of about 5,500,000 deadweight tons. Twenty-first in world trade volume only 4 years ago, Russia is now sixth.

In shipbuilding, Russia is ordering vessels at a dizzy pace, outbuilding the United States two for one. This year, according to the authoritative Marine Engineering Log, Russia is building 2,086,000 tons of merchant shipping as contrasted with 1,084,000 by the United States. Russia has 169 freighters, 40 tankers, and 17 passenger-cargo vessels under construction in shipyards located in Russia, East Germany, Finland, Yugoslavia, Japan, Italy, Bulgaria, Poland, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and West Germany.

In marine design and gadgetry, Russia is going in for the most modern improvements. Her trawler fleets have great mother ships which process, package, and freeze the fish as caught.

She is experimenting with hydrofoil passenger ships, has built nuclear subs and icebreakers and has automated to the point where one man at a console can unload a ship. Six Russian tankers being built in Japan will have racy Yankee clipper lines with closed-circuit TV for loading operations.

In oceanography, Russia has vastly expanded its research facilities. Our Bureau of Commercial Fisheries estimates that "thousands of Soviet scientists, technologists and other workers are engaged in marine research activities," with headquarters at big research institutes at Murmansk and Vladivostok. The Soviets have a research ship in the Indian Ocean, have built an oceanography school in Indonesia and are teaching new fishing techniques to the Vietnamese, among other projects.

WORRIES UNITED STATES

This outburst of Soviet energy on the high seas worries marine specialists in Washington. Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu warned in a San Francisco speech of "the challenge of the emerging Communist-bloc maritime power" and foresaw an epic battle for control of the waves.

He said the Soviet merchant fleet "is young, vigorous, and growing rapidly" and said her active cargo carriers increased 30 times as fast as the American fleet last year.

"Will we," he asked, "allow ourselves to be driven from the seas commercially for the first time in our history while we try to take comfort in possession of the world's greatest Navy?"

Senators WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and BENJAMIN SMITH, Democrat, of Massachusetts, warned in the Senate that Russia's modern fishing fleets were outcatching the "small and ancient" American fishing ships off both coasts.

BIG PROGRAM

Whether the United States will take steps to counteract the Russian maritime surge remains to be seen. The U.S. naval building program this year is a huge one, but there has been no comparable drive in the merchant marine and fishing fleets.

In the non-Government area of seapower, high wages and costs have driven shipbuilding abroad and many U.S. merchant vessels to the haven of foreign-flag operation. In reverse, many American-flag operators have sought the shelter of government subsidies. Meanwhile Russia, her merchant marine spliced to the total state of the Kremlin, challenges for dominance of the high seas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. BOLLING), for today, on account of business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MAGNUSON (at the request of Mr. WICKERSHAM), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MILLIKEN), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 30 minutes, tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 10 minutes on Monday, September 24.

Mr. CRAMER, for 30 minutes, September 20.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. CAREY.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2292. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates of honorable service in lieu of certificates of disenrollment to certain persons who served as temporary members of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve during World War II;

H.R. 9914. An act for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.;

H.R. 11974. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12870. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4. An act to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore;

S. 149. An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich;

S. 319. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that the provisions of section 4(I)

thereof, relating to long-and-short-haul charges, shall not apply to express companies;

S. 1161. An act to provide for the use of lands in the Garrison Dam project by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation;

S. 1307. An act to amend section 128 of title 28, United States Code, to constitute Richland, Wash., a place of holding court for the eastern district of Washington, southern division, and to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, Southern Division, holding court at Richland, Wash.;

S. 1924. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868) with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 2357. An act to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia;

S. 2511. An act to provide for the production and distribution of educational and training films for use by deaf persons, and for other purposes;

S. 2696. An act to correct certain land descriptions in the act entitled "An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso certain public domain lands";

S. 2971. An act to declare that certain lands of the United States are held by the United States in trust for the Jicarilla Apache Tribe of the Jicarilla Reservation;

S. 3086. An act to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3154. An act to amend Public Law 86–184, an act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State;

S. 3315. An act to relieve owners of abutting property from certain assessments in connection with the repair of alleys and sidewalks in the District of Columbia;

S. 3317. An act to amend the provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 3580. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 20, 1962, at 10 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2538. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a statement relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Hospitals and medical care, Public Health Service," for the fiscal year 1963, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2539. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notice of proposed disposition of low-grade tungsten ore and low-grade tungsten concentrates now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2540. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for a jury commission for each U.S. district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2541. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons, pursuant to section 244(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(4)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2542. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overcharges by the Shipbuilding Division of Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., for overhead costs reimbursed by the Government under cost-type contracts awarded by the Department of the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3120. An act to amend section 6 of the act of May 29, 1884; without amendment (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3152. An act to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program; without amendment (Rept. No. 2430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9491. A bill to provide for the removal of an encumbrance on the title of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the Board of Education of the Vallejo School District, Vallejo, Calif., by the U.S. Housing Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 12479. A bill to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President; with amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 11378. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, educational television stations, and public libraries; with amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11111. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Committee of conference. H.R. 8900. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other non-profit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2435). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-third report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 2436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 10569. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; with amendment (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2859. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2711. An act for the relief of Tasia Demetropoulou (Dimitropoulos); without amendment (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER. Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2753. An act for the relief of Duk Man Lee and Soon Mal Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 2415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2777. An act for the relief of Arild Ericksen Sandli; without amendment (Rept. No. 2416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2836. An act for the relief of Carmelo Rafala; without amendment (Rept. No. 2417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2902. An act for the relief of Sumiko Takahashi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2908. An act for the relief of Rosa Fumarola Balice; without amendment (Rept. No. 2419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2950. An act for the relief of Dwijendra Kumar Misra; without amendment (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2992. An act for the relief of Michelangelo Comito (Nati); without amendment (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3085. An act for the relief of Paul Huygelen and Luba A. Huygelen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3265. An act for the relief of Despina Anastos (Psyhopeda); without amendment (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3267. An act for the relief of Gunter Heinz Hillebrand; without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3275. An act for the relief of Anna Sciamanna Misticoni; without amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3279. An act for the relief of Yet Gee Moy (Tsze Woo Lai) and Mee Sen Moy (Sau Ming Lai); with amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3295. An act for the relief of Mathew Lengyel (also known as Brother Paul, S.V.D.); without amendment (Rept. 2427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3336. An act for the relief of Lazaro Loyola Arinque, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 13176. A bill to increase the participation by counties in revenues from the national wildlife refuge system by amending the act of June 15, 1935, relating to such participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 13177. A bill to provide for post cards of a distinctive color for nonbusiness messages with a postage rate of 1 cent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 886. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. Con. Res. 561. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the Cuban situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. Con. Res. 562. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 563. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to promoting international educational radio and television broadcasting as a means of achieving better understanding among and promoting education of the peoples of the world; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 564. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights by the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 13178. A bill for the relief of Armando DaLio, his wife Domenica Vescovi DaLio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 13179. A bill for the relief of Mr. Hong Song Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 13180. A bill for the relief of Wong Bing Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 13181. A bill for the relief of Esterina Ricupero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Administration of the Davis-Bacon Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a letter from Mr. J. B. Lowe, of Dallas, Tex., inserted in the RECORD of September 14, 1962, by my colleague, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE. In his letter, Mr. Lowe makes some fallacious assertions about practices of the Department of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act. In clarification of those assertions, I submit the following:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1962.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I read with interest the letter of Mr. J. B. Lowe, of Dallas, Tex., which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1962. Unfortunately, Mr. Lowe made a few erroneous statements concerning administration of the Davis-Bacon Act by the Department of Labor.

The Special Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has recently concluded extensive hearings on the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration. I would like to apprise you of the actual practices of the Department in contradiction to Mr. Lowe's statements.

Mr. Lowe's letter indicates that only union rates have been considered by the Labor Department in determining prevailing wages. This is not correct. The Department considers whatever rate is prevailing in a given area, whether it be union or nonunion.

Another fallacy in Mr. Lowe's letter is his assumption that residential construction rates would determine construction rates for nonresidential projects. This is incorrect. Under the Davis-Bacon Act the Secretary of Labor is required to determine prevailing wages from projects of a character similar to the contract work.

The Special Subcommittee on Labor has heard various criticisms of the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration. Such criticism, if constructive, is very helpful. The instant letter, however, raises some criticisms that, to me, seem unfounded. I am sure you would want to be informed of what the subcommittee has learned to be Labor Department practice under this important act.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT, *Chairman.*

Law Observance Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in this age of rising crime I think the country should be aware of an important project which is bringing together the efforts of law enforcement agencies, bar associations, civic organizations and private industry.

The Federal Bar Association through its law observance committee is engaged in a program of promoting respect for law and those who enforce it. The committee consists of the following: Harry D. Shargel, Esq., chairman; Hon. Tom C. Clark, Justice, Supreme Court of the United States; Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General; Hon. Emanuel Celler, chairman, House Judiciary Committee; Hon. Cyrus H. Vance, Secretary of the Army; Abram Chayes, Esq., Legal Adviser, Department of State; Robert H. Knight, Esq., the General Counsel, U.S. Treasury Department; John T. McNaughton, Esq., General Counsel, Department of Defense; Daniel B. Mitchie, Jr., Esq., president, National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions.

The committee is assisted by an advisory staff composed of the following personnel: Radio and Television Advisory Subcommittee: Alfred R. Beckman, vice president, American Broadcasting Co.; Leon Brooks, Esq., Columbia Broadcasting System; Robert F. Hurleigh, president, Mutual Broadcasting System; Howard Monderer, Esq., National Broadcasting Co.; William J. Wheatley, Storer Broadcasting Co.; public information adviser; Charles R. DeHaven, manager of public relations, Philadelphia Gas Works; outdoor advertising adviser: Arthur G. Petry, director of public service, Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc.; community relations adviser: Milton A. Eisenberg, vice president, Yellow Cab Co. of Philadelphia.

This national committee is arranging to have the 50 local chapters of the Federal Bar Association organize chapter law observance committees to engage in activities to educate the public on the importance of respecting the law and law enforcers, raising the morale of law-enforcement agents, attract the best personnel to the field, and inform the

public about the fine work that is being done in the law-enforcement field.

I think we must especially commend the Pennsylvania District of Kiwanis International for underwriting the cost of large outdoor posters bearing the Federal Bar Association slogan, "The Law Protects You—Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It." These posters have already been placed on billboards in the Philadelphia area donated as a public service by the General Outdoor Advertising Co. They will make possible a program pursuant to which such billboards will appear throughout the country. Industry will be asked to cooperate and the first billboard donated by a large industrial firm has already been unveiled in the Camden, N.J., area through the public-spirited contribution of the Radio Corp. of America.

The Federal Bar Association is currently making arrangements for radio and TV participation in the program and I know that we will soon see and hear a great deal about this.

The law observance committee has published a "Manual for Law Observance Committees," to assist in the formation and functioning of such committees and these manuals will be made available to any organization which is willing to participate in the program.

It would be advantageous for Government agencies and private firms to participate in this program.

Patrol Dog Teams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the high incidence of crime in housing projects and outlying areas requires the enforcement agencies to use every means available to prevent crime and to apprehend criminals. The District of Columbia has recognized that an effective deterrent to crime is the use of police-dog teams. I have communicated with the New York City Police Department and urged that department to use police dogs in their police work. The New York City Police Department has indicated that it is taking the matter under advisement.

My interest in the matter has caused me to inquire into the use of police-dog teams, and I find that dogs are used in police work in the following cities, counties, and States:

Cities using dogs in police work: Birmingham, Ala.; Sacramento, Calif.; Bridgeport, Hartford, and Milford, Conn.; Norwalk, Conn.—program about to start; Miami, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Lexington, Ky.; New Orleans, La.; Baltimore, Cumberland, Ocean City, and Mount Rainer, Md.; Brentwood, Kansas City, Overland, and St. Louis, Mo.; Clifton, Elizabeth, and Trenton, N.J.; Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Rochester, N.Y.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Tulsa, Okla.; Lancaster, and Reading, Pa.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Alexandria, Newport News, and Richmond, Va.; and Washington, D.C.

Counties using dogs in police work: Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; and St. Louis County, Mo.

States using dogs in police work: Delaware, Maryland, Michigan, and Virginia.

Our citizens have a right to be protected and we have a right to call upon our enforcement agencies to use whatever means available to decrease the rising incidence of crime.

The Foreign Aid Program for Fiscal Year 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, by Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, September 19, 1962.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am gravely concerned by the drastic cut of over $1,100 million which the Appropriations Committee has recommended in the appropriation requested by the President to conduct the foreign aid program for fiscal year 1963.

That program has a central and major role in our foreign policy whose objectives are to protect the security and promote the welfare of our country. I know that you and your colleagues of both parties in the House are as deeply devoted to the achievement of these high objectives as I am. I feel impelled, therefore, to bring to your attention my deep conviction that those objectives will be greatly endangered if this cut is allowed to stand.

You are as familiar as I am with the worldwide struggle for freedom in which the United States and other nations of the free world have been engaged against the aggressive power of totalitarian communism and of the indispensible role which our foreign aid program has had in preserving freedom in the world. It quite literally saved Europe from chaos and the spread of communism and made possible its regrowth as a strong partner in collective security. It rescued Greece and Turkey from Soviet domination, maintained stability in Iran, preserved the Philippines from Communist insurrection and made possible the continued existence of the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China. It has provided the military assistance vital to creating the free world shield of NATO. It has made possible the economic survival of Israel and the development of India and Pakistan where a fifth of the world's people are showing that progress can be made in freedom—in contrast to the failure and human misery of communism in China.

The great struggle for freedom still continues. Dangers in the Far East are still present. The importance of progress in South Asia is still as great. NATO remains essential to our safety. The Communist effort to penetrate and control the many new nations of Africa goes on. Communism has actually succeeded in establishing a beachhead in our own hemisphere, in Cuba. It is attempting to infiltrate and destroy the freedom of our Latin American neighbors, with whom we are joined in an Alliance for Progress.

Our aid program is a principal and vital instrument of our foreign policy for maintaining the integrity and freedom of the nations of these regions and for helping them in their own efforts toward economic and social progress. Its significance to our own security and welfare is fully recognized by the legislation enacted by the Congress last year and renewed this year.

It is important to realize that the appropriations requested by the President for fiscal year 1963 are intended to carry out the policy authorized by the legislation and initiated last year. The appropriations requested for fiscal year 1963, $4,754.8 million, including funds for the Alliance for Progress, are in fact only 1 percent more than the appropriations actually made and available last year, including the funds for the Alliance for Progress. They are only 3 percent more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1961 (leaving aside the Alliance, which did not then exist).

It is obvious that a drastic cut of the nature recommended by the Appropriations Committee would compel an equally drastic change in and weakening of the policy now carried out by the President pursuant to the legislation itself. I do not believe that any such change in policy is desired or intended by the Congress.

Although the reductions as a whole and in several categories will impair our ability as a nation to pursue the central objectives of our foreign policy, I would like to emphasize the effects of two reductions in particular: those in development lending and in supporting assistance.

Development lending was enacted by the Congress last year as the keystone of our aid program. The new aid agency was to move as rapidly as possible from grants for short-term purposes under the supporting assistance category to dollar-repayable loans for long-term development under the development lending category. Last year the Congress appropriated $1,112.5 million for development lending for fiscal year 1962 and authorized $1,500 million for fiscal year 1963. The President has now asked $1,250 million for fiscal year 1963 under this authorization. The increase over last year is intended to carry forward the policy of transferring aid from grants to dollar-repayable loans. The Appropriations Committee has recommended $775 million—a cut of 38 percent. (The provision of funds for the Alliance for Progress does not reduce this cut. Funds of a comparable amount were provided for the Alliance last year by a separate act.) This cut would obviously make it impossible for the President to carry out the policy established by the Congress of shifting the emphasis from grants to loans. It would reverse that policy.

In fact, the action of the committee would make it impossible to extend any significant new loans beyond those already committed in the past. Let me emphasize that underscored statement. You will recall that last year the Congress provided statutory authority to the President to make long-term commitments, subject to appropriations. Commitments made under this authority, with others already made and explicitly recognized last year, will call for loan funds in fiscal year 1963 amounting to $700 million. The committee recommendation would leave only $75 million for additional lending to such important countries as Greece, Israel, Turkey, the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea.

Such a reversal of established congressional policy would paralyze U.S. leadership in this tremendous task of development and progress in the most dangerously critical areas of the world.

I would urge on you and all Members of the Congress the sober necessity of providing the funds needed to continue that leadership.

Supporting assistance is needed, as you know, primarily to help sustain the economies of nations heavily burdened by military programs which they maintain as part of our agreed free world defense effort. These nations are on the very edge of Communist power, living quite literally under the continuing threat of infiltration, subversion or attack. Supporting assistance also goes to a few nations which provide us with bases or other special facilities—and to others whose internal stability is endangered by serious economic problems and whose collapse could set in train consequences potentially dangerous and highly expensive to our own Nation.

It is our policy to end supporting assistance to any country as soon as its circumstances and our national interest allow it in each case. But until that time comes, it is a dangerous economy to fail to do what needs to be done. The $415 million the President has requested under the authorizing legislation is already well below the $481.5 million for which he asked authorization. The further cut to $350 million recommended by the committee will make it impossible for us to act—or to act adequately—where we should in our own national interest.

The sum requested by the President for development grants, $300 million, is substantially identical with the sum appropriated last year. These funds are needed for basic education, technical training, and the preparation of the public administration officials, particularly in those nations which most recently attained their independence. They are directed toward developing the human resources which are so fundamental to the firm establishment of these new nations and their growth in freedom. The committee cut of $75 million—or 25 percent—would seriously impair our ability to provide fundamental help at a most critical time.

The contingency fund provides the essential margin of safety in our conduct of a highly complex aid program in support of our worldwide foreign policy. The demands on this fund which have arisen since the legislation was originally submitted have already been heavy. The President's request of $300 million is well below the $400 million authorization originally requested. The further cut of $75 million recommended by the committee narrows the margin dangerously below the level of safety.

I warmly welcome the action of the full Appropriations Committee in partially restoring the military assistance funds cut so heavily by the subcommittee. Nevertheless, the $1,500 million which the President has requested—and which is below both the appropriation for last year and the authorization for this year—is in fact needed.

The reduction in the Alliance for Progress, though less severe than the cuts I have discussed, does not support our call to the governments and peoples of this hemisphere to mobilize to defend the freedoms of our own continents.

The sharp reduction in the sum requested for administration of the program can have costly effects far greater than the apparent saving. In our aid program, not only are we engaged in the expenditures of very significant sums, but the wisdom with which we use them can have effects on the future of our Nation far beyond the immediate value of the funds involved. The administrative funds requested are needed to employ the most capable personnel to man the most effective organization we can devise. We cannot do this with the reduced funds recommended.

Finally, I understand the effect of section 109 of the appropriation bill, as recommended, would be to undo the work of the Congress only a few weeks ago in the foreign aid authorizing legislation to give the President authority, under certain circumstances carefully spelled out in the law, to provide aid to such nations as Yugoslavia and Poland. This matter has been extensively discussed in the Congress and I shall not, therefore, repeat the reasons why it is of the highest importance that the authority provided by the Congress in the authorizing legislation be continued.

Our aid program has always been a great national effort. Over the past 14 years, it has always been bipartisan in nature, springing from the needs of our country, not the ambitions of either party. It has been strongly supported by successive Presidents and by both parties. I trust and am confident that support will continue.

I am sending a substantially identical letter to Mr. HALLECK.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

Awards to California Contractor Spread Far Afield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, so often the public gets the impression that if a California firm is awarded a Government contract, the amount of money announced for the contract will all be used and spent in California. This is not at all true. I recently had occasion to look into this with one of the companies in my district, and I believe some of my colleagues will be interested in just exactly what happens to amounts awarded to a large and prominent company in California.

Hughes Aircraft Co. awarded subcontracts to 5,632 companies in 35 States during the first 8 months of 1962 for subassemblies, components and services needed for the company's space, defense, and civilian programs. Hughes subcontract allocations for the first 8 months of 1962 totaled $87 million, of which 48 percent went to small business concerns. Hughes has been very active in small business participation in support of their prime contracts and has participated in Government-industry small business ad hoc committee work to afford small business the greatest possible opportunity to assist in defense and space work.

On November 10, 1961, the Hughes Aircraft Co. was host to 45 representatives of the defense industry and Government in reviewing the role of small business in modern procurement. Participating were representatives of the SBA, DOD, NASA, AEC, Navy, Air Force, Army, General Services Administration, with participants of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Security Industrial Association, Aerospace Industries Association, Electronic Industries Association, Machine and Applied Products Institute and American Gear Manufacturing Association. The meeting at Hughes followed a similar meeting held at Martin and North American, and the purpose was to acquaint all participants with typical prime contractor procurement complexities and to encourage the pursuit of all possible avenues to strengthen major defense industries' small business programs.

With one eye on the long-term future growth and the other on the constant need to develop improved suppliers to meet the new technological requirements required by defense and space programs, Hughes Aircraft Co. opened a Midwest procurement office in Chicago to evaluate the potential of subcontractors in that area. The approach being taken by this office is to make a full determination of what Chicago and the Midwest States can do to help Hughes on its key space and defense programs. It is believed by Hughes that it can obtain more support from its existing subcontractors in the area, and it is Hughes' belief that there are still more manufacturers in the Midwest region who cannot only help the company, but the national defense effort in general.

Hughes spent 13 percent of its subcontract money in the Midwest last year, mostly with manufacturers with which it had been doing business for some time.

Shakespeare: Soul of an Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the 400th anniversary of the birth of William Shakespeare, the fabulous "Bard of Avon," takes place on April 23, 1964. Observance of this event is expected to take place in free countries the world over in honor of one of the most gifted literary talents of all time; a talent whose impact has been felt wherever books are published and read.

It is significant to note at this time that one of our leading television networks—the National Broadcasting Co.—has anticipated the 400th anniversary of Mr. Shakespeare's birth with an NBC news production titled, "Shakespeare: Soul of an Age." This production will be broadcast in color for a full hour over NBC-TV's nationwide network on Friday, November 30, 1962, from 7:30 to 8:30 p.m., eastern standard time. It will be, I understand, no ordinary presentation of Shakespeare's works, but a scholarly as well as entertaining undertaking designed to show what remains on earth that recalls Shakespeare's life. Through the eyes of the TV color camera, audiences will visit the places which have come to be traditionally associated with many of the characters of Shakespeare's tragedies, histories, and comedies.

The presentation will re-create the mood of these literary landmarks and hear Shakespeare's words in their proper geographical settings. In dedicated research for authenticity as well as entertainment, NBC-TV camera crews journeyed in the footsteps of Shakespeare to England, Wales, Scotland, and

France. Many of the characters of his plays, filmed in color, comprise the illuminating and exciting sequences to be seen and heard on this program.

Sir Michael Redgrave, voicing excerpts from Shakespeare's plays, will star in this NBC News production of "Shakespeare: Soul of an Age," and Sir Ralph Richardson will be its guest narrator. These are two of the most eminent actors in the British theater, and both are well known for their interpretation of Shakespearean roles. In addition to Redgrave, a group of prominent English actors will be seen in scenes from the poet's histories, tragedies and comedies.

Reconstructing Shakespeare's life, the television cameras will explore existing landmarks in Stratford-on-Avon and the surrounding countryside, as well as the other places connected with many of his plays.

The program's title comes from Ben Jonson's lines:

> Shakespeare, Sweet Swan of Avon
> What a sight it were
> To see thee in waters yet appear—
> Soul of the age.

Lou Hazam, noted television producer, produced and wrote the program, and Guy Blanchard is director-cameraman for this noteworthy artistic effort.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate for us to express appreciation to the National Broadcasting Co., which, through NBC News, will bring into the homes of millions of American families this important television program, a program which marks still another of the important contributions to news, public affairs and the arts that this network has presented through the years.

Time for Realism on the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to appear today by invitation of the chairman, Mr. MONAGAN, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Europe, on the burning public issue of the captive nations.

The purpose of my appearance was to raise eight basic questions related to the national security of the United States in the context of this vital but neglected area of our foreign policy. I raised these questions because I am convinced that Congress, in these trying times, must be more than the voice of the American people. Congress must, in my considered judgment, be the conscience of the American people in the development and execution of a foreign policy that accords with the great traditions of our country. Nothing more is needed to pull us out of the depths of our dilemma, but nothing less will suffice to meet the global challenge of imperial Russian communism.

Under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD my testimony:

TESTIMONY OF HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, CONGRESSMAN, 20TH DISTRICT, OHIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate receipt of your letter of July 25, 1962, inviting Members of the House to submit testimony concerning the captive nations.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to present my views on the issue of captive nations because I have long been an advocate of the rights of all nations and all peoples to self-government and national independence. Such views accord with the basic traditions of our country, with our political ideals, with our moral principles, and with our oft-stated intentions toward all the nations and people of the world.

I observe from your communication of July 25 that the subcommittee has taken testimony from persons having expert knowledge of conditions in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. It struck me as peculiar that testimony before this subcommittee would be limited to a select few of the captive nations held by force within the present day Russian Communist Empire. It may be that geographical limitations placed upon the Subcommittee on Europe result in this condition. I trust this is the case, because any other reason could not survive the honest test of what constitutes a captive nation, expertly defined in Public Law 86-90, known as the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

Let me make this clear, Mr. Chairman, I stand for the freedom and national independence of all the nations and which this subcommittee has taken testimony. But let me make this equally clear—I stand without reservation for the rights of all the nations spelled out in Public Law 86-90 in their quest for freedom and national independence. Freedom is indivisible. The worldwide movement toward national independence is equally indivisible. I maintain that the unity of freedom's cause is vital to the survival of freedom anywhere in the world. I maintain with equal conviction that any effort, accidental or intentional, to divide the cause of freedom—expressed through the desires of all the captive nations to regain their national independence is divisive, dangerous in the extreme, self-defeating and a black mark upon the historic traditions of our Nation.

It will be a sad day for the peoples of Asia if, by these hearings, the impression is created that our Government is concerned only with those captive nations which fall within the purview of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. A casual examination of geography reveals that the 600 million or more people of mainland China are captives of the mythology of Marxism supported by the imperial power of Moscow. Such an examination will also reveal that the people of ancient Tibet are no less captives of this tyrannical scourge—as are the people of North Korea and North Vietnam.

It will be equally damaging to the cause of American leadership if, as a consequence of these hearings, word goes out that our Government is not interested in the aspirations or the future of the captive nations in the central Asian part of the modern day Russian Empire. I have particular reference to such ancient nations as Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural. All of these nations declared and won their national independence and complete separation from imperial Russia during the period 1917-21. Acts of Russian Communist aggression which robbed these nations of their newly won national independence must not be allowed to purge the honest judgment of history. Genuine scholars are thoroughly acquainted with the historic struggles of these nations against the imperial encroachments of Moscow. Those who are not inclined toward or do not have the time for genuine scholarship in regard to these nations, can find a quick summary of the history and aspirations of these nations in the reports of the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress. Eyewitness testimony taken under oath and supported by reliable documents establish the facts concerning the rights of these nations to be regarded as captive nations. Popular ignorance concerning the history of these nations is no excuse for our failure to give them equal consideration in any deliberations relating to the issue of freedom versus human slavery.

Turning to the captive nations of Europe, I raise the question as to why the Ukraine nation and the Byelorussian nation have not been considered within the immediate purview of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee as expressed in the letter of July 25, 1962, of Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN.

These two nations have long been considered a part of Europe by competent historians. As far back as the 13th century European cosmographers and cartographers have identified Ukraine as part of the European geographical area. Noted in this regard is the work of a Frenchman, Beauplan, whose maps and charts of Ukraine were published in 1651. I admit that the work of early cosmographers and cartographers may be difficult to include in hearings of this type, but I submit that any scholarly examination of the issue of the captive nations requires an understanding and appreciation in depth of geography.

The world atlas of the Encyclopaedia Brittannica divides the U.S.S.R., the contemporary land mass of the Russian Empire, into its European and Asian parts. Both the Ukrainian nation and the Byelorussian nation are listed as European parts of that Empire.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that it is a dangerous exercise in folly, if not political suicide, to disregard the long history and the contemporary aspirations of the people of Ukraine, a nation inhabited by some 42 million people, among the great European powers, and holding unbreakable attachments to the history and culture of Europe. The same may be said for the Byelorussian nation whose population today approximates 15 million people, but which has no less an attachment to the history and to the future of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I now come to the reason which compels me to appear before this subcommittee. My purpose is best expressed in a series of questions which I present for the consideration of the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Those questions are as follows:

1. Does the committee believe that the only captive nations within the present-day Russian Empire worthy of our consideration and solicitude are those which, by an arbitrary decision, are considered a part of Europe? I trust this is not the case because no one but imperial Russia could be served by such a decision.

2. Does the committee, in its considered judgment, agree that captive nations, regardless of their geographical location, merit equal concern and solicitude by the Government of the United States? I trust this is the case, because any other approach to this vital issue will divide freedom's cause, support the propaganda of imperial Russia, spread despair among multitudes of captive people, and in the end, earn nothing but contempt for our purposes among the suffering masses of the non-European parts of

the present-day Russian Empire. We must not permit these things to happen.

3. Has the Subcommittee on Europe been limited in its purview of this Eurasian problem in any manner which prohibits an honest and open examination of the captive non-Russian nations within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? There is current public suspicion that these hearings seek to avoid an objective and deliberative examination of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, either because of the feelings of the State Department expressed in the letter of Secretary Rusk to the chairman of the House Rules Committee in connection with the pending resolution—House Resolution 211—or because an open examination of the rights of those captive nations would interfere with or impair delicate negotiations now under way with the leaders of the U.S.S.R.? I trust this is not the case, because any concealment or delay of freedom's cause, accidental or deliberate, can only increase the prospects of war over the long run.

4. Is the committee aware of the special interests in the Department of State which hold that there is nothing wrong with the Soviet Union that a change in Moscow from a Communist government to a non-Communist government would not cure? These special pleaders appear to be completely unaware that the Russian Empire under the czars was a constant threat to the survival of Western civilization, as it is today under the commissars. Russian imperialism—whether red, black, or white—is out of tune with the rising tide of self-determination so well described by President Kennedy in his address before the United Nations. Moreover, any action, statement or omission on the part of our Government which tends to favor or support a Russian Empire, under any name, brands us as ignorant reactionaries in the eyes of our proven allies behind the Russian curtain. I urge a thoroughgoing public investigation of what I have called the doctrine of Russia, the sacred cow, and its practitioners in our Department of State.

5. To what extent has the committee probed into the policy conflicts within the Department of State with regard to the political principle of self-determination and its application to the global problems of colonialism and imperialism? For example, a policy of Africa for the Africans heralds our support for the full application of self-determination for all of Africa. What prevents our announcing a policy of Russia for the Russians as an expression of our support for the aspirations of the people in the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union? We have invited the charge against our country of discrimination on a massive scale for failing to give universal application to the principle of self-determination. This policy conflict is underscored again by the opposing points of view expressed by Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Stevenson. At the United Nations Ambassador Stevenson properly charges the Russian Communists with colonial aggression for robbing Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and other once free nations of their national independence in the years immediately following World War I. Here in Washington Secretary Rusk lends his signature to a letter which holds in effect that these same captive nations never had their national independence, and worse, they are regarded by our Government as traditional parts of the Russian state. This confusion at the highest policy levels of our Government indicates someone needs a few basic lessons in history—and I do not mean Ambassador Stevenson.

6. To what extent is the committee interested in establishing the connection between the collapse of the Red army before the invading German armies during World War II and the aspirations for freedom and independence long held by the people of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, the Caucasus and others? It is time that we flushed up the truth on this chapter of history. What motivated in excess of 2 million Red army soldiers to lay down their arms in the thick of battle? Were these soldiers Russians or nonRussians? What proposition did these soldiers make to the German commanders and what prevented the German commanders' accepting the proposition? How did the civilian populations of Byelorussia, Ukraine, the Baltic States, and the Caucasus react to the German armies in the early months of conflict on the eastern front and what caused them to change their attitude as the war wore on? Answers to these questions have a vital bearing on the question of which is and which is not a captive nation. It would be a tragedy of immeasurable magnitude if we, in the conduct of the cold war, made the same ideological mistakes as those made by the fanatic Nazis in their conduct of a hot war. For the cold war with the Russians holds no less a danger for our country than a hot war.

7. Is the committee aware of the organized assault being made by Russian emigree organizations in the United States against Public Law 86–90 and the parallel which exists between their propaganda line and that of the Russian commissars on this issue? Is the committee aware of the enthusiastic support for Public Law 86–90 given by all the non-Russian emigree organizations in the United States? A worthy public service would be rendered by this committee if it probed fully into the similarity of position on this issue assumed by the Russian emigrees, the Russian commissars, and the State Department doctrine of Russia, the sacred cow. Such a probe conducted within the framework of what policy position best serves the security of the United States and what policy position best serves Russian imperial ambitions would be a most rewarding exercise.

8. Has the subcommittee sought testimony from responsible representatives of the American Committee for Liberation, which sponsors "Radio Liberation," a powerful radio signal beamed to the U.S.S.R.? I raise this question because I observe in the letter of Mr. MONAGAN of July 25, 1962, that testimony has been taken from the president of the Free Europe Committee. I urge that representatives of the American Committee for Liberation be brought before an appropriate committee of the Congress to testify as to its political aims and objectives with respect to the captive non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Such a quest for information, if properly conducted, would be most revealing in terms of Public Law 86–90 and the basic question of the indivisibility of human freedom and national independence.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the problem which engages the leadership of the House with regard to the establishment of a Select Committee of the House on the Captive Nations, as proposed in House Resolution 211. Strong public support favors action by the House to establish such a committee. The trend of the times underscores the need. I have favored the establishment of such a committee because I believe that the geographical limitations inherent in the present subcommittee structure of the House Foreign Affairs Committee would make it unduly cumbersome, if not impossible, to do justice to this vital issue. I submit that if the House does not establish a Select Committee on the Captive Nations, it is incumbent upon the House Foreign Affairs Committee to establish a subcommittee on the Captive Nations, which should not be limited by geographical considerations and which should concern itself with all the captive nations identified in Public Law 86–90.

My appearance before this subcommittee today, I hope, will contribute to a resolution of one of the most burning issues before the 87th Congress. If the House Foreign Affairs Committee is to be held responsible for a full, objective, scholarly, and purposeful examination of matters relating to the captive nations, it must take steps properly to assume this responsibility. Otherwise there is no other course open to Members of Congress who are informed on and concerned about the cause of the captive nations, as identified in Public Law 86–90, but to advocate the establishment of a select committee of the Congress on the captive nations.

I urge that this problem be resolved before the adjournment of the 87th Congress. The power of decision on this question rests within your committee. It is time that action was taken.

"Iliopsoas"—Muscles and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, last week I was thrilled to be appointed by Mr. CLARENCE CANNON to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare. These are subjects in which I have been keenly and vitally interested, not only by reasons of early misfortunes, but because of the sensitivity to the needs of my fellow man and the youth of our country.

I owe a great deal to the medical profession. I admire those who follow the vows of the Hippocratic oath. Their profession is one of the noblest of all. Few violate their great responsibilities and few pursue the golden calf to the detriment of their patients.

In my present congressional district is the New York Medical College Flower-Fifth Avenue Hospital, which for the past hundred years has made, and is still making, numberless contributions to advancement in medical science, in which field lies the primary responsibility of determination and maintenance of physical fitness.

Dr. Arthur Michele, professor and chairman of the Department of Orthopedic Surgery, New York Medical College, has written a book, published just recently by Charles C. Thomas, of Springfield, Ill., in which he presents the results of 5 years of intensive research, study, and experiment, culminating in the establishment of unequivocal criteria of physical fitness. The title of the book, "Iliopsoas," does not connote the discussion of a muscle per se, but rather of an intrinsic force harbored by man within his own body and which in a maladapted individual is capable of bringing into activity a host of disorders and bodily deformities. Incredible as it may appear at first glance, this force or power represents a potential of destruction to the human race far beyond that of the H-bomb.

When I venture the opinion that the significance of Dr. Michele's accomplishment is immeasurable, I know whereof I speak, for I have suffered greatly by reason of a childhood disorder, whose infirmity and blemish re-

main with me. And I can well testify to the efficacy of the doctor's work, for he is my orthopedic surgeon.

The need for the White House Conference for the Study of Physical Fitness, stemming from the status as determined during mobilization of our forces in World War II, is in itself a challenge to all workers in the field of man's physical well-being and to the medical profession in particular. It goes without saying that in a situation where survival of a nation may depend upon the activities of its defensive forces, there must not be even the shadow of a doubt as to the fitness of the members of those forces.

Discovery of the sulfonamides and antibiotics has done much toward eradication of specific infectious diseases; steroids have been effective in arresting the devastation caused by rheumatoid diseases, and vaccines have erased severe poliomyelitis epidemics. There remains with us, however, an ever expanding group of youths who inevitably will fall into the category of the physically unfit. The burden of responsibility inherent in the task of classifying and preparing the military and other services for possible active combat is a heavy one; there must be cognizance of the repressions, progressions, and adjustments of the human biological organism incidental to the demands of ever changing environmental conditions, so that their reflective manifestations may be discerned, and identified and interpreted and their significance weighed in arriving at a true evaluation of fitness. Ponderous as the burden may be, it may be assumed with confidence in the light of total comprehension of the vital, pivotal factor involved, the kinesiology of the human body.

The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection defines body mechanics as "the mechanical correlation of the various systems of the body with special reference to the skeletal, muscular, and visceral systems and their neurological association. Normal body mechanics may be said to obtain when this mechanical correlation is the most favorable to the function of these systems." This again implies a study of kinesiology, both physiological and pathological, and recognition of the significance of "Illiopsoas" influence.

Too often deformities which Dr. Michele has perceived to derive from nothing more than maladaptation by the individual to his environment have been found causes for rejection by the military, as well as deterrents to the full enjoyment of life and chosen vocation. A fundamental knowledge of the principles of kinesiology and their application in given situations would have expedited early detection of maladaptation and its correction, with consequent restoration of the nonvulnerable individual to a status not only acceptable by military standards, but also enabling him to follow his life's normal pattern insofar as physical well-being is concerned.

There is no doubt that much can be done to rectify in some measure the results of abnormal body mechanics. Greater attention should, however, be directed toward eradication of those maladies that follow maladaptation, lag in or failure of readjustment during the rapid growth period in the development of our youths; adjustment made mandatory by man's achievement of his self-appointed goal, the erect posture. According to Dr. Michele errors of posture are but reflections of maladaptation, and one must be competent to recognize circumstances and situations favorable to the incipience of malposture; furthermore, that the first to be considered are hip dislocations in infants and their classification, for the doctor believes that any program for physical fitness of the future citizen should commence with the mother-to-be.

In his book, "Illiopsoas," Dr. Michele offers his concept of the formation of deformaties in man, a plan for the earliest detection of physical unfitness or its potential, and a rational approach to management and correction of infirmities revealed. He is confident that any fitness program formulated in the light of a complete comprehension of the principles expounded in his book may be undertaken with the assurance that it will achieve its goal, a physically fit individual in perfect balance with his environment, capable of a full and productive life and of service to his country should the need arise.

Buffalo, N.Y., Host to Polish Union of America's 25th Quadrennial Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 19, 1962, the city of Buffalo, N.Y., was host to the Polish Union of America on the occasion of their 25th quadrennial convention.

The highlight of the convention was a banquet held on Sunday, August 19, at the Hotel Statler-Hilton in Buffalo, under the careful guidance of Mr. Alfred F. Wolinski and Mr. John Krysinski, the reception chairman.

The toastmaster for the evening was the Honorable Chester C. Gorski, president of the city council of Buffalo.

The invocation was given by the Right Reverend Monsignor Peter J. Adamski, P.A.

Greetings were extended to the delegates and guests by Mr. Walter J. Lohr, president of the Polish Union of America.

His message follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, as president of the Polish Union of America, it gives me more than usual pleasure, to extend a hearty welcome to His Excellency Bishop Leo R. Smith, our honorary chaplain of the Polish Union of America, whose friendship, is one of the most precious possessions one can hope to enjoy, always interested in the good of our organization and the welfare of its members. I also want to extend our welcome to the right reverend, the very reverend monsignories, the reverend clergy, to Congressman Thaddeus Dulski, to Senator Walter Mahoney, to Mayor John Ogarek, mayor of the city of Lackawanna, to Mr. Frank Luchowski, representative of mayor Chester Kowal, mayor of the city of good neighbors, Buffalo, who unfortunately cannot be with us, for reasons known to all of us, to Mr. Stanley Turkiewicz, president of one of the largest Polish Roman Catholic organizations in America, to the representatives of our brother and sister organizations, to the delegates and members of our organization and to all our friends, who have honored us by their presence here tonight, the opening of the 25th quadrennial convention.

I also want to thank Mr. John Krysinski, our national vice president who has labored, most earnestly and most cheerfully, to make this banquet a success.

Ladies and gentlemen, anyone who lives fully and makes a contribution to the community in which he lives, is a success.

This motto, can be applied to the fullest extent, to the Polish Union of America, a fraternal as well as a beneficial, organization of American citizens of Polish extraction.

Its worth reflects the wisdom of the founders of the Polish Union of America, the late John Pitass, pastor of St. Stanislaus Parish, Buffalo, N.Y., and the late Reverend Dominik Majer, of St. Paul, Minn., who built this organization on the enduring foundation, and religious principles, to support its purposes and religious practices, on the part of its membership, to insure its perpetuity.

Through their guiding genius, the stupendous undertaking, was launched as the Polish Union of America.

The Polish Union of America, was a product of historic necessity, it helped to preserve, what is best in the Polish background and tradition, of its members and incorporate it, into the American way of life, of which they are an integral part.

The members of the Polish Union of America contributed, to American industry, commerce, education, religious and charity. It may not be widely known, but cannot be ignored and minimized.

America to some of us, may be an adopted land, but to most of us, born here, is a home of the free and mighty, in the championship of freedom, to all peace-loving countries of the world.

While some of us despair about the future of the Polish American status, and point out, that the Polish language is spoken less and less, that the Polish American press is losing support and our fraternal organizations are not gaining enough new members, and generally claim, that our Polonia is doomed, I say, have faith

Work and work hard, because Polonia is not wasting away, falling apart and sliding into an abyss, but on the contrary, it is living a healthy normal life, based on strong and enduring principles, principles which have guided the life of the Polish American community in its religious, family, social, intellectual, economic, cultural, political and fraternal manifestations.

It is based, on positive established principles, so well embodied in the Polish Union of America, for the past 72 years, in this motto: "Unity is Strength."

Again I repeat, let us have faith, and upkeep, what our forefathers built, and as long as we have organizations, such as the Polish Union of America and others, we will succeed and benefit. As I said at the very outset of my address of welcome, anyone who lives fully and makes a contribution, to the community in which he lives, is a success, and the Polish Union of America is a success.

In conclusion, it is our hope, that you will enjoy the program arranged by the committee, but perhaps, more than that, we hope that all our thinking will be provoked, so that we will renew our efforts to promote fraternalism in its purest form.

Fraternalism, has a definite mission. Fraternalism, is a patriotic and democratic institution, founded on the principles of democracy.

It has always been a strong and beneficial influence in our Nation's history and is sorely needed today, when we are beset on every side, by other concepts of life—isms, which would destroy our Government, of, by, and for the people.

The Honorable Walter J. Mahoney, New York State senator, delivered the following address:

In a few days, September 1, we will mark the 23d anniversary of the infamous day when Poland was invaded by Hitler's Nazi hordes and World War II began. The gallant defense by Poland will go down in history as one of the most heroic chapters in the never-ending fight for freedom. Today, that fight is still going on against an equally vicious tyranny, the forces of atheistic communism. The Polish people are still in the forefront, and they deserve our prayers and encouragement. I am confident that one day they will throw off the chains of dictatorship.

The great contribution the Polish Union makes in providing insurance for its membership is well known outside your community. This is, of course, vitally important. But you are to be congratulated also for the lesser known social-service aspects of your organization. In these days when the concept of family life is under attack from all sides, and when people more and more are being encouraged to depend on government for the things which might better and more properly be done by themselves and their neighbors, this is indeed a heartening thing.

America's greatness has been its ability to draw upon the cultures of all of the many peoples who have come to her shores, preserving the best of each while uniting all under a common devotion to their adopted land. We must strive to retain the interest of our young people in their respective heritages, so that while we all fuse in the great melting pot, we do not lose sight of the great contributions each national group has made.

Senator Mahoney brought the following message from the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, August 17, 1962.

MR. WALTER J. LOHR,
President, Polish Union of America,
Buffalo, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LOHR: The 25th quadrennial convention of the Polish Union of America affords me the welcome opportunity of sending my cordial greetings to all present at the preconvention dinner.

The Polish Union, thanks to able leadership, has done a remarkably good job. It has maintained the ideals of ancient Polish traditions. It has preserved among the Americans of Polish origin respect for Polish history and Polish customs. It has contributed to the happiness and welfare of its members. It has encouraged fidelity to Poland's passionate belief in man's right to his own soul and his own integrity. God did not make the Poles to be slaves.

Among the finest of our citizens are those of Polish origin. Your great generals, Pulaski and Kosciusko, helped us win our freedom, and those who came after have defended, expanded, and enhanced it. You helped to build our railroads. You helped clear and till our fields; you helped man our factories; your thriftiness helped finance our economic growth; you have made distinguished contributions in the arts and professions; and when the call to arms has been sounded, Americans of Polish origin have customarily responded in numbers far beyond your proportion in our population.

You have been freedom fighters, not only when freedom was threatened by tyrants but also in the day-to-day struggle to keep it viable and strong.

My best wishes for a happy convention.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

Greetings were extended by the Honorable Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo, who was represented by Mr. Frank Luchowski.

Choral selections were offered by the Kalina Singing Society No. 221 P.S.A., under the direction of Mr. Peter Gorecki.

Greetings were also extended from the Polish Clergy Association by the Reverend Joseph Stelmach, president.

It was a pleasure for me to address the delegates and guests and my text follows:

It is an honor and a great personal pleasure to address this great convention of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

As I am sure you are all aware, the Polish contribution to American life extends back to the time of the earliest voyages of exploration. Poles have participated in every American conflict. They made notable contributions to the American Revolutionary effort. At the time of the Civil War there were some 30,000 Poles in the United States. Of this number, 4,000 fought in the Union Army and 1,000 in the Army of the Confederate States. When President Lincoln made his appeal for volunteers, typical of those who responded was General Kryzanowski who distinguished himself at the battles of Cross Keys, Bull Run, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg. He was appointed the first Governor of Alaska, served in Panama, and died in 1887. In 1938 his remains were transferred to the Arlington National Cemetery. Polish-Americans have fought in the Spanish War, both World Wars, and the Korean war. Their heroism is one of the great parts of the tradition of the Polish people in America. But an important part of that same tradition is the history of the organization met in convention here today, the great patriotic, religious, fraternal, Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

The founding, growth, and tradition of service of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America grew naturally out of the history of the Polish people in the United States. In 1870 there were some 50,000 Poles and 10 Polish parishes in America; in 1875 there were 200,000 Poles and 50 parishes. By 1889 there were 800,000 Poles in 132 churches led by 126 priests. At that time Wisconsin had the largest number of Polish settlements, and Chicago had the largest Polish population. Today there are more than 1,000 churches with Polish parishioners. Most Polish Americans live in the regions of the Great Lakes, lower New England, New York, and Pennsylvania. Chicago, with a population of over a half million Poles is the second largest Polish city in the world; Warsaw is the first.

The first Polish mutual aid society established in the United States was that of St. Stanislaus Kostka, in Chicago, in 1864. In time, Polish parishes were established which became the centers of social and cultural activities. The tendency toward concentration grew stronger. At the turn of the century, for example, two Polish parishes alone were larger than many dioceses. In 1899, St. Stanislaus Kostka parish of Chicago had a membership of over 50,000 parishioners, and the Buffalo parish of St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr numbered 30,000 parishioners. The parish church in America took on the form of a Poland in miniature. With the establishment of the parish, new institutions, especially the parochial school came into being. The purpose of the parochial school was not only to impart Christian education but to acquaint the child with its Polish heritage.

Since the Polish parishes were the centers of all community activities, an informal federation of parish leaders joined Father Gieryk to promote unity among the American Poles. The first convention met in Detroit; the name "Polish Roman Catholic Union" was adopted.

Thus, the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America became a fraternal organization which not only insures its members, but also gives help and assistance to them in commercial and educational endeavors. It helps its handicapped and unfortunate members in the spirit of brotherhood.

From the beginning, the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America has contributed to the founding, building, and expansion of the Polish-American school system. Various schools throughout the United States have been recipients of this aid. They include St. Stanislaus Kostka College in Chicago, and St. John Cantious College in Erie, Pa. Every convention of the Polish Roman Catholic Union in America has shown a strong interest in education.

The union, by using funds from assessed dues, also laid the foundation for the Polish Seminary at Orchard Lake, Detroit, Mich., the oldest Polish institution of higher learning in the United States.

The fifth convention of the union devoted itself to the problem of Polish orphans. The plans then made were realized in 1885 with the establishment of an orphanage in Chicago under the direction of the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth. In 1891 the union helped establish in New York City the Polish Emigration House of Saint Joseph, a social agency for the protection of Polish immigrants. In 1894 it helped build a Polish-American pavilion at the Polish National Exposition in Lwow, Poland. In 1901 and again in 1903, at Pittsburgh, the union took a leading part in the second and third Polish Catholic Congresses which strove for Polish representation in the American Catholic hierarchy. In 1904 the union contributed to the Chicago monument to Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the American Revolutionary War hero.

In 1918 the union established its juvenile department whose primary purposes were to insure the future growth of the organization and the training in character of Polish youth born in the United States. In 1935 the sports department was formed; in 1937 the youth department replaced the sports department.

In 1908 the library was established; today it is a nationally know institution having the largest collection of Polonica in English. The union has published a series of books dealing with the history of Polish-Americans. These annals are the organ of the archives and museum of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America. In 1897 the union established Narod Polski as the official organ of the organization. Issued on the first and third Mondays of every month, it is free to members.

This great tradition of service and achievement deserves commemoration here today, and I am well aware that all in attendance at this convention intend that the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America will add new and further triumphs to its splendid record.

The convention was honored by receiving a message from the President of the United States, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, which was read at the opening meeting on Monday, August 20.

The President's message follows:

It is a pleasure to send warm greetings to the members of the Polish Union of America on the occasion of your 25th quadrennial convention. I am delighted to convey these words through Congressman DULSKI.

As Americans of Polish descent, you may be proud of the contributions made by Generals Pulaski and Kosciuszko, so many others of your countrymen, and you of this generation to the American way of life and to the ideals of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

With every good wish for a successful convention and for continuing progress in the important work you are doing.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The principal speaker was Dr. Stephen A. Graczyk, K.S.G., medical director, Care of the Aged, Catholic Charities, diocese of Buffalo, who gave a very interesting address on medical care, a topic on which he is well qualified to speak. Dr. Graczyk is an authority on this subject, because of his vast experience and the many positions he holds.

The concluding speaker was his excellency, the Most Reverend Leo R. Smith, D.D., who lifted us spiritually by stressing our obligations to God and our country.

Inquiry Into Political Morality and Lobbies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two excellent articles by my colleague, Mr. MCCARTHY, which appeared this summer in the New York Times magazine.

The first one is entitled "An Inquiry Into Political Morality"; and the second is entitled "A Senator Looks at the Lobbies."

I know that all who are interested in government and in the legislative process will find these articles of great interest and value.

I wish to commend my colleague for the fine quality of these two articles.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times magazine, July 1, 1962]

AN INQUIRY INTO POLITICAL MORALITY: A SENATOR EXAMINES THE REASONS FOR THE TOO FREQUENT LAPSES IN PUBLIC ETHICS AND SUGGESTS WHERE RESPONSIBILITY LIES FOR CREATING AND ENFORCING HIGHER STANDARDS

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY)

(NOTE.—EUGENE J. MCCARTHY is a former professor of economics and sociology who took office as Senator, Democrat, from Minnesota in 1959. He wrote "Frontiers of American Democracy.")

WASHINGTON.—The morality of men who hold public office—a matter being brought forcibly to public attention in the case involving Billie Sol Estes—has been a subject of concern throughout the history of the United States.

An essay, attributed to Alexander Hamilton, in the "Federalist Papers" in 1788 states: "The aim of every political constitution is, or ought to be, first to obtain for rulers men who possess most wisdom to discern, and most virtue to pursue, the common good of society; and in the next place to take the most effectual precautions for keeping them virtuous."

One hundred and fifty years later, Peter Odegard, in an article on corruption written for the "Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences," observed that among the great modern nations the United States had had the least enviable record with regard to the morality of its public officials.

Fourteen years later, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, in commenting on the investigations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, said: "As our study of the RFC progressed, we were confronted more and more with problems of ethical conduct." He asked these questions: "How do we deal with those who under the guise of friendship accept favors which offend the spirit of the law, but do not violate the letter? What of the men outside Government who suborn those inside it? Who is more at fault, the bribed or the bribers?" How, he asked, do we deal with the disturbing problem that "among so many influential people, morality has become identical with legality."

The findings of congressional and executive investigations, reports of State and local governments—official and unofficial—indicate that the moral and ethical standards of public officials have not improved much since 1951. Congressional committees are now looking into not only the Estes case but also scandals in the national highway-construction program, price fixing, and excessive profit taking on Government contracts, even on those vitally related to national defense.

It is not important to determine whether present conditions are better or worse than those of the past; what is, is bad enough. It is important that two questions be asked and answered, if possible.

First, what are the causes of the present state of morality or lack of morality; and, second, what can be done to bring about a change for the better?

The explanation of the present state of public or political morality or immorality is not to be found in simple one-cause statements such as in a recent Senate report "that corruption is the inevitable result when one party or one faction remains too long in power." Neither is it to be found in sweeping generalizations regarding the inevitable corruption of democratic government; nor can it be explained away in terms of technique, codes and procedures of government. We must look for more fundamental causes.

There are, I think, at least three distinguishable ones: first, the general level of morality prevailing in the United States; second, the level of morality in business and in the legal profession, as well as in those other professions that directly bear on government and politics, and, third, the lack of a strong tradition of political responsibility and of the honor of public office in the United States.

Let us look first at the general level of morality in the United States. Americans by and large are concerned about the ethical aspects of politics and business. There is widespread protest against clear cases of bribery and graft and outright theft. "Throw the rascals out" is a popular campaign slogan. On the other hand, it is a matter of common knowledge, sustained by reports and statistical records, that the level is not so high as we would like it to be. Why?

Ideas do have consequences. There is less respect today for old-fashioned morality and for the hard-and-fast principles of honesty that were formerly enforced by religious conviction. Today there is rather wide acceptance among philosophies of the relativism of morality. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find some government officials and businessmen making up rules which, although convenient to their own purposes, are not based upon traditional or reasoned standards of right and wrong, truth or falsehood.

The level of strength of the virtue prevailing among citizens will inevitably be reflected in the conduct of officials—since they are drawn from the body of citizens and are formed and influenced by the moral standards which are generally accepted and observed.

The conduct of public officials is likely to be affected particularly by the standards of conduct prevailing in business and in the professions that touch most directly upon government. It is significant that, in many cases in which public officials accused of wrongdoings have attempted to defend themselves, they have argued that their actions were fully within the bounds of accepted practice in the business or professional world from which they had come.

Disclosures of dishonesty and misrepresentation in the fixing of radio and television programs a few years ago turned the spotlight of publicity on those associated with the communications and entertainment industry. These findings, however, have significant bearing upon other fields of business and professional activity and especially upon politics, in which the temptation to oversimplify and misrepresent is always strong.

In our society falsification is universally condemned, yet the practice in greater or lesser degree is widespread and to some extent condoned. The problem is complicated. Carl Sandburg, in "The People, Yes," asks the searching question: "What kind of a liar are you?"

"People lie because they don't remember clear what they say.

"People lie because they can't help making a story better than it was the way it happened.

"People tell white lies so as to be decent to others.

"People lie in a pinch, hating to do it, but lying on because it might be worse.

"And people lie just to be liars for crooked gain.

"What sort of a liar are you?

"Which of these liars are you?"

Carl Snyder, in his book, "Capitalism the Creator," observes that despite our prejudices we must acknowledge that avarice and greed have been the great forces in the building of America. This is too harsh a judgment, but certainly it is true that the opportunist and the sharp dealer are not unknown in the business world.

They may not sit at the head of the table, but often the high-pressure artist, the dealer in influence, the public-relations man skilled in expanding doubt or contracting truth as the case demands, and the disciples of Hermes, sit at the right hand.

The term, "free enterprise," which has a good and defensible meaning, has been abused. For many it has been the excuse for sweeping rejection of social justice and responsibility, for the rejection of traditional conceptions of right and wrong. "Legality" for many has become the watchword; they see little wrong in avoiding legal obligations, as indicated in the Internal Revenue Service estimate that something over $25 billion of taxable income goes unreported in the United States each year.

John Cassidy, who argued the question of political morality with Mr. Dooley at the turn of the century, insisted that he "niver knew a pollytician to go wrong ontil he's been contaminated by contact with a businessman."

This oversimplifies, but it does point to the fact that there is in nearly every case of

corruption a double responsibility or a shared responsibility.

In the long run, the indirect and more subtle influence resulting from the transfer of an exploitative and self-seeking philosophy can be more destructive of morality in public office than the direct influence of bribery.

The third general cause bearing on morality in public service in the United States is the lack of any strong tradition of the responsibilities and special obligations—and the honor—of public office.

In the beginning of our national existence, we cut ourselves away from the aristocratic traditions of the Old World and adopted an egalitarian political philosophy. Every citizen was given a share of the political power which, in the old order, had been restricted to the aristocracy.

In transferring political rights to each citizen we failed to transfer a corresponding sense of responsibility which the old traditions and institutions had imposed and institutions had imposed upon the nobility. We failed to develop new institutions or a new tradition attaching obligations and responsibility to position and to office directly, as a substitute for a system that fixed such responsibility through birth or class.

Montesquieu declared that that honor was the basis of monarchy and virtue the basis of democracy. History has demonstrated that honor without virtue is an insufficient basis for monarchy, so history is demonstrating that virtue is also inadequate unless sustained by honor.

What can be done to bring about an improvement in public morality in the United States?

First, there must be a broad effort to transform the whole social and cultural environment—that is, to transform it by eliminating whatever pushes man toward evil or leads him into error, and whatever establishes or sustains conditions which encourage man to easy response in action that is morally objectionable and wrong.

Government has a clear responsibility in this field, but it a residual and sustaining responsibility; the primary and principal responsibility rests on all persons and on all institutions that affect moral judgment and actions, primarily those whose work is religious and educational.

Second, ethical standards in business and in the professions must be raised primarily for the sake of businessmen, but also because of the effects such improved standards will have on public morality and morality in public service.

We have come to accept that only a few fields of activity are truly professional—for instance, medicine and the law—and that all others are, somehow, nonprofessional or unprofessional. It is essential that other groups be indentified, like professions, with special public responsibilities, and consequently be expected to develop self-discipline and individual codes of ethics—a true sense of profession.

I cite as examples physical scientists in some fields, certified public accountants, public-relations personnel and others acting as consultants and advisers on matters touching directly on the social and public good.

Third, we must take immediate action to develop in the United States a code of ethics for men in public office, for those with responsibilities for making laws, interpreting laws and administering the affairs of Government, and to lay the foundations upon which we can build a tradition reflecting the high honor and responsibility of Government service.

The responsibility rests first with the Congress and the President, who have the authority to set standards for Government service. In a more general way it is a responsibility of the colleges and universities. They should be willing not only to fill the demand but also to create a supply of men who view Government as a professional career and who are liberally educated and professionally trained for such service.

Lindsay Warren, as Controller General of the United States, testified in 1951 before a special subcommittee to study ethical standards in Government:

"For a long time I thought that no code of ethics or morals would insure a high standard of conduct of the Government's business. I have felt that moral integrity is something innate, the result of a person's conscience, upbringing, and education and not something controllable by regulation, no matter how rigid. * * * Without good administration the best written codes will fail.

"However, the things I have seen in my 25 years in Washington, especially the shocking disclosures of the war and postwar period, have made me more receptive to an official moral code. In the first place, I no longer feel that we can rely on the moral training of all those who come into or deal with the Government."

We must not expect perfection. It will not be possible to eliminate all abuses through changes in rules and procedures. But there is a continuing need for reexamination of the methods and processes through which the great powers of Government are exercised, and a need, also, for penalties and punishments which are adjusted to the new and varied ways in which public officials today may violate public trust.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times magazine, Aug. 19, 1962]

A Senator Looks at the Lobbies: Groups That Have Stakes in Pending Legislation Clamor To Be Heard in Congress—This It Is Argued, Is Their Right, and There Are Safeguards Against Their Abusing It

(By Eugene J. McCarthy)

(Note.—Eugene J. McCarthy has served as a Senator, Democrat, from Minnesota since 1959. He wrote "Frontiers of American Democracy.")

Washington.—The word "lobbying" has a derogatory ring. This is not surprising, for good or bad lobbying occurs in the processes of democracy at the point of rough transition where interests conflict and judicial processes fall short. Lobbying is a test—sometimes a raw test—of the judgment and integrity of political officeholders, both elected and appointed.

Who are the lobbyists? What do they do in order to affect the course of Government? How effective are they? Is lobbying a threat to democracy? Do Government officials need more protection from lobbyists? What can or should be done about lobbying? It is important that these questions be asked and that an attempt be made to answer them.

This has been a most active year for lobbyists in Washington. They were drawn especially by the tax bill, the Trade Expansion Act, the medical insurance program and by the Sugar Act.

The activities of lobbyists on the Sugar Act, which involves foreign countries, have moved the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a special study of lobbying—or, as the committee described it, of "nondiplomatic activities of representatives of foreign governments or their agents in promoting the interests of those governments." Investigation or inquiry into the operation of lobbyists in other fields has been suggested by some Members of Congress.

By statute, the lobbyist today is any person who solicits money or anything of value to be used principally to secure or influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Lobbying has a long history. The word "lobby" appeared first in the English language about the middle of the 16th century. It was derived from the medieval Latin word "lobium," a monastic walk or cloister.

Three hundred years later the word was in politics. It was used both to identify a hall or corridor in the British House of Commons and as a collective noun applied to all those who frequented these lobbies. It covered those who sought to influence men in office as well as newspapermen and others looking for news and gossip.

Today the word "lobbyist" is used both in its narrow legal sense and, more broadly, as a description of all attempts to influence not only the legislators, but also any agency or officer of Government. Registered lobbyists in Washington number approximately 1,100, but the number of persons and agencies involved in efforts to influence the Government is much greater.

Some lobbyists represent big interests and well organized groups. The chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have registered lobbyists along with the AFL–CIO; so do the American Petroleum Institute, the Association of American Railroads, and nearly all major industrial and financial interests. The so-called little people and the unorganized or less organized also have lobbyists. For example, the American Committee for Flags of Necessity, the Hualapai Tribe of Hualapai Reservation, and the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation are among those groups or organizations represented by lobbyists.

Some lobbyists are well paid; some get little more than expense money. Some operate directly on Government officials, others primarily by indirection through appeals to constituents or voters. Some are professional, others amateur. Some lobbyists represent only one position or program, while others are available as free lancers on an issue-by-issue or client-by-client basis.

Some lobbyists are quite open—they seek their own gain, the protection of an economic advantage, or the elimination or reduction of advantages held by their competitors. These cry more often for equity than they do for justice. Others speak for the arts, for morality, for aid to the sick and for the oppressed among the family of man.

What do lobbyists do in order to affect Government decisions?

The methods used by the lobbyists are almost as varied as their causes. Some appeal on a purely personal basis, as friend to friend. Some undoubtedly use monetary or material appeals, but there is little evidence of direct payoff in lobbying activities affecting the Congress. In some 14 years of membership in the Congress, I know of no case in which a Member was moved to support or to oppose a position in response to any kind of direct financial or material reward. The indirect influence of campaign contributions is more difficult to assess but it is, I believe, more important.

The most common method of lobbying is that of simply appearing before a committee of Congress or speaking to individual Members in an attempt to bring them to understand one's position or to influence them to support that position.

How effective are the lobbyists?

Some are wholly ineffective but take credit for what happens without, in fact, having in any way influenced events.

Among the regular lobbies, the postal employees' organizations are usually very active and, whenever postal pay legislation is before Congress, they are listed at or near the top in terms of total expenditures. In order to raise wages or to change working conditions significantly, the spokesmen for the postal workers of the country must influence either the Congress or the administration—or both—for Government employee unions are not recognized and dealt with in the same way as other labor unions are by private employers. There is little doubt that

the existence of this Washington lobby has influenced the Congress and successive administrations to raise salaries and to improve working conditons not only for postal employees, but for all Government workers.

The major farm organizations in the country maintain regular lobbies in Washington. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union usually take opposite sides on farm legislation. The apparent success of the two organizations parallels closely the success of the two major political parties. The Farmers Union position is favored when the Democrats are in power, and the Farm Bureau position when the Republicans are in power.

One of the most interesting and continuing lobbying efforts of recent years has been that in support of a bill which is known as H.R. 10. This bill proposes to change existing income tax laws to allow members of professions and other self-employed persons a limited income tax credit on money invested in private pension or retirement programs. Starting almost from scratch, the supporters of this legislation have secured the approval of the House of Representatives and of the Senate Finance Committee. Victory in this case—if it comes—must be credited in great measure to the efforts of a lobby registered as the American Thrift Assembly, a kind of holding company or organizing lobby, which was supported in testimony by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Farm Bureau, the American Medical Association, and others.

In this session of Congress, lobbies have been most active in four major areas: taxes, trade and tariffs, medical aid for the aged and extension of the Sugar Act. Undoubtedly the lobbyists did have or will have some effect on action in each of these areas.

Any significant change in tax laws attracts the attention of those who may be affected. The changes being considered this year were significant and controversial and the lobbying effort extensive.

Industries likely to be affected by trade and tariff policies are always well represented in Washington. Whenever an issue even remotely bearing upon trade is brought up for consideration, the representatives of these industries seek permission to testify. The hearings on the President's new tariff and trade program have attracted them in great numbers. Members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, which ordinarily hold trade and tariff hearings, are generally familiar with the testimony of these witnesses. They have been described as somewhat like professional soldiers who regularly go to battle, seldom win wars and suffer few casualties.

One of the most active Washington lobbies this year, and through the years, is that of the American Medical Association—better known in Washington for what it is against than for what it is for. The spokesmen for the AMA have effectively opposed the inclusion of doctors in the social security retirement program. They were strongly opposed to amending the social security law to provide for the payment of social security pensions to people who are permanently or totally disabled after they pass the age of 50. And in the present session of Congress, the AMA lobby led the opposition to the establishment of a medical insurance program for the aged as a part of the social security program. Action in this congressional session has been a real test of the power of the AMA lobby.

Lobbying activities with reference to the Sugar Act revision this year involved lobbyists in greater numbers than ever in the past, and the lobbying activities were more intensive. At least 22 lobbyists testified before congressional committees in behalf of the countries they represented. The list of lobbyists included former members of both the Eisenhower and Truman administrations, Washington lawyers, and public relations men. Their agreements with their principals varied from flat fees to contingency agreements, depending upon the action taken by Congress.

The massive lobbying activity this year arose from the fact that the administration recommended that the Cuban sugar quota of some 3 million tons, withdraw from Cuba because of Castro, be purchased in the world market at something like 2.8 cents a pound rather than on a quota basis from designated countries at traditional premium prices. At the premium price the supplying country would receive approximately $54 a ton more than it would receive at world prices. The administration's counterproposal was an open, almost demanding invitation to every sugar producing country interested in getting a share of the premium market to seek representation. Most of them did.

We now come to the basic question: Is lobbying a threat to democracy?

The effects of lobbying can be good or bad, helpful or harmful to democracy, depending upon two things: the purposes or objectives of the lobbying effort, and the methods or devices by which the lobby seeks to accomplish its objectives.

There are some who take the extreme view that lobbies are by their very nature power blocs and therefore inconsistent with democratic government; that since lobbies represent special or limited interests, their objectives are of necessity not directed to the general welfare and, therefore, they should be abolished.

There are some who see nothing wrong with lobbies except when they represent economic interests.

There are some who hold that the dangers in lobbying arise from secrecy and behind-the-scenes operations and from the amount of money that may be spent by lobbyists.

There are regular demands that more publicity be given to lobbying activities, that lobbying be more closely regulated, and that the amount of money which can be spent by a lobbyist or lobbying groups be limited and fully reported.

Positively, the activity of lobbyists is often very helpful. Lobbyists can help maintain a balance between Congress and the executive branch of the Government. The executive branch has a prepared case, usually sustained by expert witnesses. The Congress can offer in opposition the knowledge and experience of its own Members and that of the committee staff or congressional assistants. Often this is an unfair contest. The expert testimony of lobbyists or witnesses from outside may help to bring the contest closer to balance.

Congress, of course, does not depend entirely upon lobbyists for its information. It is the usual practice to call upon governmental experts and also on independent experts drawn from groups directly affected by the legislation under consideration or from related fields and from the academic profession.

For example, in special hearings on unemployment in 1959, invitations to testify were sent to these organizations; the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Coal Policy Conference, the AFL–CIO, the United Mine Workers, the National Small Businessmen's Association, the Railway Labor Executives Association and others. Representatives of the U.S. Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Defense were called. Leading labor economists were asked to submit papers, to testify, and to meet with the members of the committee. Hearings were also held in the field. These hearings were open to the testimony of anyone who wished to speak on the subject.

Apart from laws and regulations, there are some built-in protections against the power and influence of lobbyists. One safeguard is that usually there are organized lobbies on both sides of controversial issues; protectionists on the one hand versus free-traders on the other; the AFL–CIO opposed by the National Association of Manufacturers; growers' associations against those seeking to improve working conditions of migratory farmworkers; antivivisectionists against those who favor medical experimentation with animals.

Sometimes the opposition is not direct but involves competition for a larger share of a quota or a subsidy, or for greater participation in advantageous tax concessions.

Political party positions and programs, too, tend to eliminate large areas of political action from the influence of lobbyists. The political compaign in the United States is a rather severe testing. Most of the important national issues are raised during political campaigns, and most men who are elected to office have made firm commitments on most issues.

The President of the United States is called to account and judged by the people every 4 years; Members of the U.S. Senate must run for reelection every 6 years, Members of the House of Representatives every 2 years.

The activities of Members of Congress are watched closely by colleagues, particularly by those of the opposite party. They are watched by newspapermen whose reputations in many cases are based upon their ability to ferret out and report any action and conduct unbecoming Government officials.

In addition, of course, everyone who holds office must assume that there are at least two or three people—perhaps in his own party and certainly in the opposition party—who are quite willing to replace him and consequently are likely to give more than ordinary attention to his conduct in public office.

What can or should be done about lobbying?

Members of Congress cannot be fully protected from lobbyists by regulation. They cannot be expected to keep a checklist of registered lobbyists or demand proof of registration or defense of nonregistration before responding to a request for conversation or for a conference. Yet, Members of Congress and other Government officials can be given some protection by law.

The present Lobby Registration Act should be fully enforced, and financial reporting should be checked carefully. Fees contingent on successful lobbying should be outlawed. Care should be taken to remove from direct legislative determination those questions which should be settled by other branches of Government: by the President, by special commissions, by departments and agencies of Government or by international agreement.

Much of the agitation over the Sugar Act could have been prevented if the administration, acting directly or possibly in cooperation with the Organization of American States or the signatories to the International Sugar Agreement, had determined the way in which the Cuban sugar quota was to be allocated. There would have been some congressional protest, since in a broad way Congress has determined sugar allocations since the Sugar Act was passed in 1934. But the protest would have been limited and the compromises so minor that extensive lobbying activities, brought on when the whole question of reallocation was left open by the administration, would have been discouraged.

Better salaries for Government officials and sounder methods of financing campaigns would also lessen the likelihood of undue financial influence on public officials by lobbyists and others.

There is always the risk that public officials may be unduly subject to outside influence. But it is hard to imagine a meeting of a national legislature today that could

or should be insulated from public pressure or demand. The practice of some primitive tribes, in which the wise men or elders withdrew from society periodically to consider laws and practices, is not likely to be revived.

The whole concept that lobbying opposes the majority, that it seeks to manipulate and subvert the majority will and the public interest, is unrealistic. Lobbyists seldom manufacture a problem. They call attention to an existing problem and try to guide the course of events. Action in Washington sometimes supports the judgment of J. B. S. Hardman, the philosopher and intellectual mentor of industrial trade unionism in America: "Majorities never rule, they merely give credentials to contending minorities."

Although lobbying does not usually involve a physical assembly—such as the 1932 veterans' bonus march on Washington or current picketing of the White House—it does involve organization, a bringing together of citizens seeking a common objective. Thus, the act of lobbying is basically an exercise of the right to petition the Government—a right set forth in the Constitution. Lobbying also involves, in a way, the exercise of the right of assembly.

In a democratic society there must be a point at which influences, both good and bad, are brought to bear upon government. The point at which these influences meet finally is in the elected and appointed officials of the country. They are supposed to be men skilled and experienced in politics and possessing the character to withstand improper pressures and improper demands.

Until a clear case can be made against the lobbyist, his voice should be heard in Washington. But his voice must be identified and, insofar as possible, restricted to that influence which is justified by the facts and the conclusions to be drawn from those facts.

THE BIG ONES

As reported, according to law, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, the 10 biggest spending lobbies in Washington in 1961 were:

American Medical Association	$163,405
AFL–CIO	139,919
American Farm Bureau Federation	111,364
American Legion	103,566
U.S. Savings & Loan League	101,801
National Committee for Insurance Taxation	90,058
National Farmers Union	88,273
National Housing Conference	88,141
American Trucking Associations, Inc	84,986
International Brotherhood of Teamsters	81,918

Attorney General Robert Kennedy's Address to the Polish Roman Catholic Union Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy addressed the Polish Roman Catholic Union convention in Baltimore. I should like to call his inspiring remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

The Polish Roman Catholic Union is the oldest Polish American fraternal organization in America. In its 89 years of existence, this dedicated organization, which has chapters in virtually every State in the Union, has written an impressive record of contributions toward helping Americans of Polish descent become better versed on the strength of the democratic process and also to become better American citizens.

It is most reassuring to know that the Attorney General of the United States would take time out from his very busy schedule to meet with this very worthwhile organization and discuss with them the problems which confront freedom-loving people throughout the world. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Attorney General Kennedy was given one of the greatest ovations ever accorded a guest of the Polish Roman Catholic Union Convention in its 89 years of existence.

Attorney General Kennedy's eloquent message follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC UNION CONVENTION, LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD., MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1962

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Fathers, officers, and delegates to the Polish Roman Catholic Union Convention, the one characteristic which distinguishes us as Americans in the world today is that in the United States we have a land of 180 million people whose cultures and background come from virtually every nation in the world, and yet we live virtually as one people.

I am particularly happy to be with you here today to participate in the opening session of your convention because Americans, regardless of ethnic background, will agree that the Polish Roman Catholic Union, through its 89 years of existence, has made an indelible contribution to the growth of America.

Over the years you have assisted Polish immigrants make an orderly transition from the customs of the Old World to those of our country. Your efforts have helped these people become dedicated Americans and made your communities across the country better places in which to live.

Although Poland is a much older nation than the United States, our destinies have been closely and profitably intertwined.

A few years after its founding, Jamestown, the first permanent settlement in America, was in trouble. The gentlemen adventurers who formed Capt. John Smith's company had little taste for the hard task of building a colony in a hostile wilderness. They were more interested in vain searches for gold than in clearing stubborn forests or plowing fields.

Smith sent to London for help. He asked for men who would work and who had the skills necessary to create a civilization in the wilderness.

The next ship brought help, not more gentlemen seeking a quick fortune, but six skilled craftsmen—Lowicki, Stefanski, Mata, Bogdan, Zrencia, and Sadioski.

These first six Poles in the new world went to work. They established a glass furnace—the first industry in America—and helped the Colony to start a soap works and a sawmill. John Smith credited their example of skill and industry with saving Jamestown.

A few years later, when the Colony was to elect the first representative legislature in America, the Governor ruled that only those born in England could vote. The Poles promptly put down their tools and proclaimed "No vote, no work." The Governor relented and the annals of the Jamestown Colony for 1619 note that Poles were extended the full rights accorded other settlers.

It is not surprising that this first strike in America was by Poles and that it was staged in the name of freedom.

The Polish love of freedom served this Nation well then and in the Revolution. The names of Pulaski and Kosciusko brighten the pages of our history.

Pulaski died in an attack on the British at Savannah after distinguished service at the Battle of Brandywine and at Valley Forge. But Kosciusko lived to serve the cause of freedom both here and in Poland long after the war.

A large cash award and a valuable tract of land were bestowed upon him by a grateful Congress, but he never used this bounty for himself. Before leaving to fight again for Polish freedom in 1794, he placed his will in the hands of Thomas Jefferson.

That last testament, as did his entire life, struck a blow for freedom and human dignity. It directed that his estate be used to buy Negro slaves and set them free.

Down through the years, Americans and Poles have shared the burden of fighting for freedom. Several years ago, I climbed that steep, rocky Italian hillside where Polish troops, under General Wladyslaw Anders, took Monte Cassino from the Nazis, climaxing some of the hardest fighting of the Second World War.

I shall never forget the inscription on the memorial to the Polish soldiers buried there:

"We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given our souls to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy, and our hearts to Poland."

On the day the Poles captured Monte Cassino, American GI's were moving forward through the hills on their left and the Americans who died in that battle are buried a few miles from their Polish brothers.

This has been the theme of the relationship between the Polish and the American peoples—working and fighting together in the cause of freedom.

Time after time, Americans have been inspired by the stubborn courage of the Poles. We cannot forget that at the outset of the Second World War, Polish cavalrymen charged their horses against Nazi tanks.

Nor can we forget General Bor's uprising against the Germans in Warsaw, holding out for 63 days against the might of the German occupation force.

We have been able to make partial payment on the debt we owe to the sons of Pulaski and Kosciusko.

Nor have we forgotten our friend in the troubled days since the Second World War. We welcome and support the advances that have taken place in recent years.

We will continue to be concerned for the welfare of the Polish people and to maintain our traditional close ties of friendship with them.

I am happy that this Government has been able to extend over a half billion dollars in assistance to the Polish people in the past 5 years, and I am happy that this program is going to continue. This aid has been supplemented by the fine work of private organizations and citizens who have been sending generous assistance since the war.

American private and Government aid and assistance joined to build the new children's hospital which is nearing completion in Kracow.

We have invited leaders of the Polish Government and leaders of thought and opinion in Poland to visit America and see this land for themselves.

Cultural exchanges are continuing to increase. The Warsaw philharmonic and the Polish folk dance groups have toured this country. A band from Warsaw played at the Washington, D.C., and Newport jazz festivals this summer.

Our program of exchanging students, teachers, and technicians is continuing and

I hope it will grow as both nations can benefit from it.

Each year, more and more American tourists are going to Poland. I hope that trend will increase and will flow both ways so that more Poles will visit us and see America.

These exchanges are but tangible evidence of the close bond between the people of Poland and the people of the United States.

Today, more than ever before, we need the courage and dedication to freedom which have made Americans and Poles such good friends through their history.

We face a resourceful foe who seeks to impose his totalitarian way on free men everywhere. The threat takes many forms. It may be a wall in Berlin, occupied domination of proud old nations, guerrilla warfare in southeast Asia, military aid to Cuba, or espionage in our own country.

We are alert to this threat and as President Kennedy said last week, we intend to do everything within our power to meet it—and our power is very great.

We are making a consistent, carefully planned effort to turn the arms race into a peace race to spread respect for the rule of law, and dedication to man's God-given right to be free.

We are convinced that a supreme effort must be made to halt the arms race, but until some progress is made, we are and will remain prepared to do what is necessary to protect our own interests and the security of our friends and allies.

As we face this challenge through the difficult years ahead, another of the great attributes of the Polish people—their loyalty and devotion to the Roman Catholic Church—will serve us well.

Poles are now celebrating their 1,000th anniversary as a Christian people. Think of it—40 generations of faith.

Ten centuries of Christianity have given the Polish people a collective dynamism and a sense of great continuing national purpose. Indeed, the birth of Poland as a nation is closely tied to the arrival of Christianity and its long and proud history has continued this close bond to the church.

We have a rich heritage of our own—revolution, toughness, industry, and unswerving belief in the fundamental rights of the individual—but we are a young nation. We look back to many lands for our basic beliefs and traditions.

The Poles brought to this country strength, courage, faith, and perseverance—and America is indebted to its Polish citizens for helping to forge our national character with this steel.

A thousand years of history shows beyond a doubt that the spirit of freedom and human dignity is so ingrained in the Polish soul that no tyrant will ever succeed in destroying them.

I know from my own experience, for on the same trip that I saw the monument at Monte Cassino, I also visited Poland. I came there from the Soviet Union, and it was inspiring to enter a country where the people yearn for the principles of freedom and meaningful democracy. It was like emerging from darkness into the sunshine.

During those thousand years, Poland has been conquered and partitioned six times. Yet Poland has never lost its concept as a nation. Stubbornly and passionately, the Poles have clung to their determination to be free. They have refused to quit. They have always come back.

This is the strength and tradition of the Polish character. This is your heritage.

So, it is a privilege to be here for not only do I feel a close bond with the Polish people, but the President shares this regard and feeling. His sister-in-law is married to a Pole. The President has visited Poland as has my mother, my brother, Ted, and my sisters. With virtually no other group has my family had a closer affiliation.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, speaking on Memorial Day, 1884, in Keene, N.H., said:

"It is required of a man that he should share the passions and actions of his time at the peril of being judged not to have lived."

I can think of no other people who have shared the passions and actions of their time as have the Poles.

I hope you will have a successful conference and that you will return to your homes with renewed dedication to our common ideals of freedom and human dignity.

And I know you share with me the conviction that Poles everywhere are dedicated to these ideals and that they will triumph, for imbedded throughout the pages of Polish history and our own is the slogan which is apt today—"Polak nie sluga"—a Pole—and I might add an American—will never be a serf.

"We Asked and Now We Answer" Results of District Poll by Representative Hugh L. Carey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the results of a survey on Federal issues which I recently conducted in my district. The response, in the tens of thousands, speaks well for the public interest of the people of Brooklyn.

The questions I asked and the results are as follows:

1. Medical care for aged under social security: Yes, 62 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

2. Aid to education in some form for pupils of all schools: Yes, 60 percent; no, 37 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

3. Authorize the President to negotiate tariffs with trade blocs such as Common Market and other countries: Yes, 65 percent; no, 25 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

4. Federal subsidy or financing of (1) family fallout shelters, (2) community fallout shelters: Yes, 41 percent; no, 52 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

5. My bill to revise tax deductions to afford greater allowances for student dependents to cover education expenses: Yes, 82 percent; no, 12 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

In addition to publishing the results of this survey I have decided to live dangerously and adopt a new wrinkle. The practice among some Members who conduct these surveys is to ask questions but seldom to answer them. I submit that since I am now aware of how the residents of my district feel they have an equal right to know my position. Addressing myself first to the question which generated the most comment and controversy—No. 2, I favor a fair share in any educational assistance for every child in every school. As a sponsor of the "GI bill for junior" with my distinguished colleague, Representative JAMES J. DELANEY, of Queens, I advocate that financial assistance to preserve the right of freedom of choice in education be extended through the States and to the parents of all children in all schools. This bill has an absolute prohibition against any Federal control, interference, or monopoly in education. Since it follows the same pattern of distribution as the GI bill after World War II and the Education Act for the Pages of Congress, it is modeled on constitutionally unquestioned legislation which has worked well and is nondiscriminatory. The bill does not provide aid for teaching religious subjects and it is therefore not subject to objection under the First Amendment.

The "GI bill for junior" is in keeping with the concept of distributive justice in that every parent has an equal right to share in the proceeds of tax funds allocated to education. I believe that at every level of government, Federal, State, and local, that the parent should not be compelled to forfeit his right to freely choose a school and direct the education of his children as a condition to receiving an equitable share of his own taxes. Parents rights in education are paramount and inviolate and must remain so. This was recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations General Assembly at article 26 which reads:

Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given their children.

It is significant that when this resolution was passed in the General Assembly the Communist bloc nations abstained from voting. Under their system of education the parents have no control over the education of their children and they become creatures of the state. To avoid that in our Nation it is essential that we recognize and preserve parents' rights in education. This is particularly important in the light of the further secularization of the schools in our State resulting from the decision of the Supreme Court in the New Hyde Park regents school prayer case. Children must not be forced to attend a school where prayer is forbidden. We must move on twin fronts to restore the right of prayer to the public schools and serve the right of the parent to choose education with religion added through a fair plan of assistance. That plan is the bill for which I urge consideration as vital to our junior citizens—the "GI bill for junior." These junior citizens are voiceless and voteless but they have a right to educational excellence and I will continue to work in their interest.

On the other issues I have supported a plan of medical care for all our citizens over 65 and I intend to work for a solution which will provide that care with adequate safeguards against any threat of socialized medicine.

I strongly supported the Trade Expansion Act, a legislative blue ribbon of the 87th Congress. New York City clearly depends on trade for jobs and well-being and that trade could only be increased by effective interest in the Common Market. This legislation passed by a vote of 298 to 125.

I am in accord with the recent action of the Armed Services Committee in deleting $460 million allocated to the fallout shelter program.

Our strong defense effort, the largest in peacetime history, is the best approach

to deterring Communist aggression. I favor continuing surveys to maximize the use of existing shelter facilities.

My bill to increase the tax deduction for children from the present unrealistic amount of $600 to a gradually higher figure, based upon the age of the child and therefore his needs has received universal support. The deduction would finally rest for all dependents at a new level of $800. The other provision of this bill allowing deductions to cover educational expense has been similarly well received.

Unfortunately, until the residents of our district express themselves further on these questions as only constituents can, I will not know how many disagree with me. If the majority do, then I will not be around to run this risk again, but while I am here at least my stand is clear so that, while some may question the prudence of stating my views on the questions I have asked, it must be conceded that the policy is positive.

Assembly of Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most capable Members of the House of Representatives, and I assure you one of the most capable members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, gave an address at the plenary meeting of the Assembly of Captive European Nations in New York. His address is of note and I feel that all should read it with care.

He emphasizes the grave mistake of Hungary. This mistake was reported by my committee in this manner:

> The Hungarian revolution which broke out October 23 was catastrophic in nature and caught the free world totally unprepared.

In this address he referred to one of the reports made by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am the chairman of this Subcommittee on Europe and at the time the report was written, I was fortunate to have the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] as a member of my committee.

He was a member of the special study mission to Europe following the Hungarian revolution which was the subject of the study mission's report. His contribution to the study mission is now equaled by his reports on Cuba and the enormous problems involved in the Communist takeover with the assistance of Fidel Castro, of these peoples by the leaders of the Kremlin.

I regret that the aggression and seizure of the peoples of eastern Europe was not a lesson and forewarning to us and to the nations of the Western Hemisphere in meeting the subversion of Cuba by the U.S.S.R.

We must meet the problem of Cuba with calm deliberation. I regretted the day President Eisenhower withdrew recognition of Cuba. Recognition has not been withdrawn from other Communist controlled nations and by not withdrawing recognition, a nation can always maintain a foothold in a country by maintaining an embassy, even though small.

I know my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], will help to keep the spark of liberty alive in the hearts of the peoples of the captive nations throughout the world and I hope we will all see the day when we will again see them a free people.

I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of our colleague, the Honorable ARMISTEAD SELDEN:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN AT PLENARY MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT INTERNATIONAL CENTER, NEW YORK CITY, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1962

Five years ago, following the Hungarian Revolution, the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs undertook a special study mission. In Paris, Vienna, Munich, Bonn, London, Warsaw, and Belgrade, members of the subcommittee sought to determine the effect of U.S. policy toward Soviet satellite nations, in the wake of the massacre of Budapest.

As a member of the subcommittee I learned firsthand, from Hungarian refugees, the grim results of the failure of the United States and the free world to meet the challenge of Budapest.

Five years have passed since our subcommittee, in its report to the Congress, said:

"The forces of communism are committed to making colonies of all nations by any means available, with no recognition of any standard except that might makes right. In any consideration of policy, it must be remembered that peace will not be secured by any evidence of weakness in the free world's struggle against Soviet power and Soviet propaganda.

"The survival of Western civilization," said the 1957 subcommittee report, "depends on the influence exercised by the United States, not alone upon the nations which are free today, but, more important, upon those nations which yearn for freedom now—the satellite nations. We have reached a turning point in history where, unless we formulate and implement policies of action, courageously and firmly executed, scholars might someday read the history of the decay of Western civilization under faltering U.S. leadership.

As a member of that subcommittee and as a Member of Congress, as well as an American concerned about the future of freemen and men who would be free, I regret to say that these words are as true today as they were in 1957.

Indeed, the subcommittee report has proven prophetic—tragically so.

Today, Soviet power subjugates not only the people of Eastern and Central Europe, but the people of a nation a mere 90 miles from the shores of the power center of the free world.

Today, Soviet propaganda works unceasingly to corrode not only the will of captive nations, but the power and will of free nations as well.

Today, the Soviet threat to the survival of civilization is greater than ever before in history.

This is not alarmist talk. It is not defeatist talk. It is simple historical truth, and to ignore it is to compound the errors of the past. For the bitter fact is that during the half decade which has elapsed since Budapest, time has worked against the free world.

Yet I submit that the reason for this weakening of the free-world position is not that which Soviet propaganda and dogma would have us believe. Our power has not receded because the march of communism is inexorable, but because we did not learn the lesson of Budapest.

In short, the history of the cold war since 1957 is not so much that of Communist success as of free world failure—let me quote again from the subcommittee report—to "formulate and implement policies of action, courageously and firmly executed."

Incredibly, there remain policymakers in the free world who still cling to illusions regarding the true nature of Soviet imperialism. These people continue to urge on the free world a policy based on their illusions—a policy not of action, but of inaction.

We therefore have witnessed in the past 5 years the emergence of a cold war policy which denies the existence of the cold war, the so-called policy of coexistence.

"Coexistence," "accommodation," "relaxation of tensions"—these are the current words and phrases of the free world's diplomatic vocabulary this autumn of 1962. They are words which gloss over the essential truth of the world in which we live today.

The value of the Assembly of Captive European Nations lies in your continuing efforts to cut through these illusory words and phrases—to lay bare for the people of the free world the grim realities of Soviet power.

Your organization is not simply a symbol of hope for the captive peoples. It is also an instructor and guide for the people, as well as the policymakers, of the free world.

This assembly understands, from the harsh experience of recent history, that Soviet communism allows for only one kind of coexistence, the coexistence known by the captive peoples of Russian imperialism.

This assembly knows, from the cruel lessons inflicted upon your nations and your compatriots, that Soviet communism permits only one form of accommodation—the accommodation forced upon captive peoples by Russian brutality and deceit.

And this assembly can see through the cloud of illusion to reject the foolish and dangerous notion that there can be any true relaxation of tensions in a world half slave to the Kremlin.

No, the cold war continues relentlessly, and those who counsel coexistence, accommodation, and relaxation of tensions do not understand our adversary. As a strategy for survival of our civilization, any policy based on such illusions must fail. It can only hasten a time when, and I quote again from the subcommittee report of 1957, when "scholars might someday read the history of the decay of Western civilization under faltering U.S. leadership."

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I am especially aware of the free world's failure during the past half decade to learn the lesson of Budapest. For during this period we have seen the arm of Soviet imperialism extend, from the bloody streets of Budapest to the bloody prisons of Fidel Castro's Cuba.

From Kadar to Castro—from the enslavement of Eastern and Central Europe to the enslavement of a people neighboring the United States—that is the tragic summary of our failure to act, courageously and firmly, against Soviet aggression.

Cuba today is a captive nation in every sense. All the implements and apparatus which enforce Soviet domination of Central and Eastern Europe, including Russian military personnel and equipment, are today present on that island.

But while the American people are immediately concerned about the Soviet threat in Cuba, and while our attention is focused there, it would be well to trace the policy

steps leading to this crisis of the Western Hemisphere.

In my opinion, the free world's failure to formulate a purposeful and sustained policy concerning the captive nations of Europe is a direct cause leading to the establishment of the first captive nation in the Western Hemisphere. A policy which grants and permits the Soviet Union's subversion and overthrow of legitimate governments in Europe has resulted in the Kremlin's challenging the United States on our own frontier.

This course of events is really not surprising. For although there are those policymakers in the free world who think in terms of so-called spheres of influence, the Communists neither know nor respect any limitation on their world aspirations.

"The forces of communism," declared our congressional report 5 years ago, "are committed to making colonies of all nations by any means available, with no recognition of any standard except that might makes right."

Predictably, when the free world assures the Communists that they need fear nothing from us in their own so-called sphere, the Communists intensify their efforts to extend that sphere. Their goal remains world domination, nothing less.

In 1956, when Khrushchev declared "hands off Hungary," the West accommodated. We heard much expert talk then about so-called spheres of influence and the alleged political and military realities of Eastern and Central Europe. The result is that today the Soviet dictator is emboldened to tell us, in the same strident tone, "hands off Cuba."

Where now are the experts who ceded the freedom of 100 million Europeans on the basis of their inhabiting areas within the so-called Soviet "sphere"? Surely these authorities must now recognize that Soviet imperialism is not satisfied by concessions, nor is it derived from or limited by geography.

Cuba, we may be assured, is not a Soviet satellite because of its geographical proximity to the Soviet Union. I submit that the same can be said for the captive nations of Europe. Subversion, force, denial of the right to self-determination, these are the political and military realities which support Soviet domination over Budapest and Havana.

The point is clear, if only our experts will see it. The nations of Eastern and Central Europe are not Communist-dominated because of political inevitability, but because the forces of Soviet tyranny have been permitted a free hand by vacillating and indecisive Western policies.

If we begin by accommodating ourselves to Rusian domination in Eastern and central Europe, we inevitably must end by accommodating ourselves, whether we like it or not, to this same domination in the Western Hemisphere.

But this the people of the United States, who bear the greatest share of responsibility for free world policy, will never permit. And that is why I am hopeful that we may yet learn from Havana the lesson of Budapest.

Let us hope that these points are now brought home, to our policy framers as well as our people.

First, that we cannot cede or abandon any people or nation anywhere to Soviet tyranny, but must hold as a tenet of our world policy and faith the ultimate self-determination of all peoples.

To believe or to act otherwise is not simply immoral—it is irresponsible to the interests of Western civilization.

Second, that Communist ambition is global in scope and must be met by global counterstrategy.

Our failure has been that we continue to meet the Communists on cold war battlefields, within the bounds and upon the terms which their interests dictate. Berlin, Vietnam, Cuba, these are the stakes in the world struggle today. Significantly, they are all Western stakes.

A global counterstrategy for the West would mean that Khrushchev would not be given a free hand to pick and choose pressure points convenient only to the Soviet timetable. The vulnerable segments of the Soviet empire can and should be targets for Western political strategy.

Third, that we take the lead in extending the meaning of anticolonialism to include the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, as well as those in other parts of the world.

If the principle of self-determination means anything, it must be universal and unqualified. Our policymakers speak of taking the lead in the so-called revolution of rising expectations. Let us not overlook the expectations and hopes of the suffering peoples of Eastern and Central Europe, and let us not forget the brutal suppression of their revolutionary goals.

Here the United Nations faces one of its longstanding challenges, a challenge that cannot be evaded. For the repression of the European captive nations cannot be ignored by the United Nations if its pronouncements concerning self-determination are to be taken seriously.

Self-determination of peoples and nations is not subject to two definitions, one for the underdeveloped parts of the world and the other for Soviet captive peoples and nations. Let the moral finger of the United Nations point accusingly at Communist repression—and let the free world exert its influence in the United Nations toward that end.

Lastly, let the lesson be learned that the greatest hope for world peace and the security of the free world lies in carrying the cold war battle to the enemy—in extending the boundaries of freedom. Communism and Soviet imperialism will not recede or soften or mellow of its own accord. History shows that only the unremitting pressure of freemen, and men who would be free, can subdue tyranny.

Can we then look ahead to "policies of action, courageously and firmly executed?" We may hope that the swift pace of events in this hemisphere in recent weeks may spur courageous and firm action. Two years ago, almost to the day—on September 28, 1960—a program for such action was put forward in simple and direct language.

"I am tired of reading what Khrushchev is doing," said John F. Kennedy to an audience at Erie, Pa. "I would like the people of the world to be reading what the American President is doing, and what the United States is doing, not merely what Castro is doing or Khrushchev is doing or Kadar or Gomulka is doing."

These words of a man who is now President of the leading Nation of the free world reflect the feeling of the people of the United States and of anti-Communist lovers of freedom everywhere.

The time is overdue for this country and its allies to be up and doing. We must seize the initiative in the cold war through policies aimed at the ultimate elimination of Soviet imperialism—not only in the Western Hemisphere, but throughout the globe.

We live for a day when there need be no assembly of captive European nations. Only, however, when the lesson of Budapest and of Havana is truly learned by freemen—and acted upon by the forces of freedom—can we be assured that this day will come.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1962

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Oh God, in whose strong hands are the threads of every life which seeks its pattern on the loom of Thy righteous will, back of all our thinking and striving we are conscious of something divine that haunts us and will not let us go—something at work behind our fallible minds. Sometimes in the stillness we hear it like soft bells at evening pealing; sometimes in hours of mystic insight we feel it, and rising above the trifles which so often clutter our days, our hungry and empty hearts cry out, "Nearer, my God, to Thee, nearer to Thee." If that petition is but answered in these stern, strange times in which our lot is cast, if really in our hearts we draw near to Thee, then at Thy fire our little candle will blaze as we bring Thy light to every shadowed area of human need.

Even so, send us forth in the Spirit of the Master whose we are and whom we serve. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 19, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 19, 1962, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 3475. An act to provide further for cooperation with States in administration and enforcement of certain Federal laws; and

S. 3529. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 with regard to reimbursement of the railroad unemployment insurance account.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1171) to assure continued fish and wildlife benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas by authorizing their appropriate incidental or secondary use for public recreation to the extent that such